## BOARD MEETING AGENDA - September 25, 2017

1. Call to Order

- NOTICE OF MEETING RECORDINGS

Meetings of Lehigh County Authority's Board of Directors that are held at LCA's Main Office at 1053 Spruce Road, Wescosville, PA, may be recorded for viewing online at lehighcountauthority.org. Recordings of LCA meetings are for public convenience and internal use only and are not considered as minutes for the meeting being recorded, nor are they part of public record. Recordings may be retained or destroyed at LCA's discretion.

- Public Participation Sign-In Request

2. Review of Agenda / Executive Sessions
3. Approval of Minutes

- September 11, 2017 Board meeting minutes

4. Public Comments
5. Action / Discussion Items:

## FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

- LCA Pension Program - 2018 Minimum Municipal Obligation (MMO) - information only (yellow)
- 2018-2022 Capital Plans - Final Draft - information only (to be handed out at meeting)
- 2018 Preliminary Budget - presentation \& discussion
- 2018 Western Lehigh Rates - Preliminary Review (to be handed out at meeting)
- Suburban Water Rate Study - presentation \& discussion


## WATER

- Suburban Division - 2017 Water Meter Replacement Project (pink)


## WASTEWATER

- Design Phase Change Order - Park Pump Station Upgrade (blue)

6. Monthly Project Updates / Information Items ( $1^{\text {st }}$ Board meeting per month)
7. Monthly Financial Review ( $2^{\text {nd }}$ Board meeting per month) - August 2017 report attached
8. Monthly System Operations Overview ( $2^{\text {nd }}$ Board meeting per month) - August 2017 report attached
9. Staff Comments
10. Solicitor's Comments
11. Public Comments / Other Comments
12. Executive Sessions
13. Adjournment


PUBLIC PARTICIPATION POLICY
In accordance with Authority policy, members of the public shall record their name, address, and discussion item on the sign-in sheet at the start of each meeting; this information shall also be stated when addressing the meeting. During the Public Comment portions of the meeting, members of the public will be allowed 5 minutes to make comments/ask questions regarding non-agenda items, but time may be
extended at the discretion of the Chair; comments/questions regarding agenda items may be addressed after the presentation of the agenda item. Members of the public may not request that specific items or language be included in the meeting minutes.

The Meeting of the Lehigh County Authority was called to order at 11:04 a.m. on Monday, September 11, 2017, at which time Chairman Nagle called an Executive Session regarding potential litigation. Other Members present at the commencement of the meeting were: Linda Rosenfeld, Kevin Baker, Jeff Morgan, Richard Bohner, Norma Cusick, Scott Bieber, Ted Lyons and Deana Zosky. Authority Staff present were Liesel Gross, Brad Landon, Ed Klein, Chuck Volk, Chris Moughan, John Parsons, Susan Sampson, and Lisa Miller. Phil DePoe entered the meeting at 12:05 p.m.

The Executive Session ended at 12:23 p.m.
Chairman Nagle announced a break at 12:23 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 12:28 p.m. at which time the regular meeting was called to order.

## REVIEW OF AGENDA

Chairman Nagle announced that today's Board meeting is being videotaped and streaming live and recordings will be posted to the Authority's website.

Chairman Nagle noted there was an Executive Session at 11:00 a.m. prior to the regular meeting; the topic was potential litigation. There are no additional agenda changes.

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

## August 28, 2017 Regular Meeting Minutes

Richard Bohner suggested several corrections for grammar, word choice and phrasing. Scott Bieber asked that on page 2, fourth paragraph under the 2018-2022 Draft Capital Plans heading, the reference to Little Lehigh Creek be changed to Spring Creek.

On a motion by Richard Bohner, seconded by Ted Lyons, the Board approved the Minutes of the September 11, 2017 meeting as corrected above (9-0).

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

Joyce Marin, a Longswamp Township, Berks County resident with a Macungie mailing address, stated she read an article in the newspaper regarding blending and wants to learn more about this topic. Ms. Marin also stated she is concerned about the overall water table and how groundwater is being monitored because wells in her neighborhood are going dry. Liesel Gross addressed her concerns stating that weekly reports are posted on the Authority's website showing surface water and groundwater conditions within the Little Lehigh Creek basin. The Authority has established new drought triggers based on a collection of measures including the water level in the Little Lehigh Creek, a groundwater quarry in Fogelsville and a monitoring well in the Lower Macungie area. All triggers and other supplies are showing normal levels and Ms. Gross added that the Authority has not heard of any private wells going dry. Ms. Gross asked Ms. Marin to contact her after the meeting with information on the wells that are going dry so the Authority can use this information with other evaluations the Authority is doing. John Parsons gave an update on the status of the watershed monitoring project being led by Al Guiseppe of Spotts, Stevens and McCoy.

## ACTION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

## 2018-2022 Capital Plans - Review of Public Comments Received

Chuck Volk handed out the comments that were received from the Lehigh Valley Planning Commission (LVPC) and comments received from the City of Allentown (COA). Liesel Gross noted the Authority received the comments from the City late on Friday. The comments will be reviewed and the Authority will respond to them. The Board requested to see the Authority's response to the City when complete. Ms. Gross noted that more detail of the City Division water projects will be provided in the presentation of the Water System

Master Plan that Arcadis will be presenting next. The Board asked if there were any public comments. There were none. The LVPC and COA comments will be placed on the Authority's website.

## Allentown Division - Water System Master Plan Presentation

John Parsons, who was the project manager for this project, gave an overview of the study. Tony Dill and Marnie Bell were present from Arcadis and gave a PowerPoint presentation providing the scope and key findings of the Water System Master Plan. The purpose of the plan was to assess the current condition and remaining useful life of the water system infrastructure (excluding distribution system piping), identify prioritized projects that reduce risk, improve reliability, enhance operations, and develop a capital improvement plan (CIP) that encompasses 50-year planning period and addresses short and long term needs.

Deana Zosky asked how the Authority is integrating all study results with other planning documents and the budget. Chuck Volk said that the results were put into the Capital Plan.

In response to Board member questions about the Lehigh River intake project outlined in the plan, John Parsons commented that a lot of work has been done with the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) on the taste and odor regarding the Lehigh River, since that has been a complaint of customers at times when the Lehigh River intake has been used to provide water. The taste and odor problem originates from Geosmin and MIB (Methyl-Isoborneol) found in the water, especially during lowflow conditions that the Lehigh River often experiences.

Ted Lyons asked what would happen if the Authority loses use of the Little Lehigh Creek intake. John Parsons explained the water plant would struggle to keep up with the system demands, especially if not using the Lehigh River intake.

John Parsons provided three hardcopies of the entire report for anyone who wants to review it.
Kevin Baker asked if anything in the report provided a level of surprise. John Parsons said they were not surprised by the results of the report because it's an old system and the results are typical of an old system.

Liesel Gross said the master plan was submitted to the City in August and they are currently reviewing it.

## CH2M Contract Extension

Kevin Baker recused himself from this discussion because of a professional relationship with CH2M through his employment. A Conflict of Interest Disclosure form was signed and will be attached to the Minutes. Liesel Gross provided a memorandum describing the Operations \& Maintenance Contract Renewal and introduced Joe Nattress, Kevin Dahl, and Diana Heimbach from CH2M. Chuck Volk gave a brief background of the work and negotiations regarding the services CH 2 M provides.

Joe Nattress presented a PowerPoint overview of the processes and operation of the industrial wastewater pretreatment plant (PTP) in Fogelsville along with a background of CH 2 M and its history of working relationship with the Authority.

Liesel Gross described the history and negotiations regarding the contract renewal between the Authority and CH 2 M . Highlights of the contract terms and changes in three major areas include rate setting, the waste hauler program, and guaranteed cost savings/process improvements.

The Board commented on the waste hauler program regarding testing and registration. Diana Heimbach responded describing how the haulers are checked and the frequency of testing. Haulers must be preregistered and permitted prior to unloading at the plant.

Liesel Gross explained the benefits of extending the contract with CH2M that result in cost savings and process improvements. Joe Nattress described three capital improvements which are possible because of
the longer term of the contract that will be at no additional cost to the Authority but will result in shared cost savings for both parties.

Liesel Gross reviewed the process the Authority used to analyze and evaluate the competitiveness of CH2M's pricing and drafted a summary comparing the costs for LCA to operate the plant itself with its own personnel versus CH2M operating the plant. The cost is very similar however, if the Authority were to operate the plant, the Authority would not have the benefit of CH2M engineering expertise and public outreach, the transition cost would be significant because of upfront costs due to the costs incurred to hire personnel and purchase replacement equipment, as well as the costs to implement capital investments that CH 2 M will fund.

Liesel Gross said that based on the review of the contract by Authority Staff and Brad Landon, and in addition to the strong partnership with LCA and CH2M, it is recommended the proposed O \& M contract be approved.

Deana Zosky stated her concerns regarding capacity and long-term maintenance strategies as it relates to industrial customers and the ability of the Authority to recover the full cost of maintaining the facility. She also asked how the Authority is protected against any risks associated with the waste hauler program; Joe Nattress and Diana Heimbach explained the risks and explained how the new program will serve to minimize the risk to the Authority and CH2M, holding permitted haulers and waste generators responsible for the waste they discharge to the facility.

On a motion by Jeff Morgan, seconded by Norma Cusick, the Board approved the CH2M contract extension and authorized Staff to execute the contract with the ability to make any minor changes in the final version that do not materially change the terms in the version shared with the Board and reviewed for the meeting (8-0). Kevin Baker recused himself.

## Allentown Division - Kline's Island WWTP Phase 1 AO Design Improvements

Phil DePoe gave an overview of the project to respond to the EPA Administrative Order to eliminate sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs) and specifically to eliminate the use of Outfall 003 at Kline's Island Wastewater Treatment Plant (KIWWTP) to discharge untreated wastewater to the Little Lehigh Creek during wet-weather events. He reviewed the City of Allentown's (City) proposed two options to address this, including options for flow equalization and blending. Kleinfelder had previously completed the conceptual design for these options including developing of cost estimates for two phases of work. The City is responsible for determining the scope of the project and paying for the work, and recently directed the Authority to proceed with final design of the first phase of work on the blending option only. Mr. DePoe explained that Kleinfelder developed a proposal to complete the final design of the work, and he described all the components at the KIWWTP that would be included in the design. Ultimately, the blending option would include addition of tanks and other treatment facilities so that peak flows that exceed the plant's current 87 million gallon per day (MGD) peak flow capacity to receive primary treatment and disinfection, blending the treated effluent with flows that receive full treatment, and resulting in effluent discharges that meet all permit requirements.

Liesel Gross explained that since this item had been tabled from the August 14, 2017 Board meeting agenda, Kleinfelder was asked to prepare an updated proposal that would include work stoppages at key points along the design schedule to allow for the City and Authority representatives to pursue regulatory and legislative outreach initiatives aimed at securing a formal decision on the blending alternative prior to spending the full amount of the design contract. She referenced the recent news article that clarified the regulatory position that no formal decision would be provided on blending until a permit application was submitted, and the final design is required to prepare the permit application. However, if the outreach to regulators is successful in securing a formal decision sooner, that could save all ratepayers unnecessary design expenses. Kleinfelder provided a revised proposal to capture this request, which was described in more detail in the memo distributed to the Board prior to the meeting.

Kevin Baker asked what would happen if the Authority did nothing at the KIWWTP, and Mr. DePoe explained that overflows at Outfall 003 would continue anytime peak flows would exceed 87 MGD.

Linda Rosenfeld asked for clarification of the conditions in which blending would be used and stated that if it is only during peak flow period, the water level in the river is so high that the blended effluent being discharge would have minimal impact. Mr. DePoe confirmed that the blending facilities would be used during storms when the wastewater flows exceed 87 MGD and that Kleinfelder's conceptual design work has confirmed there is no measurable difference in effluent quality for blended waste versus waste discharged if flow equalization facilities were constructed.

Deana Zosky expressed her concern for downstream users of the Lehigh River that would be receiving the blended effluent, and that the impact to environmental quality is important to consider.

Marisa Altman, Allentown resident, stated that she believes there is a lot of ambiguity about the blending issue and the true impact it would have on the environment. She expressed concern about the potential for increasing frequency of larger storms that create the peak flow conditions, and that the City and other communities need to address the root cause of the problem. She suggested that the use of green infrastructure for stormwater management could help mitigate the peak flows. She also asked what would happen if the City invests in blending facilities now, only to find later that regulations don't allow it.

Liesel Gross thanked Ms. Altman for her comments and reminded the Board and public that the facilities to be constructed at the KIWWTP are only a part of the overall solution being contemplated. In the Western Lehigh County region, the townships and boroughs have partnered together to develop strategies to improve their sewer systems and address leakage. This will reduce peak flows, and even more leakage will be removed if other communities and the City of Allentown complete more work in their own systems as well.

Dan Koplish, consultant to the City of Allentown, provided a handout describing a study completed by Kleinfelder in 2016 to determine the water quality impact of blending. He explained that the permit requirements are established to protect the environment and sensitive ecosystems during very low-flow conditions when the KIWWTP discharge has the greatest impact on the environment. Because the blending facilities would only be activated during high-flow conditions, and the resulting discharge would continue to meet permit requirements, there is no measurable environmental impact caused by blending versus other alternatives. Blending is also the lowest cost alternative. Mr. Koplish also distributed a diagram of the KIWWTP, showing the footprint of flow equalization tanks that would be required to achieve similar results as blending. He expressed concern over the ability to expand the plant in the future if flow equalization tanks are constructed and in the event that regulatory changes require additional treatment facilities to be added at the site.

Jeff Morgan asked for confirmation that the blending facilities would treat the peak flows and discharges would continue to meet permit requirements. Phil DePoe explained Kleinfelder's conceptual design work indicates all permit requirements would be met.

Ted Lyons asked about the work completed to date by Kleinfelder and if there is any reason that they completed more work than anticipated, as indicated in the Authority staff memo. Mr. DePoe responded that the consultant's familiarity with the KIWWTP facility and its operations staff allowed more work to be completed in the conceptual design phase, and this will result in a lower overall project cost as their final design proposal is also well below the anticipated design cost for this work.

On a motion by Scott Bieber, seconded by Linda Rosenfeld, the Board approved the professional services authorization, amendment number 2, for Kleinfelder in the amount of $\$ 874,620.00$ for the final design of the City Division Administrative Order Phase 1 Improvements, as amended by the updated proposal distributed and discussed by the Board (8-1). Deana Zosky opposed.

## MONTHLY PROJECT UPDATESIINFORMATION ITEMS

Liesel Gross called the Board's attention to four items under Finance \& Administration section of the report (the 2018-2022 Capital Plan, 2018 Preliminary Budget, 2018 Western Lehigh Rates, and Suburban Water Rate Study) as they all relate to the 2018 Preliminary Budget. Deana Zosky suggested that budget assumptions, rate structures, operating budget, and capital plans should be integrated and presented together for approval as a single financial strategy. Liesel Gross responded that the Authority staff will review this prior to the submission of the meeting agenda for the September 25, 2017 Board meeting.

## STAFF COMMENTS

Liesel Gross recognized the Board for coming in early for the meeting and appreciates their level of dedication and detailed feedback provided on the items discussed at this meeting.

Susan Sampson announced that Liesel Gross has been selected by the Pennsylvania Municipalities Authorities Association (PMAA) as the 2017 Employee of the Year and will be honored at a dinner in Hershey that evening.

## SOLICITOR'S COMMENTS

None.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS / OTHER COMMENTS

None.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

An Executive Session was held at 11:04 a.m.

## ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 2:54 p.m.

## MEMORANDUM

Date: $\quad$ September 13, 2017
To: Lehigh County Authority Board of Directors
From: Edward Klein, Chief Financial Officer
Subject: $\quad 2018$ Minimum Municipal Obligation (MMO) for the Lehigh County Authority Pension Plan (39-448-6N)

Act 205 of 1984, as amended, governs the funding requirements for all municipal pension plans. The law requires the Chief Administrative Officer of each pension plan to inform the governing board of the municipality of the plan's expected financial obligation for the coming year. This must be done by the last business day in September.

The calculation of the 2018 MMO required an estimate of the $2017 \mathrm{~W}-2$ wages of the employees covered by the plan. I have indicated on the attached worksheet my best estimate of the same. Questions on the pension cost calculation may be addressed to either myself or the Pennsylvania Municipal Retirement System at (800) 622-7968.

The MMO is the municipality's 2018 bill for this pension plan and must be paid by December 31, 2018. The obligation must be met with general fund monies or with any General State Aid to Municipal Pensions to which we may be entitled to under Act 205.


Edward Klein
Chief Financial Officer edwardklein@lehighcountyauthority.org (610) 398-2503, extension 160

Attachment: 2018 MMO Worksheet

# The Minimum Municipal Obligation Worksheet (MMO) <br> For The <br> Lehigh County Authority Pension Plan (39-448-6 N) 

## For Plan Year 2018

## CHARGES

Estimated 2017 W-2 Payroll

For Covered Plan Members:
PMRS Determined Normal Cost
Expressed as a Decimal:
RESULT: (A) * (B) =
Administrative Charge (PMRS Determined)
\# of Plan Members times $\$ 20$ :
Amortization of Unfunded Liability
(PMRS Determined)
(A) $\$ 9.036,254$
(B) $\qquad$

TOTAL CHARGES: $(\mathbf{C})+(\mathbf{D})+(\mathbf{E})=$
(C) ${ }^{\#, 101,519}$
(D) $\quad 3,780$
(E) $\quad 130,146$
(F) $1,235,445$

## CREDITS

Repeat Estimated 2017 W-2 Payroll
For Covered Plan Members:
Employee Contribution Rate
Expressed as a Decimal:

$$
\text { RESULT: } \mathbf{( A )} \text { * }(\mathbf{G})=
$$

Amortization of the Actuarial Surplus
(PMRS Determined)
TOTAL CREDITS: $\mathbf{( H ) + ( \mathbf { I } ) =}$
MINIMUM MUNICIPAL OBLIGATION
(Based on 01/01/2015 Actuarial Valuation)
Equals TOTAL CHARGES Minus
TOTAL CREDITS (F) - ( J$)=$ (Please round numbers to dollars)
Prepared By: Kathy A.Marfin Human hesouras mgr
(A) $9,036.254$

$$
2
$$ (Name)


(G) 01
(H) ${ }^{8} 90,363$
$\qquad$ (Title) $\qquad$
(MAO) ${ }^{8} 1,145,083$

## MEMORANDUM

|  |  | Date: September 25, 2017 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To: | Lehigh County Authority Board |  |
| From: | Amy Kunkel, Capital Works Project Engineer |  |
| Subject: | Suburban Division - 2017 Water Meter Replacement Project - |  |
|  | Construction Phase |  |

## MOTIONS / APPROVALS REQUESTED:

| No. | Item | Amount |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Capital Project Authorization - Construction Phase | $\$ \mathbf{1 , 6 6 8 , 8 0 0 . 0 0}$ |
| 2 | Construction Contract - General (*): <br> Core and Main, LP f/k/a HD Supply Waterworks, LTD | $\$ 1,380,762.70$ |
| 3 | Meter Reading Upgrade Direct Purchase (*): <br> Core and Main, LP f/k/a HD Supply Waterworks, LTD | $\$ 28,000.00$ |
| 4 | Large Meter Direct Purchase (*) <br> Core and Main, LP f/k/a HD Supply Waterworks, LTD | $\$ 120,000.00$ |

(*) Included in Capital Project Authorization

## BACKGROUND:

The project consists of the replacement of older water meters (both residential and nonresidential) that have reached the end of their useful life. Meters 2" in size and smaller will be replaced under the General Construction Contract. Non-residential meters that are 3" and larger will be purchased by LCA and installed by the customer. All of the meter replacements will have new radio read units installed. Additionally, all meters that are currently manual read will be upgraded to radio read.

The existing (MXU) radio read unit that Sensus used on the older meters is being replaced with new "M Units" that require different meter reading equipment. The new meter reading equipment will be directly purchased and installed by LCA staff prior to the start of the meter replacement project. The new radio read equipment is compatible with our existing meter reading equipment, which will continue to read the old style radio units that have not been upgraded as part of this project.

The older MXU units were expected to have a 7 year battery life. As such, there are many metersless than 15 years old which do not fall within the meter replacement project, but cannot be read because of MXU failure. The General Construction contract includes replacement of approximately 800 of these failed units with new M Units. These new units will have a 20 year battery life.

## PROJECT OBJECTIVE:

The project objective is to replace and upgrade older and non-functioning meter reading equipment to increase meter reading accuracy and efficiency which in turn should increase revenue.

## FUNDING:

The Project will be funded by the LCA Suburban Division.

## BUDGET AMENDMENT:

Not required

## PROJECT STATUS:

Board approval is requested for the Construction Phase.

## THIS APPROVAL - CONSTRUCTION PHASE

## BIDDING SUMMARY:

This project was bid as one contract. The project was advertised for bid on August 23, 2017 and bids were received via PennBid on September 14, 2017, the results of which are as follows:

| General Construction |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Bidder | Bid Amount |
| Core and Main, LP, f/k/a HD Supply Waterworks, LLP | $\$ 1,380,762.70$ |

Core and Main, LP has extensive meter replacement experience, has worked with LCA numerous times on other projects, and is a supplier of Sensus products which is the basis of design meter equipment used in the Suburban Division. Both the firm and its subcontractor's qualifications and experience statements indicate numerous projects of similar scope and type. The bid documents are in order and the company appears well qualified to perform the work. The bid submitted is below the $\$ 1,400,000$ engineer's estimate for their portion of the replacement project.

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES:

Construction engineering and part time inspection services will be performed by LCA personnel.

## PROJECT SCHEDULE:

Based on contract award following the September 25, 2017 Board meeting, it is anticipated that the project will be completed by April 2018.

## FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS:

None

## CAPITAL PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

| Project No.: | SD-W-17-5 Budget Fund: | Suburban Div\Water\Capital |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Title: | Suburban Division <br> 2017 Water Meter Replacement Project Construction Phase - | Project Type: |
| This Authorization: To DATE ( $\mathrm{w} / \mathrm{ABOVE}$ ) | \$1,668,800 $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 6 6 8 , 8 0 0}$ | Construction Engineering Study Equipment Purchase Amendment |

## DESCRIPTION AND BENEFITS:

This Authorization is for the replacement of approximately 2000 residential meters and 430 commercial meters as well as replacing the transceiver units on "non-read" meters. Residential meters which are 20 years and older and commercial meters 15 years and older will be replaced. All meters will be upgraded to the most current radio read capability. This authorization takes the project through construction phase.

| Previous Authorizations |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| None |  |


| REQUESTED THIS AUTHORIZATION |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Construction Phase |  |
| Staff | $\$ 65,000$ |
|  |  |
| Contract 1-General Construction | $\$ 1,380,800$ |
| Miscellaneous | $\$ 28,000$ |
| Meter Reading Upgrade Direct Purchase | $\$ 120,000$ |
| Large Meter Direct Purchase | $\$ 75,000$ |
| Contingency | $\$ 1,668,800$ |
| Total This Authorization |  |


| Future Authorization |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| None |  |

Total Estimated Project $\$ 1,668,800$

## Review and Approvals:

Lehigh County Authority
1053 Spruce Street * P.O. Box 3348 * Allentown, PA 18106-0348
(610)398-2503 * FAX (610)398-8413 * Email: service@lehighcountyauthority.org

MEMORANDUM

Date:
September 25, 2017
To: Lehigh County Authority Board
From: Charles Volk, P.E., Chief Capital Works Officer
Subject: Design Phase Change Order - Park Pump Station Upgrade

MOTIONS /APPROVALS REQUESTED:

| No. | Item | Amount |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Capital Project Authorization - Contract Amendment No. 1 <br> Whitman, Requardt and Associates, LLP - design phase change <br> order | $\$ 44,406$ |

## PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The Park Pump Station was constructed in the early 1980s and is located in Little Lehigh Parkway within the City of Allentown. The station was originally intended to serve as a relief facility for the Western Lehigh and Little Lehigh Interceptors during wet weather events. The station conveys wastewater from ten municipalities to just upstream of Kline’s Island Wastewater Treatment Plant. The station has seen a dramatic increase in operation since its inception, and is now operated daily which has resulted in significant wear and tear on equipment, with many components nearing the end of their service life. In addition, the increasing frequency of pump related repairs and declining pump performance has necessitated an upgrade of this essential asset in order to restore the station to its design capacity and avoid sanitary sewer surcharging and overflows in the interceptors.

The purpose of this project is to maintain the level of service and design capacity, prolong service life and enhance station reliability. The project includes the following major equipment items: replace the pumps and motors, replace the electrical controls and drives, replace the HVAC system, replace the inoperable force main drain valve, replace affected sections of discharge and suction piping, install a new winch and hoist system for pump removal, modify the first floor dry well hatch, and other related upgrade work.

The improvements are consistent with provisions of the EPA Administrative Order.

## Change Order Summary:

This design phase change order requested by the design engineer (WRA) is to capture additional design scope items that were unforeseen at the commencement of design phase. These additional items include: evaluation of feasibility of increasing station design capacity beyond current 21 mgd to 24 mgd , in lieu of obtaining additional design capacity at KIWWTP in main pump station (this included evaluation of station space limitations, force main and station hydraulics analyses, and cost evaluation), analysis of maximum station capacity evaluation based on existing PPL service size, replacement of sump pumps, replacement of surge relief valve on force main, removal of well water supply system and connection with City water, replacement of all roof mounted exhaust fans, wet well level control system design revision for a new bubbler type control system, and specifications for all changes.

## Financial:

The Project will be funded by the LCA Suburban Division.

## Project Status:

Design phase is approximately $80 \%$ complete. The DEP Part 2 Water Quality Management Permit was submitted on $7 / 16 / 17$ to DEP and we are awaiting review comments. Bid phase is anticipated to follow DEP permit approval in early 2018.

## THIS APPROVAL:

Contract Amendment No. 1

## FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS

Construction phase.

## CAPITAL PROJECT AUTHORIZATION <br> AMENDMENT No. 1

| Project No.: | SD-S-15 | BUDGET <br> FUND: | Suburban <br> DivlWastewater\Capital |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Title: | Park Pump Station Upgrade |  | Project Type: |  |
|  |  |  | $\square$ | Construction <br> Engineering Design |
| This Authorization: | \$ 44,406 |  |  | Equipment Purchase |
| To DATE ( $\mathrm{W} / \mathrm{ABOVE}$ ) | \$ 377,008 |  | $\square$ | Amendment |

Contract amendment no. 1 - Whitman, Requardt, and Associates, LLC Design Phase Change Order DESCRIPTION OF SCOPE:
This design phase change order requested by the design engineer (WRA) is to capture additional design scope items that were unforeseen at the commencement of design phase. These additional items include the following:

1) Evaluation of feasibility of increasing station design capacity beyond current 21 mgd to 24 mgd , in lieu of obtaining additional design capacity at KIWWTP in main pump station (this included evaluation of station space limitations, force main and station hydraulics analyses, and cost evaluation);
2) Station capacity expansion capacity evaluation based on existing PPL service size
3) Replacement of station sump pumps
4) Replacement of surge relief valve on force main
5) Removal of well water supply system and design of connection with City waterline
6) Replacement of all roof mounted exhaust fans and fan controls
7) Wet well level control system design revision for a new bubbler type control system
8) Specifications for all changes

| Previous Authorizations |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Park Pump Station Upgrade Design Phase | $\$ 332,602$ |


| REQUESTED THIS AUTHORIZATION |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Design Phase Contract Amendment No. 1 |  |  |
| Professional Services: |  |  |
| Design \& Bid Phase Services - WRA |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total This Authorization |  |  |


| Future Authorization |  |  | $\$ 2,647,245$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Phase |  |  |  |


| Total Estimated Project | $\$ 2,950,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |

## REVIEW AND APPROVALS:

Project Manager
Date
Chief Executive Officer
Date

## LEHIGH COUNTY AUTHORITY

FINANCIAL REPORT - AUGUST 2017

## FINANCIAL REPORT

AUGUST 2017

1. SUMMARY

## A. Month

|  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MONTH | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Income Statement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | 243,435 | $(50,645)$ | 13,445 | 198,859 | 294,080 | 229,990 | 44,576 |
| Suburban Wastewater | $(273,052)$ | $(142,658)$ | $(29,820)$ | $(52,682)$ | $(130,394)$ | $(243,232)$ | $(220,370)$ |
| City Division | $(437,769)$ | $(1,588,575)$ | $(476,993)$ | $(214,223)$ | 1,150,806 | 39,224 | $(223,546)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | $(41,088)$ | $(346,966)$ | $(505,788)$ | 133,808 | 305,878 | 464,700 | $(174,897)$ |
| Suburban Wastewater | $(100,156)$ | $(311,678)$ | $(322,766)$ | 83,874 | 211,522 | 222,610 | $(184,029)$ |
| City Division | 1,059,999 | 499 | 1,130,835 | 1,231,913 | 1,059,500 | $(70,836)$ | $(171,914)$ |

## Net income

Suburban Water was the lone fund with a positive net income. Suburban Wastewater and the City Division both finished with net incomes that were negative. Compared to forecast for the month, Suburban Water and City Division both came in better than forecast while Suburban Wastewater came in below forecast.

The $\$ 294 \mathrm{k}$ favorable forecast variance in Suburban Water was driven mainly by lower operating expenses that more than made up for lower operating revenues along with the effect of lower expensed capital from lower overall capital spending.
Suburban Wastewater was unfavorable to forecast by $\$ 130 \mathrm{k}$ on higher operating expenses with a slight positive offset from higher non-operating revenues.
City Division was $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{~m}$ higher than the forecast for the month. This was due to higher operating revenues and lower capital expensed which was partially offset by higher operating expenses.

## Cash Flows

City Division was the only fund with positive cash flow. Suburban Water and Suburban Wastewater were both on the negative side. Compared to forecast, however, all three funds had cash flows that were better than forecasts.

Suburban Water was $\$ 306 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast for the month due to higher cash generated from operations along with lower capital spending.

Suburban Wastewater was $\$ 212 k$ better than forecast despite lower cash from operations as lower capital spending more than offset the lower operating cash.
B. YTD

|  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YTD | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Income Statement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | 10,084 | $(179,782)$ | $(124,402)$ | 623,664 | 189,867 | 134,486 | $(613,580)$ |
| Suburban Wastewater | 222,932 | 221,128 | $(224,099)$ | 453,342 | 1,805 | 447,031 | $(230,410)$ |
| City Division | $(2,833,409)$ | $(5,669,054)$ | $(7,300,153)$ | $(5,367,187)$ | 2,835,645 | 4,466,744 | 2,533,777 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | 14,567,354 | 13,985,063 | 1,621,734 | 498,174 | 582,291 | 12,945,620 | 14,069,180 |
| Suburban Wastewater | 1,283,043 | 668,967 | $(2,567,667)$ | 1,863,529 | 614,076 | 3,850,710 | $(580,486)$ |
| City Division | 1,595,306 | $(632,320)$ | $(1,217,390)$ | 2,800,407 | 2,227,626 | 2,812,696 | $(1,205,101)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt Service Coverage Ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | 1.38 | 1.39 | 1.22 | 1.85 | (0.00) | 0.17 | (0.47) |
| Suburban Wastewater | 7.75 | 7.51 | 2.40 | 7.47 | 0.24 | 5.35 | 0.28 |
| City Division | 1.26 | 1.22 | 1.12 | 1.26 | 0.04 | 0.14 | 0.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| YTD Cash Flow Statement (Adjusted) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | $(724,652)$ | $(1,306,943)$ | $(4,278,266)$ | 498,174 | 582,291 | 3,553,614 | $(1,222,826)$ |
| Suburban Wastewater | 1,283,043 | 668,967 | $(2,567,667)$ | 1,863,529 | 614,076 | 3,850,710 | $(580,486)$ |
| City Division | 1,595,306 | $(632,320)$ | $(1,217,390)$ | 2,800,407 | 2,227,626 | 2,812,696 | $(1,205,101)$ |

## Net income

Suburban Water and Suburban Wastewater have net incomes through this year that are positive while the City Division has a net loss so far this year. Compared to forecast, all three funds have net incomes better than both forecast and budget.

Suburban Water has a net income that is $\$ 190 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 135 \mathrm{k}$ better than budget. Against forecast, net income was better as lower operating revenues were offset by lower operating expenses and lower expensed capital more than offset lower non-operating revenues. Against budget, operating revenues are lower but operating expenses are significantly lower to more than offset the lower operating revenues.

Suburban Wastewater has a net income that is $\$ 2 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 447 \mathrm{k}$ better than budget. The favorable variance to forecast is largely driven by the offset of higher operating and non-operating revenues by higher operating expenses. The variance to budget is driven by lower operating expenses and lower non-operating expenses offset partly by lower operating revenues.

City Division has a net income that is $\$ 2.8 \mathrm{~m}$ favorable to forecast and $\$ 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$ favorable to budget. So the net income is negative but not as negative as forecast or budget so far this year. The primary reason for the significant favorable variance to forecast is higher non-operating revenues along with lower nonoperating expenses with some help from higher operating revenues more than compensating for higher operating expenses.

## Cash Flows

All three funds have cash flows so far this year that are positive. Additionally, the cash flows on all three funds are better than both forecast and budget.

Suburban Water cash flow is $\$ 582 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 3.5 \mathrm{~m}$ better than budget after adjusting for borrowing. In both cases, primary drivers of these favorable variances is lower capital spending.

Suburban Wastewater cash flow is $\$ 614 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 3.9 \mathrm{~m}$ better than budget. Again, the primary factor in this is lower capital spending.

City Division has cash flow that is $\$ 2.2 \mathrm{~m}$ better than forecast and $\$ 2.8 \mathrm{~m}$ better than budget. This is also primarily due to lower capital spending against forecast and budget.

## Debt Service Coverage Ratio

All three funds have a debt service coverage ratio that is better than the internal target of 1.20 and in line with or better than both forecast and budget.

## 2. SUBURBAN WATER

A. Month

| MONTH - SUBURBAN WATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 713,837 | 761,276 | 777,499 | 734,571 | $(47,439)$ | $(63,662)$ | $(20,734)$ |
| Operating (Expenses) | $(668,958)$ | $(772,471)$ | $(734,533)$ | $(540,385)$ | 103,513 | 65,575 | $(128,573)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | 44,879 | $(11,195)$ | 42,966 | 194,186 | 56,074 | 1,913 | $(149,306)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | 215,831 | 63,407 | 66,167 | 87,003 | 152,424 | 149,664 | 128,828 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest | 260,710 | 52,212 | 109,133 | 281,189 | 208,498 | 151,577 | $(20,479)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income | 113,604 | 14,143 | 16,667 | 5,014 | 99,461 | 96,937 | 108,590 |
| Interest Expense | $(130,879)$ | $(117,000)$ | $(112,355)$ | $(87,344)$ | $(13,879)$ | $(18,524)$ | $(43,535)$ |
| Capital Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET INCOME | 243,435 | $(50,645)$ | 13,445 | 198,859 | 294,080 | 229,990 | 44,576 |

Net income was positive and was $\$ 294$ k better than forecast.
Operating revenues were down due to lower revenues from the industrial/commercial and residential segments.

Operating expenses were significantly lower due to lower spending for maintenance services, water purchases, and equipment purchases.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) were favorable due to lower capital costs expensed that more than offset lower tapping fees and lower project reimbursement.

Interest income was up on higher invested balances.

| MONTH - SUBURBAN WATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Net Income | 243,435 | $(50,645)$ | 13,445 | 198,859 | 294,080 | 229,990 | 44,576 |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 245,832 | 245,832 | 245,833 | 245,832 | - | (1) | - |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | (0) | $(2,000)$ | - | (0) | 2,000 | (0) | (0) |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | $(180,885)$ | 25,314 | 8,333 | 181 | $(206,199)$ | $(189,218)$ | $(181,066)$ |
| Principal Payments | $(152,751)$ | $(139,000)$ | $(152,816)$ | $(123,151)$ | $(13,751)$ | 65 | $(29,600)$ |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Borrowing | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Expenditures | $(196,719)$ | $(426,467)$ | $(620,583)$ | $(187,912)$ | 229,748 | 423,864 | $(8,807)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | $(41,088)$ | $(346,966)$ | $(505,788)$ | 133,808 | 305,878 | 464,700 | $(174,897)$ |

Cash flow was negative but was $\$ 306 k$ better than forecast on higher cash generated by operations
Cash generated by operations was better than forecast due to higher net income.
Capital spending was $\$ 229 k$ lower than forecast.
B. YTD

| YTD - SUBURBAN WATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 5,820,779 | 5,990,905 | 5,988,030 | 5,748,960 | $(170,126)$ | $(167,251)$ | 71,819 |
| Operating (Expenses) | $(5,244,680)$ | $(5,417,218)$ | $(5,876,264)$ | $(4,859,453)$ | 172,538 | 631,584 | $(385,227)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | 576,099 | 573,687 | 111,766 | 889,507 | 2,412 | 464,333 | $(313,408)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | 423,994 | 297,258 | 529,336 | 401,443 | 126,737 | $(105,342)$ | 22,552 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest Expense | 1,000,093 | 870,944 | 641,102 | 1,290,949 | 129,149 | 358,991 | $(290,856)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income | 161,269 | 68,143 | 133,336 | 37,709 | 93,126 | 27,933 | 123,559 |
| Interest Expense | $(1,151,278)$ | $(1,118,870)$ | $(898,840)$ | $(704,995)$ | $(32,408)$ | $(252,438)$ | $(446,283)$ |
| Capital Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET INCOME | 10,084 | $(179,782)$ | $(124,402)$ | 623,664 | 189,867 | 134,486 | $(613,580)$ |

Net income for the year is positive and is $\$ 190 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 135 \mathrm{k}$ better than budget.

## Compared to forecast

Operating revenues are down due to lower revenues from industrial/commercial and residential segments.

Operating expenses are lower due to lower spending on maintenance services, water purchases, and equipment purchases.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) are favorable due to lower expensed capital which more than made up for lower tapping fees and lower project reimbursement.

Interest income was higher on higher invested balances with a large portion of that coming from the investments out of the 2017 bond issue.

## Compared to budget

Operating revenues are down due to lower revenues from industrial/commercial and residential segments.

Operating expenses are lower due to lower spending on maintenance services, water purchases, miscellaneous services, and equipment purchases.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) are unfavorable due to lower project reimbursement which was partially offset by lower expensed capital.

Interest income was higher on higher invested balances with a large portion of that coming from the investments out of the 2017 bond issue.

| YTD - SUBURBAN WATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Net Income | 10,084 | $(179,782)$ | $(124,402)$ | 623,664 | 189,867 | 134,486 | $(613,580)$ |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 1,966,656 | 1,966,656 | 1,966,664 | 1,966,656 | - | (8) |  |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | - | $(4,000)$ | - | (0) | 4,000 | - | 0 |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 5,026 | 202,509 | 66,664 | 3,030 | $(197,483)$ | $(61,638)$ | 1,996 |
| Principal Payments | $(1,094,413)$ | $(1,080,596)$ | $(1,222,528)$ | $(1,078,846)$ | $(13,817)$ | 128,115 | $(15,567)$ |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Borrowing | 15,292,006 | 15,292,006 | 5,900,000 | - | - | 9,392,006 | 15,292,006 |
| Capital Expenditures | (1,612,005) | (2,211,730) | $(4,964,664)$ | $(1,016,330)$ | 599,725 | 3,352,659 | $(595,676)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 14,567,354 | 13,985,063 | 1,621,734 | 498,174 | 582,291 | 12,945,620 | 14,069,180 |

If we adjust the cash flows for all of the differences created by borrowing variances, cash flow so far this year would be negative but would be $\$ 582 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 3.6 \mathrm{~m}$ better than budget.

Compared to forecast, cash flows are up on lower capital spending
Compared to budget, cash flows are better due to lower capital spending as well.

## 3. SUBURBAN WASTEWATER

A. Month

| MONTH - SUBURBAN WASTEWATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 1,438,968 | 1,434,244 | 1,511,596 | 1,457,691 | 4,724 | $(72,628)$ | $(18,723)$ |
| Operating (Expenses) | (1,752,309) | (1,597,270) | $(1,546,447)$ | (1,764,899) | $(155,039)$ | $(205,862)$ | 12,590 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | $(313,341)$ | $(163,026)$ | $(34,851)$ | $(307,208)$ | $(150,315)$ | $(278,490)$ | $(6,133)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | 57,663 | 38,010 | 66,083 | 271,221 | 19,653 | $(8,420)$ | $(213,558)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest Expense | $(255,678)$ | $(125,016)$ | 31,232 | $(35,987)$ | $(130,662)$ | $(286,910)$ | $(219,691)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income | 394 | 389 | 9,917 | 808 | 5 | $(9,523)$ | (414) |
| Interest Expense | $(17,768)$ | $(18,031)$ | $(70,969)$ | $(17,502)$ | 263 | 53,201 | (266) |
| Capital Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET INCOME | $(273,052)$ | $(142,658)$ | $(29,820)$ | $(52,682)$ | $(130,394)$ | $(243,232)$ | $(220,370)$ |

Net income was negative and was $\$ 130 \mathrm{k}$ lower than forecast.
Operating revenue was slightly favorable to forecast. Revenues from signatory group was about in line with forecast with higher revenues from WLI and LLRI offset by lower revenues from Western Weisenberg. Wastewater Treatment Plant Revenues mostly offset as well with lower hauler fees made up by higher industrial charges and higher revenues from excess removal

Operating expenses were higher than forecast due to higher treatment \& transportation costs along with higher treatment removal costs with a partial offset from lower maintenance services spending and lower contract operator costs.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) were higher than forecast due to higher tapping fees.

| MONTH - SUBURBAN WASTEWATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Net Income | $(273,052)$ | $(142,658)$ | $(29,820)$ | $(52,682)$ | $(130,394)$ | $(243,232)$ | $(220,370)$ |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 364,694 | 364,694 | 327,083 | 334,133 | - | 37,611 | 30,561 |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | 2,734 | 2,847 | - | 3,051 | (113) | 2,734 | (317) |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 163 | 86 | 25,000 | 145 | 77 | $(24,837)$ | 18 |
| Principal Payments | $(26,023)$ | $(39,500)$ | $(93,946)$ | $(42,013)$ | 13,477 | 67,923 | 15,990 |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Borrowing | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Expenditures | $(168,672)$ | $(497,147)$ | $(551,083)$ | $(158,761)$ | 328,475 | 382,411 | $(9,911)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | $(100,156)$ | $(311,678)$ | $(322,766)$ | 83,874 | 211,522 | 222,610 | $(184,029)$ |

Cash flows were negative but were favorable to forecast on lower capital spending.
B. YTD

| YTD - SUBURBAN WASTEWATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 11,236,256 | 11,195,339 | 12,107,229 | 11,910,510 | 40,917 | $(870,973)$ | $(674,254)$ |
| Operating (Expenses) | $(11,700,603)$ | (11,647,160) | $(12,371,576)$ | $(12,371,202)$ | $(53,443)$ | 670,973 | 670,599 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | $(464,347)$ | $(451,820)$ | $(264,347)$ | $(460,691)$ | $(12,526)$ | $(200,000)$ | $(3,655)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | 827,966 | 814,084 | 528,664 | 1,045,077 | 13,883 | 299,302 | $(217,110)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest Expense | 363,620 | 362,264 | 264,317 | 584,385 | 1,357 | 99,303 | $(220,766)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income | 3,129 | 3,113 | 79,336 | 6,224 | 16 | $(76,207)$ | $(3,095)$ |
| Interest Expense | $(143,817)$ | $(144,249)$ | $(567,752)$ | $(137,268)$ | 432 | 423,935 | $(6,549)$ |
| Capital Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET INCOME | 222,932 | 221,128 | $(224,099)$ | 453,342 | 1,805 | 447,031 | $(230,410)$ |

For the year, net income is positive and is better than forecast by $\$ 2 \mathrm{k}$ and better than budget by $\$ 447 \mathrm{k}$.

## Compared to forecast

Operating revenues are favorable but there are no major variances across segments.
Operating expenses are higher than forecast due to lower spending on maintenance services and contract operator costs being more than offset by higher treatment, transportation, and removal costs.

## Compared to budget

Operating revenues are down to budget with major unfavorable variances in the Wastewater Treatment Plant for hauler fees, and industrial charges that are partially offset by favorable variances from the signatory group.

Operating expenses are down to budget with most of that coming from lower spending on maintenance services and contract operator costs with some offset from higher treatment \& transportation costs.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) are favorable to budget due to higher tapping fees along with lower expensed capital.

| YTD - SUBURBAN WASTEWATER | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Net Income | 222,932 | 221,128 | $(224,099)$ | 453,342 | 1,804 | 447,031 | $(230,410)$ |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 2,917,552 | 2,917,552 | 2,616,664 | 2,673,064 | - | 300,888 | 244,488 |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | 22,576 | 22,776 | - | 23,797 | (200) | 22,576 | $(1,221)$ |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 681 | 690 | 200,000 | 1,146 | (9) | $(199,319)$ | (465) |
| Principal Payments | $(302,610)$ | $(315,999)$ | $(751,568)$ | $(323,502)$ | 13,388 | 448,958 | 20,891 |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Borrowing | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Expenditures | $(1,578,087)$ | $(2,177,180)$ | $(4,408,664)$ | $(964,318)$ | 599,093 | 2,830,577 | $(613,769)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 1,283,043 | 668,967 | $(2,567,667)$ | 1,863,529 | 614,076 | 3,850,710 | $(580,486)$ |

Adjusting cash flows so far this year for all of the borrowing difference, cash flows are a positive $\$ 1.3 \mathrm{~m}$ and are $\$ 614 \mathrm{k}$ better than forecast and $\$ 3.9 \mathrm{~m}$ better than budget.

Compared to forecast, cash flows are up due to lower capital spending.
Compared to budget, cash flows are up on higher funds generated by operations along with lower capital spending.
4. CITY DIVISION

## A. Month

| MONTH - CITY DIVISION | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 2,885,524 | 2,684,708 | 3,025,222 | 3,130,680 | 200,816 | $(139,698)$ | $(245,156)$ |
| Operating (Expenses) | (1,950,608) | $(1,872,693)$ | (1,871,840) | (1,897,980) | $(77,915)$ | $(78,768)$ | $(52,629)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | 934,916 | 812,015 | 1,153,382 | 1,232,700 | 122,901 | $(218,466)$ | $(297,784)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | $(132,982)$ | $(1,174,984)$ | $(283,834)$ | $(131,781)$ | 1,042,002 | 150,852 | $(1,201)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest Expense | 801,934 | $(362,969)$ | 869,548 | 1,100,920 | 1,164,903 | $(67,614)$ | $(298,985)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income | 23,238 | 37,335 | 25,167 | 316 | $(14,097)$ | $(1,929)$ | 22,922 |
| Interest Expense | $(1,262,941)$ | $(1,262,941)$ | $(1,371,708)$ | $(1,315,458)$ | - | 108,767 | 52,517 |
| Capital Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET INCOME | $(437,769)$ | $\underline{(1,588,575)}$ | $(476,993)$ | $(214,223)$ | $\underline{\text { 1,150,806 }}$ | 39,224 | $(223,546)$ |

Net income for the month was negative but was $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{~m}$ better than forecast.
Operating revenues were up to forecast on higher water revenues along with higher wastewater revenues. Water revenues were up as a result of higher residential/commercial revenues. Wastewater revenues were up from higher municipal revenues.

Operating expenses were slightly higher than forecast with most of that variances due to higher spending on purchased services.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) were favorable to forecast as lower capital costs expensed were significantly lower and that more than offset small unfavorable variances on tapping fees and project reimbursement revenues.

| MONTH - CITY DIVISION | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Net Income | $(437,769)$ | $(1,588,575)$ | $(476,993)$ | $(214,223)$ | 1,150,806 | 39,224 | $(223,546)$ |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 450,000 | 450,000 | 466,667 | 450,000 | - | $(16,667)$ |  |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | 1,262,941 | 1,262,941 | 1,371,708 | 1,315,458 | - | $(108,767)$ | $(52,517)$ |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 166,436 | 1,213,324 | 658,667 | 196,415 | $(1,046,888)$ | $(492,231)$ | $(29,979)$ |
| Principal Payments | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Cash Outlays on Lease \& Lease Reserve | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Borrowing | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Expenditures | $(381,609)$ | $(1,337,191)$ | $(889,214)$ | $(515,738)$ | 955,582 | 507,605 | 134,129 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 1,059,999 | 499 | 1,130,835 | 1,231,913 | 1,059,500 | $(70,836)$ | $(171,914)$ |

Cash flows for the month were positive and were $\$ 1.1 \mathrm{~m}$ better than forecast. This was driven by lower capital spending.
B. YTD

| YTD - CITY DIVISION | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 21,730,956 | 21,292,664 | 20,717,567 | 20,654,374 | 438,292 | 1,013,389 | 1,076,582 |
| Operating (Expenses) | $\underline{(14,461,704)}$ | $\underline{(14,357,008)}$ | (14,974,720) | $(13,478,703)$ | $(104,696)$ | 513,016 | $(983,002)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | 7,269,252 | 6,935,656 | 5,742,847 | 7,175,672 | 333,596 | 1,526,405 | 93,580 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | $(264,881)$ | $(2,799,863)$ | $(2,270,672)$ | $(2,222,890)$ | 2,534,983 | 2,005,791 | 1,958,010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest Expense | 7,004,371 | 4,135,793 | 3,472,175 | 4,952,781 | 2,868,578 | 3,532,196 | 2,051,590 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Interest Income | 265,747 | 298,681 | 201,336 | 203,696 | $(32,933)$ | 64,411 | 62,051 |
| Interest Expense | $(10,103,528)$ | $(10,103,528)$ | $(10,973,664)$ | $(10,523,664)$ | - | 870,136 | 420,136 |
| Capital Contributions | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET INCOME | $(2,833,409)$ | $(5,669,054)$ | $(7,300,153)$ | $(5,367,187)$ | 2,835,645 | 4,466,744 | 2,533,777 |

Net income for the year is negative but better than forecast by $\$ 2.8 \mathrm{~m}$ and better than budget by $\$ 4.5 \mathrm{~m}$

## Compared to forecast

Operating revenues are up to forecast with water up by $\$ 243 \mathrm{k}$ and wastewater up by $\$ 195 \mathrm{k}$. Water is up on higher residential/commercial revenues and wastewater is up on higher municipal revenues.

Operating expenses are slightly higher than forecast on slightly higher purchased services.
Non-operating revenues (expenses) are favorable due to lower capital charged to expense and from higher project reimbursement so far this year.

## Compared to budget

Operating revenues are up to budget with water up by $\$ 807 \mathrm{k}$ and wastewater up by $\$ 206 \mathrm{k}$. Water is up due to higher residential/commercial revenues. Wastewater is up due to higher residential/commercial revenues as well along with higher hauler revenues.

Operating expenses are lower due to lower materials and supplies costs along with lower equipment purchases.

Non-operating revenues (expenses) are favorable due to lower capital costs charged to expense partially offset by lower tapping fees and lower project reimbursement revenues.

| YTD - CITY DIVISION | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Net Income | $(2,833,409)$ | $(5,669,054)$ | $(7,300,153)$ | $(5,367,187)$ | 2,835,645 | 4,466,744 | 2,533,777 |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 3,600,000 | 3,600,000 | 3,733,336 | 3,600,000 | - | $(133,336)$ | - |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | 3,579,667 | 3,579,667 | 4,449,803 | 10,523,664 | - | $(870,136)$ | $(6,943,997)$ |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 984,437 | 3,106,591 | 5,269,336 | 1,849,415 | $(2,122,154)$ | $(4,284,899)$ | $(864,978)$ |
| Principal Payments | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Cash Outlays on Lease \& Lease Reserve | $(252,000)$ | $(252,000)$ | $(256,000)$ | $(250,000)$ | - | 4,000 | $(2,000)$ |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| New Borrowing | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Capital Expenditures | $(3,483,389)$ | $(4,997,524)$ | (7,113,712) | (7,555,485) | 1,514,135 | 3,630,323 | 4,072,096 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 1,595,306 | $(632,320)$ | $(1,217,390)$ | 2,800,407 | 2,227,626 | 2,812,696 | $(1,205,101)$ |

YTD cash flow is positive and $\$ 2,2 \mathrm{~m}$ better than forecast and $\$ 2.8 \mathrm{~m}$ better than budget.
Compared to forecast, cash flows are up on higher cash generated by operations along with lower capital spending.

Compared to budget, cash flows are up on lower capital spending with a partial offset from lower cash generated by operations.

## 5. FULL YEAR FORECAST

The Q3 Forecast is in the table below for reference.

|  |  |  |  | Variance to |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Forecast | Budget | Last FC | Budget | Last FC |
| INCOME STATEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | $(21,018)$ | $(34,673)$ | $(240,736)$ | 13,655 | 219,718 |
| Suburban Wastewater | 326,504 | $(237,977)$ | $(235,352)$ | 564,481 | 561,856 |
| City Division | $(9,623,562)$ | $(10,217,568)$ | $(10,277,443)$ | 594,006 | 653,881 |
| TOTAL LCA | $(9,318,077)$ | $(10,490,218)$ | $(10,753,531)$ | 1,172,141 | 1,435,454 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CASH FLOW STATEMENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | 13,118,480 | $(81,469)$ | 8,746,795 | 13,199,950 | 4,371,685 |
| Suburban Wastewater | $(501,737)$ | 7,121,675 | 37,287,310 | $(7,623,412)$ | $(37,789,047)$ |
| City Division | $(3,705,185)$ | $(4,479,360)$ | $(4,538,598)$ | 774,175 | 833,413 |
| TOTAL LCA | 8,911,558 | 2,560,846 | 41,495,507 | 6,350,712 | $(32,583,950)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO |  |  |  |  |  |
| Suburban Water | 1.38 | 1.27 | 1.20 | 0.12 | 0.19 |
| Suburban Wastewater | 7.96 | 2.45 | 2.52 | 5.51 | 5.44 |
| City Division | 1.22 | 1.21 | 1.18 | 0.01 | 0.04 |






|  | $\begin{aligned} & \bar{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \bar{a} \\ \hat{a} \end{array}$ | ¢ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 原 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \tilde{e} \\ \stackrel{i}{2} \\ \mid \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 冗} \\ \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \bar{\sim} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 号 | ¢ \％\％ |
|  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{e} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{t} \end{array}\right\|$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 峾 } \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | Na |
|  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{n} \\ \mid \end{array}\right\|$ | 諦 | \％${ }_{\sim}^{\text {\％}}$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\widetilde{m}} \\ & \text { 島 } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{w} \\ \mid \end{array}\right\|$ | 产 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 霜 } \end{aligned}$ |  | \％ | へin |
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| Lehigh countr Authorit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| suburban wastewater |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| month－Suburban wastewater |  |  |  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  | ytd－suburban wastewat |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | Fcvar | Budvar | prvar | Income Statement |
| Operating Revenues | 1，438，968 | 1，434，244 | 1，511，596 | 1，457，691 | 4，724 | （72，628） | （18，723） | Operating Revenues |
| Operating Exxpenses） | （1， 1752,309 ） | （1，59，270） | $(1,546,47)$ | $(1,764,899)$ | （155，039） | （205，862） | 12，590 | Operating（Expenses） |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non－Operating Revenues（Expenses） | 57,663 | 38，010 | 66，083 | 271，221 | 19，653 | （8，420） | $(213,58)$ | Operating Revenues（E） |
| Income Before Interest txpense | （255，678） | $(125,016)$ | 31，232 | （35，987） | （130，662） | （286，90） | （219，691） | Income Before Interest Expense |
| Interest Income | 394 | 389 | 9,917 | 808 |  | （9，523） | （414） | Interest Income |
| Interest Expense | （17，768） | （18，031） | （70，969） | （17，502） | 263 | 53，201 | （266） | Interest Expense |
| Capital Contributio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Capital Contributions |
| tincome | （273，052） | （192，658） | $(2,820)$ | （52，682） | （130，394） | （243，232） | $(220,30)$ | netincome |
| MONTH－SUBurban wastewater |  |  |  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  | yto－suburban wastewater |
| Cash flow statement（Indirect） | Actual | Forecast | Buaget | Prior Year | fcvar | Budvar | Pr var | Cash flow statement（Indirect） |
| Net Income | （273，052） | （112，658） | $(22,820)$ | （52，682） | （130，394） | （243，232） | （220，370） | Net Income |
| Add：Depreciation \＆Amortization | 364，694 | 364，694 | 327，083 | 334，133 |  | 37，611 | 30，561 | Add：Depreciation \＆Amortization |
| Add：Non－Cash Interest Expense | 2，734 | 2，847 |  | 3，051 | （113） | 2，734 | （317） | Add：Non－Cash interest Expense |
| Add：Capex Charged to Expense | 163 |  | 25，000 | 145 |  | $(2,883)$ | 18 | Add：Capex Charged to Expense |
| Principal Payments | （26，023） | （39，500） | （93，946） | （42，013） | 477 | 67，923 | 15，990 | Principal Payments |
| Investments Converting To Cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Investments Converting To Cash |
| New Borrowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New Borrowing |
| Capital Expenditures | （168，672） | （497，147） | （551，083） | （158，761） | 328，475 | 382,411 | （9，911） | Capital Expenditures |
| Net fund cash flows | （100，156） | （311，678） | （322，76） | 83，874 | 211，522 | ${ }^{222,610}$ | （184，029） | Net fund cash flows |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | aubster |  |  |  | tid－suburban wastewater |
| Cash Flow Statement（Direct） | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior | FC Var | Budvar | PY Var | Cash Fow Statement（Direct） |
| Operating Revenues | 1，438，968 | 1，433，244 | 1，511，596 | 1，45，691 |  | （72，628） | （18，23） | Operating Revenues |
| Operating Expenses（Ex Depreciation） | （1，387，615） | $(1,232,576)$ | $(1,219,364)$ | （1，430，766） | （155，039） | （168，251） | 43，151 | Operating Expenses（Ex Depreciation） |
| Interest Income |  |  | －9，917 |  |  | （0，523） | （414） | Interest Income |
| Cash Available for Debt Service | 51，747 | 202，057 | 302，199 | 27，733 | （150，310） | （250，402） | 24，014 | Cash Available For Debt Service |
| Interest Payments | （15，03） | $(15,18)$ | （70，969） | （14，451） | 151 | 55，936 | （582） | Interest Payments |
| Principal Payments | （26，023） | （3，500） | （93，946） | （42，013） | 13，477 | 67，923 | 15，990 | Principal Payments |
| Net Cash Available Atter Debt Service | 10，690 | 147，373 | 137，234 | （28，732） | （136，683） | （126，544） | 39，422 | Net Cash Available Atter Debt Service |
| Non－Operating Revenues（Expenses） |  |  | 66,083 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Add：Capex Charged to Expense | 163 | 86 | 25，000 | 145 | 77 | （2，883） | 18 | Add：Capex Charged to Expense |
| Less：Project Reimbursement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Less：Project Reimbursement |
| Non－Cash Working Capital Changes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Non－Cash Working Capital Changes |
| Net Cash Available For Capital | 68，516 | 185，469 | 228，317 | 242，634 | $(116,953)$ | （159，801） | （174，118） | Net Cash Avvilable For Capital |
| Project Reimbursement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Project Reimbursement |
| Capital Contributions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Capital Contributions |
| Investments Converting To Cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Investments Converting To Cash |
| New Borrowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New Borrowing |
| Capital Expenditures | （168，672） | （997，147） | （551，083） | （158，761） | 328，475 | 382，411 | （9，911） | Capital Expenditures |
| Net fund Cash flows | （100，156） | （311，678） | （322，766） | 83，874 | 211，522 | 222，610 | （184，029） | NEt fund cash flows |
| debt service coverage rato |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Debt service coverage rato |
| Total Cash Available For Debt Service | 109，573 | 240，153 |  | 299，099 |  |  |  | Total Cash Available For Debt Serice |
| Debt Service | 41，057 | 54，684 | 164，915 | 56，464 |  |  |  | Debt Serrice |
| DSCR | 2.67 | 4.39 | 2.38 | 5.30 |  |  |  | DSCR |


| LEHIGH COUNTY AUTHORITY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTHLY FINANCIAL STATEMENTS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTH - CITY DIVIIION | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  | YTD-CITY DIVIISION | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var | Income Statement | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FCVar | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 2,885,524 | 2,684,708 | 3,025,222 | 3,130,680 | 200,816 | $(139,698)$ | (245,156) | Operating Revenues | 21,730,956 | 21,292,664 | 20,717,567 | 20,654,374 | 438,292 | 1,013,389 | 1,076,582 |
| Operating (Expenses) | $(1,950,608)$ | $(1,872,693)$ | $(1,871,840)$ | $(1,897,980)$ | $(77,915)$ | (78,768) | $(52,629)$ | Operating (Expenses) | $(14,461,704)$ | $(14,357,008)$ | $(14,974,720)$ | (13,478,703) | (104,696) | 513,016 | (983,002) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Operating Income | 934,916 | 812,015 | 1,153,382 | 1,232,700 | 122,901 | $(218,466)$ | (297,784) | Operating Income | 7,269,252 | 6,935,656 | 5,742,847 | 7,175,672 | 333,596 | 1,526,405 | 93,580 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | $(132,982)$ | $(1,174,984)$ | (283,834) | (131,781) | 1,042,002 | 150,852 | $(1,201)$ | Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | $(264,881)$ | $(2,799,863)$ | $(2,270,672)$ | $(2,222,890)$ | 2,534,983 | 2,005,791 | 1,958,010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income Before Interest Expense | 801,934 | $(362,969)$ | 869,548 | 1,100,920 | 1,164,903 | $(67,614)$ | $(298,985)$ | Income Before Interest Expense | 7,004,371 | 4,135,793 | 3,472,175 | 4,952,781 | 2,868,578 | 3,532,196 | 2,051,590 |
| Interest Income | 23,238 | 37,335 | 25,167 | 316 | $(14,097)$ | $(1,929)$ | 22,922 | Interest Income | 265,747 | 298,681 | 201,336 | 203,696 | $(32,933)$ | 64,411 | 62,051 |
| Interest Expense Capital Contributions | $(1,262,941)$ | $(1,262,941)$ | $(1,371,708)$ | $(1,315,458)$ |  | 108,767 | 52,517 | Interest Expense | (10,103,528) | $(10,103,528)$ | (10,973,664) | (10,523,664) |  | 870,136 | 420,136 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Capital Contributions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net income | $(437,769)$ | $(1,588,575)$ | $(476,993)$ | $(214,223)$ | 1,150,806 | 39,224 | $(223,546)$ | netincome | $(2,833,409)$ | (5,669,054) | $(7,300,153)$ | $(5,367,187)$ | 2,835,645 | 4,466,744 | 2,533,777 |
|  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTH-CITY DIVISION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | YTD-CITY DIVISİN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | PriorYear | FCVar | Bud Var | PY Var | Cash Flow Statement (Indirect) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FCVar | Bud Var | pY Var |
| Net Income | (437,769) | $(1,588,575)$ | $(476,993)$ | (214,223) | 1,150,806 | 39,224 | $(223,546)$ | Net Income | $(2,833,409)$ | (5,669,054) | $(7,300,153)$ | $(5,367,187)$ | 2,835,645 | 4,466,744 | 2,533,777 |
| Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 450,000 | 450,000 | 466,667 | 450,000 |  | $(16,667)$ |  | Add: Depreciation \& Amortization | 3,600,000 | 3,600,000 | 3,733,336 | 3,60,000 |  | $(133,336)$ |  |
| Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | 1,262,941 | 1,262,941 | 1,371,708 | 1,315,458 |  | (108,767) | $(52,517)$ | Add: Non-Cash Interest Expense | 3,579,667 | 3,579,667 | 4,449,803 | 10,523,664 |  | $(870,136)$ | $(6,943,997)$ |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 166,436 | 1,213,324 | 658,667 | 196,415 | $(1,046,888)$ | $(492,231)$ | $(2,979)$ | Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 984,437 | 3,106,591 | 5,269,336 | 1,849,415 | $(2,122,154)$ | $(4,284,899)$ | $(864,978)$ |
| Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Outlays on Lease \& Lease Reserve | - | - |  | $\cdot$ |  | - | - | Cash Outlays on Lease \& Lease Reserve | $(252,000)$ | (252,000) | $(256,000)$ | $(250,000)$ | - | 4,000 | $(2,000)$ |
| Investments Converting To Cash |  |  |  |  |  | - |  | Investments Converting To Cash |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
| New Borrowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New Borrowing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Expenditures | (381,609) | $(1,337,191)$ | (889,214) | $(515,738)$ | 955,582 | 507,605 | 134,129 | Capital Expenditures | $(3,483,389)$ | $(4,997,524)$ | (7,113,712) | $(7,555,485)$ | 1,514,135 | 3,630,323 | 4,072,096 |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,059,999 | 499 | 1,130,835 | 1,231,913 | 1,059,500 | $(70,836)$ | $(171,914)$ | NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 1,595,306 | $(632,320)$ | $(1,217,390)$ | 2,800,407 | 2,227,626 | 2,812,696 | $(1,205,101)$ |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | AUGUST 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONTH - CITY DIVISION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Ytd - CITY Division |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Flow Statement (Direct) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FCVar | Bud Var | PY Var | Cash Flow Statement (Direct) | Actual | Forecast | Budget | Prior Year | FC Var | Bud Var | PY Var |
| Operating Revenues | 2,885,524 | 2,684,708 | 3,025,222 | 3,130,680 | 200,816 | $(139,698)$ | (245,156) | Operating Revenues | 21,730,956 | 21,292,664 | 20,717,567 | 20,654,374 | 438,292 | 1,013,389 | 1,076,582 |
| Operating Expenses (Ex Depreciation) | $(1,500,608)$ | $(1,422,693)$ | $(1,405,173)$ | $(1,447,980)$ | $(77,915)$ | $(95,435)$ | $(52,629)$ | Operating Expenses (Ex Depreciation) | (10,861,704) | $(10,757,008)$ | $(11,241,384)$ | $(9,878,703)$ | (104,696) | 379,680 | $(983,002)$ |
| Interest Income | 23,238 | 37,335 | 25,167 | 316 | $(14,097)$ | $(1,929)$ | 22,922 | Interest Income | 265,747 | 298,681 | 201,336 | 203,696 | (32,933) | 64,411 | 62,051 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cash Available For Debt Service | 1,408,154 | 1,299,350 | 1,645,216 | 1,683,016 | 108,804 | (237,062) | (274,862) | Cash Available For Debt Service | 11,134,999 | 10,834,337 | 9,677,519 | 10,979,368 | 300,662 | 1,457,480 | 155,632 |
| Interest Payments |  |  | - | - | - | - | - | Interest Payments | $(6,523,861)$ | $(6,523,861)$ | $(6,523,861)$ | - | - |  | $(6,523,861)$ |
| Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  | $=$ |  | Principal Payments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Available For Debt Service |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1,408,154 | 1,299,350 | 1,645,216 | 1,683,016 | 108,804 | (237,062) | $(274,862)$ | Net Cash Available For Debt Service | 4,611,138 | 4,310,476 | 3,153,658 | 10,979,368 | 300,662 | 1,457,480 | $(6,368,229)$ |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | $(132,982)$ | $(1,174,984)$ | $(283,834)$ | (131,781) | 1,042,002 | 150,852 | $(1,201)$ | Non-Operating Revenues (Expenses) | $(264,881)$ | $(2,799,863)$ | $(2,270,672)$ | $(2,222,890)$ | 2,534,983 | 2,005,791 | 1,958,010 |
| Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 166,436 | 1,213,324 | 658,667 | 196,415 | $(1,046,888)$ | $(492,231)$ | (29,979) | Add: Capex Charged to Expense | 984,437 | 3,106,591 | 5,269,336 | 1,849,415 | $(2,122,154)$ | $(4,284,899)$ | (864,978) |
| Less: Project Reimbursement |  | $(20,599)$ | $(327,750)$ |  | 20,599 | 327,750 |  | Less: Project Reimbursement | (558,736) | $(164,796)$ | $(2,622,000)$ |  | $(393,940)$ | 2,063,264 | $(558,736)$ |
| Cash Outlays on Lease \& Lease Reserve | - |  |  | . |  | - | - | Cash Outlays on Lease \& Lease Reserve | $(252,000)$ | $(252,000)$ | $(256,000)$ | $(250,000)$ | - | 4,000 | $(2,000)$ |
| Non-Cash Working Capital Changes |  |  |  |  |  | $\square$ |  | Non-Cash Working Capital Changes |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Available For Capital | 1,441,608 | 1,317,091 | 1,692,299 | 1,747,651 | 124,517 | $(250,691)$ | $(306,043)$ | Net Cash Available For Capital | 4,519,959 | 4,200,408 | 3,274,322 | 10,355,892 | 319,551 | 1,245,637 | $(5,835,933)$ |
| Project Reimbursement | - | 20,599 | 327,750 | - | $(20,599)$ | $(327,750)$ | - | Project Reimbursement | 558,736 | 164,796 | 2,622,000 | - | 393,940 | $(2,063,264)$ | 558,736 |
| Project Reimbursement | . |  |  | - |  | - |  | Capital Contributions |  |  |  | - |  | - |  |
| Investments Converting To Cash | - |  | - | - | - | - | - | Investments Converting To Cash | - | - | - | $\cdot$ | - | - |  |
| New Borrowing | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | New Borrowing | . | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Capital Expenditures | $(381,609)$ | $(1,337,191)$ | (889,214) | $(515,738)$ | 955,582 | 507,605 | 134,129 | Capital Expenditures | $(3,483,389)$ | (4,997,524) | $(7,113,712)$ | $(7,555,485)$ | 1,514,135 | 3,630,323 | 4,072,096 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 1,059,999 | 499 | 1,130,835 | 1,231,913 | 1,059,500 | $(70,836)$ | $(171,914)$ | NET FUND CASH FLOWS | 1,595,306 | (632,320) | $(1,217,390)$ | 2,800,407 | 2,227,626 | 2,812,696 | $(1,205,101)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Debt service coverage ratio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | DEBT SERVICE COVERAGE RATIO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Net Cash Available For Debt ServiceDebt Service | 1,399,608 | 1,275,091 | 1,650,299 | 1,724,101 |  |  |  | Net Cash Available For Debt Service | 10,959,820 | 10,640,269 | 9,718,183 | 10,956,585 |  |  |  |
|  | 1,087,310 | 1,087,310 | 1,087,310 | 1,031,060 |  |  |  | Debt Service | 8,698,480 | 8,698,480 | 8,698,480 | 8,698,480 |  |  |  |
| Debt Service | 1.29 | 1.17 | 1.52 | 1.67 |  |  |  | DSCR | 1.26 | 1.22 | 1.12 | 1.26 |  |  |  |


|  | System <br> Pre | ehigh County Authori <br> Operations Review - Augu <br> sented: September 25, | st 2017 <br> 017 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Critical Activities | System | Description | Aug-17 | 2017-to-Date | 2016 Totals | Permit |
|  |  |  | Daily Avg (MGD) | Daily Avg (MGD) | Daily Avg (MGD) | Daily Max (MGD) |
| Water Production | Allentown | Total | 21.12 | 21.41 | 20.41 | 39.0 |
|  |  | Schantz Spring | 6.30 | 6.37 | 5.91 | 9.0 |
|  |  | Crystal Spring | 3.88 | 3.90 | 3.86 | 4.0 |
|  |  | Little Lehigh Creek | 10.94 | 11.09 | 10.46 | 30.0 |
|  |  | Lehigh River | 0.00 | 0.05 | 0.18 | 28.0 |
|  | Central Lehigh | Total | 9.83 | 9.42 | 9.27 | 19.04 MGD Avg |
|  |  | Feed from Allentown | 7.02 | 7.02 | 5.99 | 7.0 MGD Avg 10.5 MGD Max |
|  |  | Well Production (CLD) | 2.81 | 2.40 | 3.28 | 8.54 MGD Avg |
|  |  | Sum of all (12) other Suburban Water Systems | 0.18 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 1.71 Sum of all wells |
| Wastewater Treatment |  | Kline's Island | 33.19 | 31.58 | 29.67 | 40.0 |
|  |  | Pretreatment Plant | 4.87 | 4.47 | 4.33 | 5.75 (design capacity) |
|  |  | Sum of all (5) other Suburban WW Systems | 0.18 | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.36 |
|  |  |  | Aug-17 | 2017-to-Date | 2016 Totals |  |
| Precipitation Totals (inches) |  |  | 8.45 | 39.14 | 36.82 |  |
| Compliance Reports Submitted to Allentown |  |  | 21 | 209 | 269 |  |
| Notices of Violation (NOVs) |  | (Allentown + Suburban) | 0 | 0 | 3 |  |
| Sanitary Sewer Overflows (SSOs)/Bypasses |  | (Allentown + Suburban) | 1 | 19 | 16 |  |
| Main Breaks Repaired |  | Allentown | 0 | 12 | 19 |  |
|  |  | Suburban | 1 | 6 | 11 |  |
| Customer Service Phone Inquiries |  | (Allentown + Suburban) | 2,396 | 18,110 | 28,099 |  |
| Water Shutoffs for Non-Payment |  | (Allentown + Suburban) | 124 | 1,148 | 1,685 |  |
| Injury Accidents |  | (Allentown + Suburban) | 0 | 5 | 10 |  |
| Emergency Declarations |  | Allentown | 0 | (2) @ \$51,235 | (2) @ \$87,079 |  |
|  |  | Suburban | 0 | (1) @ \$72,554 | (1) @ \$33,495 |  |
| Significant Repairs: <br> KIWWTP Primary Digester \#1 (cover replacement) is scheduled to be back on-line by the end of September. Permanent abandonments of six (6) suburban system wells are currently being coordinated. Repairs and/or restorations for these sites were not feasible. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Description of NOVs and/or SSOs: <br> There was one (1) bypass that occurred at Heidelberg Heights WWTP on 8/12/2017. This bypass occurred as a result of heavy rainfall. There were no NOVs or SSOs for either Allentown or Suburban during August 2017. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Highlights: <br> In the Central Lehigh Division, there are several on-going projects that are new to the system. Project summaries are presented below. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Valve and Hydrant Program - All 1,515 fire hydrants in the CLD have been exercised and serviced as of 8/29/2017. All hydrants have been flow tested and site confirmation has been done with GPS. 812 work orders (wo's) were created as a result of the inspections and servicing. The vast majority of these wo's were for painting and for defenders that either need to be installed or repaired. There were twenty (20) "high priority" wo's for hydrants needing immediate attention, including several that were not functional at all. Nearly all of the high priority wo's were due to partially/fully frozen stems or caps. Several leaking hydrants were also addressed.

The valve maintenance work began in mid-September. The CLD currently has a total of 5 , 666 water valves. This includes 5,523 gate valves ranging in size from 1"-24" and 143 butterfly valves ranging in size from 2 " 24 ". Valvetek will be operating and collecting data on 1,889 valves annually over the three year contract.

One example of a positive result of the hydrant maintenance happened in Valley West Estates. At the lowest elevation of a large subdivision, there was a hydrant that apparently had been hit by a car. Unknown to us, that hydrant had a broken Traffic Breakaway Ring that can't be seen from the outside. During the inspection and flow testing, we also experienced multiple cycling of the fire pumps at the Valley West Pump Station, which resulted in an extreme pressure surge at the hydrant. The broken Breakaway Ring slammed shut, creating a local water hammer that blew out (16) nearby water meters. LCA staff has adjusted the time delays of the fire pumps so they ramp up quicker and reduce cycling and the hydrant was totally replaced. If this had occurred during an actual fire, there would have been serious water supply problems in that area to adequately address the fire.

Curb Box Locating using GPS - Valvetek has been contracted to locate $\sim 18,000$ curb boxes in the Central Lehigh Division. The project started on $7 / 31 / 2017$ and as of $9 / 14 / 2017,4470(24 \%)$ have been located. Another 305 boxes have been returned to LCA as non-locates, creating work orders for LCA staff to manually find. At present, 1171 wo's have been generated to locate or repair existing boxes. This work is to be completed by late December 2017 or early January 2018.

Hydrant Flushing Program - The hydrant flushing program ended in August due to lack of available manpower. At that point, $948 / 1,515$ (63\%) of the hydrants had been worked. Flushing will resume in 2018 and will become an annual project.

Watershed Flow Monitoring Program - FYBR, Inc will be installing a flow meter on the Little Lehigh bridge on Cherry Lane during the week of $9 / 18$. This will be a pilot program so we can evaluate some of their new equipment. The pilot program is being provided to us free of charge. Among other goals, we need to verify that their equipment properly gathers the data we need and the ability to transmit all of the data wirelessly back to LCA headquarters must also be confirmed. Subsequently, we will develop costs for full implementation of six (6) new surface water flow monitoring stations and for three (3) new groundwater monitoring stations.

