

Electric Metering Approach -Sensitivity Analysis







Change in Net Revenue - Net Present Value at 2.50%		Change in Net Revenue - Net Present Value at 2.50%			
Digital Hand Read	(\$22,800,000)	Digital Hand Read	(\$22,800,000)		
Mechanical Hand Read	(\$20,300,000)	Mechanical Hand Read	(\$20,300,000)		
AMR Drive By	\$7,500,000	AMR Drive By	\$7,500,000		
Hybrid AMR	\$14,500,000	Hybrid AMR	\$14,200,000		
AMI	\$14,500,000	AMI	\$14,200,000		

• Original Base Case

• Revised Base Case



Scenario Assumptions	Base Case	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	A+B+C
Meter Accuracy:					
Assumed Meter Accuracy Loss	1.00%	0.25%	1.00%	1.00%	0.25%
Assumed Meter Reporting Loss	1.43%	0.71%	1.43%	1.43%	0.71%
Number of Collectors:					
# Collectors as Multiple of Base Case	1.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	3.0
Assumed Number of Collectors	73	73	219	73	219
Assumed Years of Useful Life	20	20	20	15	15



Change in Net Revenue -					
Net Present Value at 2.50%	Base Case	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	A + B + C
25-Year Forecast	Original	Higher Meter	More	Shorter	Combined
	Assumptions	Accuracy	Collectors	Useful Life	Scenario
Digital Hand Read	(\$22,800,000)	(\$31,100,000)	(\$22,800,000)	(\$22,700,000)	(\$31,000,000)
Mechanical Hand Read	(\$20,300,000)	(\$28,600,000)	(\$20,300,000)	(\$20,300,000)	(\$28,600,000)
AMR Drive By	\$7,500,000	(\$800,000)	\$7,500,000	\$7,600,000	(\$700,000)
Hybrid AMR	\$14,200,000	\$5,900,000	\$11,500,000	\$14,300,000	\$3,300,000
AMI	\$14,200,000	\$5,900,000	\$11,400,000	\$14,300,000	\$3,200,000



Change in Net Revenue -					
Net Present Value at 2.50%	Base Case	Scenario A	Scenario B	Scenario C	A + B + C
35-Year Forecast	Original	Higher Meter	More	Shorter	Combined
	Assumptions	Accuracy	Collectors	Useful Life	Scenario
Digital Hand Read	(\$37,400,000)	(\$48,000,000)	(\$37,400,000)	(\$39,300,000)	(\$49,900,000)
Mechanical Hand Read	(\$34,900,000)	(\$45,500,000)	(\$34,900,000)	(\$34,900,000)	(\$45,500,000)
AMR Drive By	\$10,200,000	(\$400,000)	\$10,200,000	\$7,100,000	(\$3,500,000)
Hybrid AMR	\$21,100,000	\$10,600,000	\$17,700,000	\$18,000,000	\$4,000,000
AMI	\$21,400,000	\$10,900,000	\$18,000,000	\$17,900,000	\$3,900,000



- The original findings are very robust they hold up even with much more conservative assumptions
- Relative economic favorability
 - » AMI and Hybrid are the most economically advantageous
 - » Both hand-read options are the least economical
 - » AMI Drive option is in between
- Non-economic factors differentiate between Hybrid AMR and AMI
 - » Among those two, functional capability makes AMI the recommended approach
- AMI has a positive net present value compared to the status quo—in other words, it pays for itself
 - » It wouldn't have to have a positive net present value in order to be recommended, but it is an additional advantage that it does

