

1 Q. **Reference: CA-NLH-058.**

2 a) Please provide the breakdown summarized in Table 1 of the cost and each benefit
3 associated with the AMT Drive By System and the Mesh AMI System alternatives.

4 b) Table 1 shows a difference in net present value of about \$2.1 million in favour of the
5 AMT Drive By System over the Mesh AMI System. How much is this in percentage terms
6 relative to the total net present value of costs of the AMT Drive By System, and the total
7 capital cost of the AMT Drive By System?

8 c) Did Newfoundland Power participate in this analysis, or did Hydro rely on information
9 produced by, or on behalf of, NP? If so, please provide the information.

10 d) Is Hydro aware of any collaborating studies of AMI undertaken by, or on behalf of,
11 Newfoundland Power?

12

13

14 A. a) Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro (“Hydro”) notes that Table 1 submitted in response to
15 CA-NLH-058 of this proceeding contained erroneous data; Hydro has provided the correct
16 Table 1 in CA-NLH-058, Revision 1. The figures in Table 1 of Hydro’s response to CA-NLH-058
17 were derived from the analysis of upfront capital project costs and the reduction in
18 operating and maintenance costs each year for the drive-by automatic meter reading
19 (“AMR”) system. These costs were then netted from the Total Costs, as shown in Table 1. As
20 previously noted, while Hydro anticipated that the capital costs of each alternative would
21 likely increase due to the same factors driving the cost increase for the drive-by AMR
22 system, Hydro updated the drive-by AMR system costs only.

1 and expenses to implement an AMI system. Newfoundland Power did not participate in
2 Hydro's analysis.

3 **d)** Hydro is not aware of any collaborating studies of AMI undertaken by, or on behalf of,
4 Newfoundland Power.