
From: Norm Gabana [ngabana@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2013 8:57 PM
To: Commission Secretary BCUC:EX
Subject: Final Filling A M I Please confirm receiving

Commission Secretary

April 23,2013

B C U C

Members of the Commission primary interests in this extensive and exhausting process are:

- 1 . The life expectancy of the devices, especially in part-time residences (summer homes) where the power is disconnected for 6 to 9 months of the year
- 2 . The total benefits created from A M I
- 3 . The allocation of those benefits between ratepayers, Fortis and third parties
- 4 . The total costs ratepayers will incur
5. The NET BENEFIT to ratepayers

Life Expectancy

At the last rate hearing Fortis's expert witness stated life expectancy of the new meters is about 16 years. With the rapid advancement in technology we are experiencing, it is highly likely that the meters are already out of date.

Furthermore, how is life expectancy affected when the power is disconnected at part-time residences (summer homes) for 6 to 9 months per year?

Benefits Created

Fortis has stated that their present cost to read a meter is \$3.50 per meter every 2 months. Given that Fortis owns both power and natural gas franchises, and further given that Fortis SHOULD BE achieving economies of scale by reading both meters on one trip, and further given there are no plans to "modernize" natural gas meters, what are the true savings that can be realized by this "upgrade"?

Fortis has stated "there will be cost savings from owning both franchises". Is it not logical that simultaneous meter reading should be the easiest to do NOW, with the savings being returned to their customer and not consumed in a capital budget?

Allocation of Benefits

The projected cost is \$500 per meter, Fortis's earns a 9% return on investments plus a 40 basis point "risk investment benefit", the current Bank of Canada interest rate is 1%, so unless the commission can prove

the average benefit to society is at least \$855 PER METER over their 16 year life, then the only party making money on this proposal is Fortis.

When one considers the total number of part-time residences (summer homes) along with all the residences and buildings at our ski hills, a significant proportion have less than three months occupancy per year. How does this affect the cost-benefit calculation for A M I?

Costs to Ratepayers

If the commission approves AMI, along with the RIB costs that are in our bills now, and the coming impact from the Waneta power purchase agreement, our electrical costs are going to be outrageous.

To date the commission has only considered the published price per kilowatt. With all these additional fees being charged to ratepayers, the commission must consider the total amount paid by rate payers divided by kilowatts used as the actual price per kilowatt paid by ratepayers.

Net Benefit to Ratepayers

Members of the commission, one could go on and on with rhetorical questions and uninformed statements. The only real method to proving whether Fortis is the only beneficiary from this proposal is the detailed financial analysis proposed above.

N Gabana

3850 Dogwood Dr.

Trail B C.

V1R 2V5