AMS notes

Exec summary

Employment for all residential and Many business customers

Three-year deployment schedule with last meters in service year in 2019 in outlying areas
deployment to begin in Louisville area

Cost: 511 million which 346 million of capital and 165 million of O & M over a 20 year
timeframe

1 billion in expected benefits over the 20 year.

Comports with PSC goals established in Adm case 2012–00428

AMS will empower customers through more information and control over their energy usage and
cost

Page 9 sites lowering of calls to elimination of decreased auto related safety incidents and dog
bites 80 experienced since 2011

Page 10 company expects availability of data to drive increased interest in optional rates and
energy efficiency programs that have already demonstrated positive benefits for those customers
that have taken advantage of these programs

Page 10 sites little additional cost to capture and transmit gas consumption data

Page 10 cost of electric meter $104.09 compared to gas meter $74.09

Pages 11 and 12 go to great extent and justifying gas meters wonder how this benefits KU
customers

Page 13 section 5.5.1 .1 sites device vigil he communicates interval data and register rate using
two-way telecommunication’s infrastructure stores data and communicates gives examples from
24 hours once every eight hours etc.

Footnote 9 page 14 states MV 90 meters are excluded from planned AMS deployment

Page 17 section 5.5.8 .1 web portal cites 24 hours is the soonest time data can be made at
available due to processes that translate AMS consumption data

Page 24 section 5.7.5 discusses demand response support
Page 25 of report page 61 of case file notation regarding demand conservation further problems could be stratified giving greater incentive to customers whose conservation efforts are most dependable or provide the deepest reduction in peak usage.

Page 27 file page 63 section on pick your own due date indicates campus billing possibility.

Page 31/67 shows bar chart of savings 40% nearly 50% of savings from recovery of non-technical losses.

Pages 34/7 a discussion of reduce staffing for recurrent meter reading data request would be factored into rate case stated savings of 92 million over 20 years.

Pages 35 and 36/72 discussing non-technical losses appears to be in direct conflict with required meter testing cite points for error.

Why would cost not be recorded in construction work in progress or regulatory asset until the employment is complete?

Ask for EPRI study that quantifies non-technical losses.

Page 49/85 section 9 dealing with customer education and communication plan reading of that naturally link schools as being able to initially up participate in the AMS meter installation program.

For possible testimony inclusion express concern of program based on nearly half of the benefits coming from non-technical losses based on an EPRI study.

Belomy Meese research study shows that favorables on AMS program are those who have already installed LED’s showing a tendency toward being open about energy efficiency.

Info request how will MV 90 m be integrated into a MS system.