AD-A125 250	AN EVALUATION CONSERVATION P WASHINGTON DC	METHODOLOGY FOR F ROJECTSIU) LOGIST OCT 82 LNI-WL110	ACILITY ENERGY ICS MANAGEMENT INST MDA903-81-C 0165	1/1
UNCLASSIFIED			F/G 5/	1 NL
	•			
			END DATE (GMT) 3 83	
<u> </u>				



MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A AN EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR FACILITY ENERGY CONSERVATION PROJECTS

October 1982



FILE COPY 3110

LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE 4701 Sangamore Road P.O. Box 9489 Washington, D.C. 20016



ł

REPORT DOCUMENTATION	PAGE	READ INSTRUCTIONS
REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION	NO. 3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
MTJIO	40-A125	250
TITLE (and Subtitie)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERE
"An Evaluation Methodology for	Facility	Final
Energy Conservation Projects"	ractive	
		A MT 110
UTHOR(.)		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(#)
		MDA903-81-C-0166
ERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
Logistics Management Institute	1	AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
4701 Sangamore Road		
Washington, D.C. 20016		
CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS	Deferre	14. REPORT DATE
UPULY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF	Derense	UCEODER 1982 13. NUMBER OF PAGES
		30
MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(II different	from Controlling Offi	ce) 15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)
		Unclassifed
		15. DECLASSIFICATION DOWNGRADING
		I SCHEDULF
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered i	Distributio	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered i	Distributio In Block 20, 11 dillored	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i	Distributio	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	Distributio	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abetract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	Distributio	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	Distributio	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) "A" Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES	Distributio n Block 20, 11 differen	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Concernation Townstere	Distributio In Block 20, 11 different d identify by block num	n Unlimited
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Conservation Investment Cycle Cost, Military Construct Method (IFAM)	Distributio In Block 20, 11 different d identify by block num Program (ECJ ilon (MILCON),	n Unlimited nt trom Report) mber) (P), Financial Analysis, Life , Improved Financial Analysis
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Conservation Investment Cycle Cost, Military Construct Method (IFAM)	Distributio In Block 20, if different d identify by block num Program (ECI ion (MILCON).,	n Unlimited nt trom Report) mber) (P), Financial Analysis, Life , Improved Financial Analysis
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Conservation Investment Cycle Cost, Military Construct Method (IFAM) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Cinese control of the formation	Distributio In Block 20, 11 different d identify by block num Program (ECI ion (MILCON).,	n Unlimited nt (rom Report) (P), Financial Analysis, Life Improved Financial Analysis (FCIP) in
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) 'A'' Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Conservation Investment Cycle Cost, Military Construct Method (IFAM) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Since establishing the Energy 1977, the Department of Defense t proposed by installations to cons	Distributio In Block 20, 11 different differentity by block num Program (ECI ion (MILCON)., I Identity by block num v Conservation has expended a serve utility	n Unlimited n Unlimited nt trom Report) (P), Financial Analysis, Life , Improved Financial Analysis here: n Investment Program (ECIP) in about \$750 million on projects energy. Each proposed project
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) "A" Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Conservation Investment Cycle Cost, Military Construct Method (IFAM) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Since establishing the Energy 1977, the Department of Defense t proposed by installations to cons was analyzed to determine such pa investment ratio (SIR), energy sa then ranked against all "completif funding priority. A certain lack	Distributio In Block 20, 11 different didentify by block num Program (ECI ion (MILCON)., Indentify by block num y Conservation has expended a serve utility arameters as ing" energy co c of rigor in	n Unlimited nt trom Report) (P), Financial Analysis, Life (IP), Financial Analysis, Life (Improved Financial Analysis) (P) n Investment Program (ECIP) in about \$750 million on projects energy. Each proposed project life cycle cost (LCC), savings ital cost ratio (E/C), etc., an onservation projects to develop analysis and ranking was not
DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) "A" Approved for Public Release ; DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered i SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Energy Conservation Investment Cycle Cost, Military Construct Method (IFAM) ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and Since establishing the Energy 1977, the Department of Defense t proposed by installations to cons was analyzed to determine such pa investment ratio (SIR), energy sa then ranked against all "completif funding priority. A certain lack	Distributio In Block 20, 11 different d Identify by block num Program (ECI ion (MILCON), I Identify by block num v Conservation has expended a serve utility arameters as hvings to cap: ing" energy co to f rigor in	n Unlimited n Unlimited nt trom Report) (P), Financial Analysis, Life Improved Financial Analysis (ECIP) in about S750 million on projects energy. Each proposed project life cycle cost (LCC), savings (tal cost ratio (E/C), etc., and onservation projects to develop analysis and ranking was not

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Date Entered)

critical because the funds required and the funds available were approximately equal.

Two factors have arisen that make more rigorous analysis and more careful ranking necessary. First, the sum of estimated costs of all proposed projects exceeds the funding available. Second, the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) requires all executive agencies to use an LCC analysis technique promulgated by the Department of Energy (DOE) to determine which projects are to be funded. Thus, DoD must incorporate this method into its ECIP analysis and ranking techniques.

The report presents an improved financial analysis method--IFAM-- for use in ECIP which fulfills all the FEMP requirements. IFAM employs a microcomputer with user-friendly software to analyze and rank projects. Inputs to IFAM are both general--GNP deflators, DOE energy cost escalation rates, OMBauthorized federal discount rate, etc., and project-specific--estimated capital and operational cash flow, schedules, local utility energy costs, etc. Only the project-specific inputs are required from the proposing installation. Analysis takes place at a central analysis center where general and projectspecific inputs are entered on an electronic ledger "spread sheet." Using IFAM, the analysis center produces a most likely value for financial parameters of interest--LCC, SIR, E/C, etc.--and ranks competing projects by the desired parameters. A sensitivity analysis and an uncertainty analysis capability are embedded in the IFAM software.

The reports recommends that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations) encourage IFAM's use in the next available ECIP cycle on a pilot basis by one major command or facilities engineering division of each Military Department. If that test proves IFAM to be an effective, efficient ECIP analysis tool, the report further recommends that it be used for all ECIP analyses and that it be considered for financial analysis in other DoD energyand construction-related programs.

Accession For NTIS CRALL STO 7 8 Uninserved Just friestion. Distribution/ Availability Codes Avail and/or Special

Unclassified SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Date Entered)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since establishing the Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP) in 1977, the Department of Defense has expended about \$750 million on projects proposed by installations to conserve utility energy. Each proposed project was analyzed to determine such measures as life cycle cost (LCC), savings to investment ratio (SIR), energy savings to capital cost ratio (E/C), and then ranked against all "competing" energy conservation projects to develop funding priority. Rigor in analysis and ranking was not critical because the funds required and the funds available were approximately equal.

Two factors have arisen that make more rigorous analysis and more careful ranking necessary. First, the sum of estimated costs of all proposed projects exceeds the funding available. Second, the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) requires all executive agencies to use the more demanding LCC analysis technique promulgated by the Department of Energy (DoE) to determine which projects are to be funded. Thus, DoD must incorporate this method into its ECIP project selection technique.

We have developed for use in ECIP an improved financial analysis method--IFAM--which fulfills all the FEMP requirements. IFAM employs a microcomputer with user-friendly software to analyze and rank projects. Inputs to IFAM are both general--GNP deflators, DOE energy cost escalation rates, OMB-authorized federal discount rate, etc.--and project-specific--estimated capital and operational cash flow, schedules, local utility energy costs, etc. Only the project-specific inputs are required from the proposing installation. Analysis takes place at a center where general and project-specific inputs are entered on an electronic ledger "spread sheet." Using IFAM, the analysis

ii

ŧ

center produces a most likely value for financial measures of interest--LCC, SIR, E/C, etc.--and ranks competing projects by the desired measures. A sensitivity analysis and an uncertainty analysis capability are embedded in the IFAM software.

We recommend that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations) enlist the cooperation of the Military Departments in a pilot test of IFAM in the next available ECIP cycle. If that test proves IFAM to be an effective ECIP analysis tool, we recommend that it be used for all ECIP analyses and that it be considered as a financial analysis method in other DoD construction-related programs.

•

し、これなどのないないという

in the

South States

TABLE OF CONTENTS

																										-	
VE SUMMARY	Ł.	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•		ii
FIGURES	• •	•	•	•	•	•	•	٠	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	۰	•	•	•	•	•		v
TABLES		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		v
INTRODUC	FION																										
LIFE	CYCL	E	cos	ST	•	•		•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		1-1
	VE SUMMARY FIGURES TABLES INTRODUCT LIFE	VE SUMMARY . FIGURES TABLES INTRODUCTION LIFE CYCL	VE SUMMARY FIGURES TABLES INTRODUCTION LIFE CYCLE	VE SUMMARY FIGURES TABLES INTRODUCTION LIFE CYCLE COS	VE SUMMARY FIGURES TABLES INTRODUCTION LIFE CYCLE COST	VE SUMMARY	E SUMMARY																				

Page

and the second se

	ENERGY MANAGEMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	1-2 1-2 1-3
2.	AN IMPROVED LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS METHOD	2-1
	OVERVIEW	2-1
	PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS	2-3
	PROPOSED ANALYSIS PROCESS	2-4
3.	IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED METHOD	3-1

APPENDICES

A. INSTALLATION INPUT FORM

B. SAMPLE PROJECT LCC ANALYSIS SPREAD SHEET

C. IFAM COMPUTER LISTING (Separately bound)

i۷

LIST OF FIGURES

ļ

Figure No.		Page
2-1	System Flow Chart	2-2
2-2	LCC Cash Flow Timeline	2-3
2-3	MILCON Cycle	2-5
2-4	FEMP Cycle	2-5
2-5	Statistical Uncertainty Analysis	2-7

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Fable No.</u>		Page
1-1	Facility Life Cycle Costs	1-1
1-2	ECIP Projects Funding	1-4
1-3	Comparison of ECIP and FEMP Guidelines	1-5
3-1	DoD Programs in Which IFAM Could Be Used Beneficially	3-2

ŧ

1. INTRODUCTION

Department of Defense (DoD) installation energy costs are growing in real terms, and the future rate of that growth has become increasingly uncertain. Economic analyses of prospective installation projects have thus become mandatory and more complex. When projects consume substantial amounts of energy during their lifetimes or when they conserve or shift energy sources, the combined effects of inflation and energy price escalation make future costs used in these analyses more uncertain. Planning for new or replacement facilities must take into account uncertain future costs, as well as initial acquisition costs.

This report presents a method for performing economic analysis of proposed facility energy projects under the DoD's Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP).

LIFE CYCLE COST

As indicated in Table 1-1, the relative percentages of the construction and operational phases of a system's Life Cycle Cost (LCC) vary widely, but in general over one-half of a system's LCC occurs in the operational phase. Thus, an economic analysis of a proposed project will be meaningful only if acquisition and ownership cost calculations are accurate and complete.

TABLE 1-1. FACILITY LIFE CYCLE COSTS

Construction	•	•	•	28-54%
Operation and Maintenance	•	•	•	45-60%
Replacement and Modernization		•	•	5-10%
Salvage and Disposal	•			0-1%

Source: Dienemann, P.F., "Life Cycle Cost Analysis Methodology for Construction Projects." F. R. Harris, Inc., report for Royal Commission of Saudi Arabia, Contract No. SGC-02-1397, October 1978.

1-1

ŧ

LCC analysis should be performed when any construction, refurbishment or energy conservation project meets one or more of the following conditions:¹

- the anticipated energy costs of the facility, system, or purchase are expected to be large throughout its life;
- the facility, system, or purchase has a long, physical lifetime;
- the increased efficiency of maintenance will have a significant impact on overall costs;
- the investment is large;
- the post-purchase costs are significant.

Six steps generally are recognized in the economic analysis of a proposed energy investment:

- 1. Identify alternative approaches to achieve objective.
- 2. Establish a common time basis for costs and study period.
- 3. Identify and estimate benefits and costs.
- 4. Convert cash flows to a common time.
- 5. Compare alternatives based on relative economic efficiencies.
- 6. Perform risk and/or sensitivity analysis.

The method presented in this report covers all steps of the analysis except the first. Once the engineering alternatives are established, the method will either facilitate or directly perform the remaining steps.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Federal Energy Management Program

The Department of Energy (DOE) is responsible for establishing energy conservation regulations and monitoring the energy conservation performance for all executive agencies, in accordance with public law and

¹Brown, R. J. and Yanuck, R. R., <u>Life Cycle Costing A Practical Guide for</u> <u>Energy Managers</u>, The Fairmount Press, Inc., Atlanta, Ga., 1980.

のないので

executive order.² One aspect of this responsibility is to provide a common method of analysis and comparison of the life cycle capital and operating costs of federal energy conservation and renewable energy projects. The "Life Cycle Cost Manual for the Federal Energy Management Program" was promulgated in December 1980 as National Bureau of Standards (NBS) Handbook 135 by the Department of Commerce. It was incorporated into the Code of Federal Regulations³ in November 1981. The regulation requires the FEMP LCC analysis method to be used to estimate:

- Whether retrofitting an alternative system to an existing Federal building is cost-effective and tends to minimize the life cycle cost of that building;
- Relative cost-effectiveness of retrofit investments in buildings;
- Whether an alternative design for a new Federal building will minimize the life cycle cost of that building;
- Payback time for solar demonstration projects;
- Present value of net benefits or excess costs of a solar demonstration project compared to a substitute conventional non-solar alternative building system in an existing Federal building or in the design of a new Federal building.

Energy Conservation Investment Program

١.

÷ •

ちまたいいたぜ

F

ł,

The Department of Defense established ECIP in March 1977 as its primary program for achieving the energy reduction goals for existing facilities which were established by Executive Order 12003. It is a Military Construction (MILCON) funded program for retrofitting existing DoD facilities to make them more energy efficient. The program has expanded to include such

²Section 381(a)(2) of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6361(a)(2); Section 10 of Executive Order 11912, as amended; Title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act, 92 Stat. 3275.

³Subpart n. Pa 436, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations.

1-3

projects as renewable energy sources and cogeneration. The ECIP program has been effective in accomplishing energy conservation measures that would not have been funded through Base Operating Support funds.

Through FY 1981, the Military Departments spent approximately \$750 million for energy conservation improvements under ECIP, as detailed in Table 1-2. During that period, the estimated cost of proposed projects and the funds available were approximately equal. Therefore, although projects were ranked for order of accomplishment, the ranking was not critical. Beginning in FY 1982, however, a backlog of unfunded projects developed and ranking became more significant.

TABLE 1-2. ECIP PROJECTS FUNDING (Millions of Dollars)

FISCAL YEAR	ARMY	NAVY	AIR FORCE	TOTAL
FY76	30.4	28.8	44.0	103.2
FY77	60.1	52.5	28.1	140.7
FY78	15.6	26.1	31.6	73.3
FY79	52.7	42.9	35.0	130.6
FY80	45.0	46.7	32.2	123.9
FY81	67.4	53.0	45.2	165.6
TOTAL	271.2	250.0	216.1	737.3

The analysis scheme for ECIP projects, in existence since the program's inception, is different from the LCC analysis methods now required by the FEMP. It is a simple system, ignoring some elements of a project's life cycle cost. In keeping with the national policy of the late 1970's, it emphasizes energy (Btu) savings. A comparison of FEMP and ECIP projectranking guidelines is shown in Table 1-3.

As Table 1-3 suggests, the FEMP LCC analysis is a complete economic analysis and project ranking method. It can be applied not only to energy

1-4

4

TABLE 1-3. COMPARISON OF ECIP AND FEMP GUIDELINES

FEMP

- A. Required for all energy related construction.
- All projects must be LCC cost-effective. All LCC cost parameters are included. Based on a savings-to-investment ratio (SIR) >1.0
- Ratrofit projects ranked by SIR. New construction ranked by LCC. Solar projects ranked partially by uet LCC, payback, and SIR.
- All annual cash flows are estimated in constant dollars as of the date of study. Same year is fiscal year of study.
- Seven percent "real" discount rate must be used.
- F. Until marginal utility prices become available, project investment costs occur at the beginning of the base year and must be adjusted downward 10 percent to reflect benefits to society.
- Energy conversion factors are "boundary purchase prices", i.e., 3412 Btu/kWh for electricity.
- H. Use actual base year fuel prices if available or use DOE prices. Time-ofiay pricing and projected escalation rates may be used if provided by supplier.
- "On-site generated" electricity prices are the higher of actual local purchased electricity or the price of input fuel plus generation and distribution losses. "On-site generated" steam and hot water price is the price of input fuel and generation distribution custs.
- J. DOE-provided differential escalation rates must be applied to base year fuel costs for projection of future prices.
- X. Equivalent study period of mutuallyexclusive projects is lesser of 25 years or least common multiple of the estimated lifetimes of the system alternatives. For non-mutually exclusive retrofit projects, use the estimated life of each system up to 25 years.
- For multiple proposed projects within a building or system, use an iterative SIR and LCC method to eliminate overestimation of energy and dollar avoidance.
- M. LCC rule does not specifically require sensitivity or probability analysis, but FEMP manual recommends and OMB Circular A-94 requires it "if there is a reasonable basis to estimate the variability of future costs and benefits."

With a start state of the providence of the

ł

ECIP

- A. Required for only "sepital intensive" retrofit projects.
- B. All projects must be cost-effective. LCC cost parameters not included or used differently are design, initial 5 terminal salvage, and replacement costs. Based on a "simplified" liscounted energy savings-to-cost ratio (E/C) > 1.0.
- C. Retrofit projects ranked by E/C (undiscounted construction working estimate (CWE), first operating year energy savings only). New construcand solar not applicable to ECIP.
- D. Annual cash flows are estimated in constant dollars as of the end of the program (day #1 of execution year) by use of short-term escalation factors for all cost and savings categories. Base year is axecution year.
- E. Ten percent "real" discount rate must be used.
- F. No mention of marginal pricing or benefitis-to-society adjustments. Investment costs occur at the beginning of the execution year.
- G. Some energy conversion factors are different from those in FEMP. Specifically, the conversion for electricity is 11,600 Btu/kWh for onsite and "boundary purchased" electricity (for use only in the E/C calculation).
- H. Use actual base year (escalated to execution year) prices for fuel. No time-of-day pricing mentioned.
- Price for electricity or steam purchased from on-site sources is the actual average gross energy input to the generating plant plus distribution losses.
- J. ECIP-provided differential escalation rates may be used or "where local conditions and experience indicate more valid differential escalation rates," local values may be used.
- K. Economic life of all projects must not exceed DoD given values. No mention of mutually or non-mutually exclusive projects.
- For multiple proposed projects within a building or system. "Care must be exercised by the analyst" to assure that projected energy savings are not duplicative.
- M. ECIP does not mention sensitivity analysis but DODI 7041.3 requires risk/uncertainty analysis (cost ranges for estimates).

- ----

1-5

and the second statement of the

conservation retrofit projects, but also to new construction, operations and maintenance, and alternate energy projects. It does not include, however, the means to assess economic risk.

We propose remedying that deficiency by building into the basic FEMP LCC methodology a capability for assessing cost uncertainty. The resulting enhanced methodology, which we describe in the rest of this report, would then be suitable for financial evaluation of candidate projects for ECIP and other construction-related programs.

1

2. AN IMPROVED LIFE CYCLE COST ANALYSIS METHOD

Our improved financial analysis method (IFAM) permits proposed energy projects to be ranked by their expected life cycle cost values and the uncertainty surrounding those values. It fulfills all requirements of the FEMP and of DoD Instruction 7041.3.¹

OVERVIEW

IFAM is designed to use commercially-available, user-friendly microcomputer hardware and software.² It is envisaged for use at a common analysis center, such as a Military Department facility engineering headquarters, a major command, public works center or field engineering division, requiring only project-specific data to be provided by installation personnel. Figure 2-1 provides a summary system flow chart.

Two data files are required, one project-specific, the other general. Project-specific data are obtained from the proposing installation. An installation input form is at Appendix A.

The general file contains such data as the discount rate designated by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for use in the financial analysis of federal projects, the DOE projection of costs for electricity and fuels (e.g., No. 2 heating oil, No. 6 residual oil) in all DOE Regions, the end-use energy conversion rates for all fuels, etc. These data will be provided by higher headquarters.

¹"Economic Analysis and Program Evaluation for Resource Management," DoDI 7041.3, October 18, 1972.

²IFAM was programmed using the VisiCalc (VisiCorp) electronic ledger sheet. Other commercial electronic ledger sheet programs such as SuperCalc (Sorcim) or MultiPlan (MicroSoft) can be used.



The project-specific data are combined with the general data directly on an electronic ledger "spread sheet" on the computer monitor screen. The spread sheet is the only display needed for the LCC analysis; IFAM software contains all the analysis algorithms which are "behind" the spread sheet. A hard copy example of a project LCC analysis spread sheet, as performed by IFAM, is at Appendix B.

IFAM calculates the most likely project LCC and several other project energy and financial indices, such as savings-to-investment ratio (SIR), energy (MBtus) saved, etc. It also calculates a statistical measure of the likelihood of the various output indices being achieved and screens and ranks all projects considered according to desired indices.³

³The computer program listing is available from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations) in hard copy or diskette.

PREPARATION FOR ANALYSIS

For each proposed project, installation personnel must complete an input form (Appendix A), using data from the standard planning and estimating process used for any construction project. In addition to discrete estimates of LCC element values and schedule milestone dates, installation engineering personnel also should provide high and low values and early and late dates to establish a practical range around each cost and schedule estimate. IFAM will employ these ranges in the statistical analysis of economic uncertainty.

Visualizing each proposed project's life by a time line similar to Figure 2-2 should assist installation personnel in estimating the timing of project cash flow, which is required on the input sheet.



The FEMP analysis method of NBS Handbook 135 makes several assumptions about the timing of the date of study (DOS), design, investment, and annual costs to simplify a complex analysis (e.g. mixing mid-calendar year energy projections with fiscal year cash flows). The assumptions can generate inaccuracies in certain output ranking variables, but are the only reasonable method for use in manual computations. IFAM data processing algorithms, using

2-3

ŧ

the actual DOS and projections of construction start date and beneficial occupancy date (BOD) can easily accommodate the cash flow timing, thus provide a better estimate of a project's LCC, precluding the need for simplifying assumptions. Figures 2-3 and 2-4 illustrate the difference between the IFAM analysis using the actual MILCON planning cycle and an analysis using the NBS Handbook 135 assumptions.

When the installation input form is complete, it is sent to an analysis center for processing.

PROPOSED ANALYSIS PROCESS

The basis for the system is an electronic ledger sheet, or "spread sheet," which incorporates all general and project-specific data in a single presentation. The ledger sheet is visible to the analyst on the cathode ray tube monitor of the microcomputer. The analyst has only to enter values for project-specific data by the microcomputer keyboard in the appropriate cells of the ledger sheet. Using those data and appropriate items of data from the general data file (previously built), IFAM produces a best estimate of the project's LCC.

When the analysis of all competing projects has been completed, IFAM can provide a ranking of projects according to the desired parameter(s). If any data are changed, either project-specific or general, entry of the new data will automatically and essentially instantaneously change the output LCC information of affected projects and the concomitant ranking of all projects. This capability not only accommodates actual changes in cost estimates, but also allows the testing of the sensitivity of projects' LCCs and LCC rankings to changes in the value of input financial parameters.

2-4

.

FIGURE 2-3 MILCON CYCLE



FIGURE 2-4 FEMP CYCLE



2-5

のないのでの

Sensitivity analysis is a method of measuring the responsiveness of a project's financial parameters--LCC, SIR, energy savings (MBtus or dollars) to cost ratio (E/C) etc.--to a range of values for a selected or uncertain key input. Frequently called "what if" analysis, it allows the analyst to assess the effect of a change in an input parameter on the project's LCC. For instance, a change in the discount rate (established at 7 percent by OMB Circular A-94), may be under consideration. Or the planned opening or closing of a refinery or pipeline may change the projected fuel cost for installations in a certain area. Or an uncertain economic outlook in an area may bring about a wide range in the project's construction working estimate (CWE). The analyst's substitution of the proposed values for the values used in the original analysis on the ledger sheet will trigger IFAM to recalculate and display the entire ledger sheet with the new results. A change in the value of one project-specific input may cause a change in the ranking of that project's LCC relative to that of other projects. A change in the value of a general input may change the value, hence the ranking, of all projects' LCCs. IFAM generates new rankings for each change in input data.

The analysis algorithms of IFAM combine a standard "present value" financial analysis with a statistical analysis of the economic uncertainty of a project. The GNP deflator and appropriate differential escalation and discount rates are applied to each cash flow item of the project time line to determine the present value of the financial parameters -- LCC, SIR, E/C, etc. -- associated with the future cash flow of the project. The economic uncertainty or risk analysis uses the ranges of schedule and dollar value estimates to produce the most probable value of LCC and a measure of the likelihood of achieving that value. IFAM performs risk analysis by incorporating a statistical approximation of Monte Carlo simulation techniques combined with elements of portfolio management theory. The basic tenet in this method is that a decision maker, given the choice between two ECIP projects of equal SIR (or E/C, or other ranking index), would prefer the project with the higher certainty of achieving the computed SIR value. Another way of saying this is that the project with the lowest percentage variance would be preferred.^{4,5} Conversely, if two projects have the same percentage variance of the SiR, the project with the higher computed SIR would be preferred. Figure 2-5 illustrates IFAM's risk analysis technique.



FIGURE 2-5 STATISTICAL UNCERTAINTY ANALYSIS

⁴Hertz, D. B., "Risk Analysis in Capital Investment," <u>Harvard Business</u> Review, January - February, 1964.

⁵Hertz, D. B., "Investment Policies That Pay Off," <u>Harvard Business</u> <u>Review</u>, January - February, 1968. The algorithm combines probability distributions of the inputs and calculates the most likely mean and variance of the outputs. In effect, for each project the computer approximates the performance of a Monte Carlo simulation using randomly selected values of each cost element from its unique distribution curve of probable values. In a Monte Carlo simulation, as shown in Figure 2-5(A), after 1,000 or more iterations of calculating discrete values of the SIR, the mean and variance of the resulting distribution curve is calculated for that ECIP project. The SIR mean is then plotted against its percentage variance. The next ECIP project is then simulated using its set of cost element distribution curves, and a mean and percentage variance are computed and plotted as before. After values for all ECIP projects have been plotted, Figure 2-5(B) is obtained.

Using the two criteria for preferred investments, i.e., high SIR and low variance, projects to the right and downward on the normalized percentage variance versus SIR graph in Figure 2-5(B) are preferred. For example, project 1 in Figure 2-5(B) is preferred to projects 2 or 3 because it has a higher SIR at the same variance. Likewise project 4 is preferred to project 3 because at the same SIR value it has lower variance or a better probability of being achieved. Consequently, projects to the right and downward are preferred. A "frontier" line (i) may be drawn of the most favorable projects.

Finally, Figure 2-5(C) can be divided into three distinct management decision-making policy regions: conservative, moderate, and risk-taking. For example, a risk-taking management policy would invest in a project that had the highest possible return (e.g., highest SIR) and accept a larger risk of actually achieving that value. Conversely, a conservative policy would invest in a project with lower but more certain return (e.g., lower SIR value).

2-8

Also, screening criteria may be imposed: SIR must be greater than 1.0 or variance must be less than 30 percent (as shown in Figure 2-5(C) by the vertical and horizontal lines). The "acceptable area" (unshaded) now includes those projects meeting the screening and investment policy tests.

More than one index (SIR, LCC, and E/C, for example) may be simulated, plotted, and screened. The final acceptable area of projects will be composed of those projects contained in the feasible acceptable areas of all screens.

The mean value of the index is a more probable estimate than the discrete value computed without statistical analysis. Examples from the literature suggest that discrete rates of return on investment of 20 percent would actually be about 7 percent after uncertainty analysis. This reflects the higher probability of achieving the 7 percent based on the uncertainty of the inputs. Projects ranked by this "more probable" index will have a more accurate ranking since rank is based on higher probabilities of achievement.

A final question concerns the possibility of unrealistic estimates provided by the installation for the low and high values of the cost elements. By providing narrow boundaries for each input estimate it is possible to artificially increase the weighted mean SIR and lower the variance. If this becomes a problem, it may be mitigated by providing guidelines for setting the low and high values, or providing for default values or upper and lower limits in the IFAM software. For example, if historical construction bidding cost data for similar projects is available by construction region, the 90 percent confidence interval around the mean low bid may be determined and applied to the installation's construction estimate. The range for other large cost drivers and savings values may be determined in the same way. The estimated energy costs may similarly be bracketed using low, expected, and high values

2-9

for the ranges of differential escalation rates provided by DOE or by alternate forecasts such as those provided to subscribers by private econometric services (e.g., Data Resources, Inc., Chase Econometrics).



ŧ

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED METHOD

The stage is well set for implementing IFAM. First, it takes advantage of new microcomputer hardware and software which simplify its use. The method simultaneously improves rigor and accuracy of ECIP project evaluation and eliminates the redundant manual calculations now needed for even limited analysis. Second, potential users in appropriate organizations of each of the Military Departments have contributed to and are familiar with IFAM.¹

We recommend the first step of IFAM implementation in the DoD be conducted as a trial -- a pilot program.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations) (DASD(I)) should enlist the cooperation of the three Military Departments. One major command each in the Army and Air Force and one facilities engineering division headquarters in the Navy should be selected to use IFAM to analyze and rank all proposed ECIP projects within its purview during the next available fiscal cycle. Upon completion of the ECIP package submission for inclusion in the MILCON appropriations, the DASD(I) should review comments and recommendations from the Military Departments concerning the utility of IFAM and encourage the DoD-wide implementation -- or retirement -- of IFAM accordingly.

If IFAM proves beneficial for ECIP, it should have similar advantage in the DoD major construction program and in such other energy- and constructionrelated programs as:

¹ECIP-knowledgeable representatives of the Corps of Engineers, the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and the Air Force Engineering and Services Center have been consulted on ECIP during the development of IFAM, and have received an IFAM demonstration.

TABLE 3-1. DoD PROGRAMS IN WHICH IFAM COULD BE USED BENEFICIALLY

ALL MILITARY SERVICES

Alternative Energy Sources Programs (geothermal, solar, and wind) Refuse-Derived Fuel and Biomass Programs Facilities Metering Program Dual Fuel and Coal Conversion Programs Energy Conservation and Management Program (ECAM) Maintenance Programs (O&M) New Building Design and Construction Program (MILCON)

ARMY

Energy Engineering Analysis Program (EEAP) Quick Return on Investment Program (QRIP) Family Housing Energy Conservation

NAVY & MARINE CORPS

Energy Engineering Program (EEP) Boiler Tune-Up Program Family Housing Conservation Programs Energy Conservation Opportunity Program (ECOP) Federal Agencies Substitution Task Program (FAST) Reserve Facilities Energy Conservation Program Navy Exchange and Commissary Conservation Program

AIR FORCE

Energy Audits and Technical Surveys Program O&M/Management Actions Program Colloidal Boiler Fuels Program Fluidized-Bed Combustion and Coal Gasification Programs M-X Renewable Energy Systems Program Power Systems and Resource Conservation R&D Programs Terrestrial Energy R&D Programs Process Energy Use Analysis Program Process Equipment Retrofits Program

APPENDIX A

INSTALLATION INPUT FORM

Ĺ

Ł

.

INSTALLATION INPUT FORM

•

Project Name:		Address:	
Facility:		Agency Contact:	
Agency:		UIC:	Serial No.:
Major Claimant:		Revised:	Project No.:
Active: Yes/No			
Funding Command:		Date of Construction	Beneficial Occupancy
Appropriation:		(Month, Year):	Date (Month, Year):
DOE kegion:		Low:	Low:
Utility Rate:		Expect:	Expect:
		High:	High:
Residential =]	Industrial = 3		
Commercial = 2	Transportation = 4	System Efficiency:	
		Existing:	Retrofit:

A-1

1

i

INSTALLATION INPUT FORM (Continued) (All Costs in Constant _(Yr.) bollars)

High Value Most-Likely Value Low Value Year Occurs Year Begins or Other (I_, E_, R_, Other (I__, E_, R_, Salvage (Terminal Value of New System) Retrofit or New System Salvage (Existing System) Non-Recurring O&M Salvage (Existing Non-Recurring 06M System) Recurring O&M Recurring O&M **Existing System** Keplacment Replacement LCC ELEMENTS Design Design CWE CWE

; .:

A North Contraction

A-2

	Local Cost Per MBtu	(Constant Year Yr. Dollars)				
INPUT FORM ued)	d-Use tion	Retrofit (MBtus)				
INSTALLATION (Contin	Annual En Consump	Existing (MBtus)				e Heating ()il (No.2), 6), Natural Gas, pane, etc.), Bituminous and energy conversion factor.
		Energy Source				For Source, Specify: Electricity, Distillate Residual Fuel Oil (No. M-Gas (MFBI), BPG (Proj Cual, or Other. If other, state source a

二川中北王

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE PROJECT LCC ANALYSIS SPREAD SHEET

۸.

4

·

.

WE BEAR AD THE PARTY

Freiset N		ACILITIES	ENERGY IN	PROVEMENTS	i	Select	Esist/Retre	fit System	Cenversi	on States-	50	50	FEMPIONE CC
Facility.	N	IND HOFFETT IAVFAC-WEBT	DIV TIELD CA		A	4887885 1461	D R. RYAN	AIV 857-					3412
Nater Cla	imant' P	ACTLT			V1C		N##274	50	erial No	t	3244		138478
Date Prep	ared 3	/111/	1979		Revised:	8/5/	19813	P	rosoct Ne	• •	180		149498
Autive?		- 1	25			Date of Co	nstruction			Beneficial	Occupancy Da	te	1016
Tunding boorobr	Countre?		AVFAL			Law	MAR	1982)	Low	APR	19633		75588
DOE Reg	1987)			Etpest	JUN	19823	Espect	JUN	19833		22588
Utility	Rate 187 Re	asdentsal-	1>	3		Nigh	JUL	19423	High.	SEP	17833		125071
	Ce	mmercial=1	•					76					3412
										· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Nost Preb	able LCC Con	it Elements	•	LIISTING S		Constant	1782	Deliars					
	**	1782	1983	1784	1945	178	4 1987	1740	174	• 1770	1991	1992	1 * * 3
DESIGN		•						U D					
SALVAGE (E	aisting)	i						i	Ì		0		•
SALVAGE (N	(ew)	•) 8)		9		0 0	9	0	•
REPLACEME	NT	0	•	•	0		0 0	0		0 0	0	•	•
RECURRING	04M	:		0		1	o o	0			0 0		
OTHER COS	T-invest	i				1					0	9	6
	-Energy	•	•	•	•			٥		e 0	٥	•	•
	-Replace	•	•	•)	• •	•		0 0	0		•
M	-Naint	•		•) I			Ballara		• •	•		•
DESIGN	ABIG LLL LD	24800		111108111 B) (Constant.		0				•	•
CVE		532250	•) 4)	• •	0		• •	•	0	•
SALVAGE	sisting)	•	•)		0		• •		•	0
SALVAGE (N	lew) Int												
RECURRING	Ma0 5							0			i		0
NON-RECUR	RING OF	0	•	•) 1))	0 0	0		• •	0	0	•
OTHER COS	ST-Invest	•	0	4			• •	•		0 0	•		•
	-Energy	0)				0 0 A A			4
	-Repiece \												•
Discount	Rate (22%)=	7	1.87	. 73457944	۱								
Discount	Factor	. 93457944	. 87343873	81429784	74289521	7129841	8 .44434222	62274974	.5820071	0 .54393374	.50834929 .	47509280	4491176
GNP Defla		2.123	2.JJJJ	1.3477			2 3.204	J 926			••••••		
DOE I	EGION NO	•		*** ANNUAL	ENERGY DI	FFERENTIA	L ESCALATION	RATES***			Estimate is	Nest Pro	bable Nean V
		1982	1983	1784	1983	178	4 1987	1788	178	9 1990	1991	1992	1773
Resid.	Electricity	1.0528	1.1083883	1.1449115	\$ 1.32 9 5253	:]. 331473	7 1.2344292	1.2373918	1.240363	4 1.2433385	1,2407574 1		1 2362070 1
	LPG	1 81744	1.0311071	1.0542448		. 	2 1.1100431	1.1298791	1.148562	1 1.1485037	1,2204139	2758587	1 3344010 1
	Natural Gas	1.087175	1.1819991	1.2858744	1.3971500	1.414579	5 1.4322248	1.4508730	1.448183	2 1.4864995	1.5215110	1.5573473	1.5940279 1
Comm.	Electricity	1.03676	1.0758715	1.1168373	5 1.1599663	5 1.160740	5 1.1415152	1.1423905	1.163064	6 1,1638433	1.1418545	1.1578742	1.1578745 1
	Distillate	1.01757	1.0355810	1.0540441	1 1.0729700	i 1.093763	5 1.1151157	1.1378424	1.157556	18 1.1826807	1.2393498	. 2774333 	- 2.36383333 2 - 1.5591311 1
	Nesidual Natural Gam	1.06273	1.1213174	1.202782	0 1.4477440 9 1.2824793) 1 913041 2 1 297024	0 1.3403037	1 3243524	1.341334	LB 1.3545403	1,3837998	1.4117418	1 4484445 3
	Steam Coal	1.04277	1.0801532	1.1343894	1 1.1874871	1.203115	0 1.2171002	1.2353482	1.251920	3 1.2487733	1.2744891	. 2882384	1.2860220 1
Indust.	Electricity	1.05252	1.1077985	1.165780	5 1.227218	1 1.234334	4 1.2414756	1.2486964	1.25593	1 1.2632234	1 2616886	1.2401554	1 2584245 1
	Distillate	1.01757	1.0355810	1.0340441	1 1.072970(6 1.093531 	6 1.1146396	1.1343070	1.158550	18 L.1813923	1 2379777	1 . 2981939 1 . 4589451	1.3622001 1
	Natural Gas	1.08724	1.1821471	1.2853281	9 1.397531(· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1 1.4170544	1.9841490	1.30417	45 1 4448574	1.4870494	1.5283390	1.5708171 1
	N-Gas MFB1	1.088175	1.1841941	1.2884981	8 1.482437(B 1.343412	. 1 . 2868757	1.2327228	1.18083	29 1.1311694	1 1412874	1.1722081	1.2239534 1
* •••••	Steam Coal	1.13725	1.2733402	1.4788571	1 1.4727429	5 1.714483	4 1.7575147	1.8815018	1 846580	88 1.8928027	1.9109448	1.9292449	1.9477384 1
		1.036043			• • • • • • • • • • • • • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4 1.2620408	1.2807220	1.17004	** 1.31/2334			
**EIISTI	NG SYSTEN	1962	1763	1980		5 174	6 1787	1788	17		1991	1992	1993
U Elect:	ricity (1Wh)	•	•)	• •	•		• •	•		
	14819 (Me.2) 981 (Me.4)		448892 98	518500 14	V (5 554984 **	, , ,788/4 -	F	• • • • • • • •	414448	9 429941 AT	439487 25	49345 49	439399.18 4
1 Natur	al Gas		•••••••••••		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		• •••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••			• •) 		•
S N-Gas	ME 81	•			•	•	• •		•	•	• •		v •
C LPG,P	repane,ets.				•	•	•		•		: :		
Ca so 1	ine								•				i i
Elest	riesty (kW)				i i	i i	i		i i	•	• •		•
ENERG	Y TOTAL		448872.7	B 510599.3	5 354984.7	8 378844.	08 \$85071.11	7 399474.9	4 414630	58 427941.4	3 437487.23	447363.4	V 637377-18 A 292849 93
1 Invest	LOSIS Mett Ceste		, 408030.34 L	416891.1 	6 434732.3 A	5 997818.) A	10 JUV070.91	6 373448.6 N	7 887710 A	. 60 342637.4			• •
S Non-Fu	el Cesta	i			•	i			÷	i	1 4		• •
C Replac	ement Cests	(•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •		• •
. Net An	R. Cash Flow	, (-400850.	5 -414881.	2 -424922.	5 -407018	.2 -389871.(373448.1	7 -35772	0.4 -342457.	3 -325184.6	-308689.	272607.7
V Elect) i		•		•				•			
W Disti	liste (Ne.2)			•	•		•		•	•	1 1		• •
B Restd	1841 (No.4)		. 377129.3	. 411375.3	. 448748.4	489929.	17 471391.5	. 433242.8	9 495298	. 41 . 597342.1	4 \$15978.84	523334.	4 \$31420.35
1 Natur	al Cas			•	•	•	•		•				: :
- R-GA1 C LPC -	ratate.etc			•			•		i	i			i i
Bitun	sineus Coal		•	•	•	•	i i	•	•	•	• •		• •
64501	1.50		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	: :		: :
51041 gm###	LTIGITY (EV)			¥ 8 411271 1			17 471391.8	. 483142.8		.41 307342.2	······································	\$23334.4	4 111429.35
B Energi	y Gosta		. 337377.4		1 141140	7 117723.	14 \$14100.0		1 100205	. 44 . 276867 . 3	5 261992 47	248633 3	4 235957.00
I Invest	BOBL COSLO	\$\$1728.9	7	•			•	•	•		• •		
C Replac	enent Costs		•	•	Í	•	i i	• (•	•	• •		• •
				4		1	1	1 .384877	1	5 4	3 .241992 1	.148433	4-+235952-1

حماد المحمول معموري

ı.

مستحد بسابعهما بدلما وال

															(
	FFMB / BMT														
	END-USE/S	CONVERSIO	AT SOURCE	METER	ANNUAL END (1984 BT	V'SI ENERG'	Y CONSUMPT: Existing - 7	zon Retrofii	PHYSI Resid	CAL UNIT COMM	DST(19815) Indust	NET MOTU (Source)	1982 Existing	Dellars RETROFIT	
1	3412	100	3412	STU/EVE	Lisetries	t y	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	(•
ļ	247470	38	277388	BTU/Gal BTU/Gal	Distillat Residual	e (No.2) (No.4)	42848	59999				24124		114944 44	
'	1814	54	1881 4815	BTV/+1	Natural G		•	•	•		•	•	•		
	1814	54	1001 4015	STV/et	N-Gas MFB	11		•	•	•	•	•		•	k.
1	22500	78	32142.857	kBTV/Ten	Bituminou	Rejetc. S Caal									
-	125071	24	521129 17	STU/GA1	Gasoline		0	•	0	•	•	•	•		
	3412	199	3412	BTV/EVB	Electrici	ty (14)	•	•	•	0	•		•		
+-							•••••								
	•	•	1995	1776	1997	1778	1999	2606	2401	2402	2003	2004	2985	2004	VARIANCE
ł	•	•									0				
	0		•			•		•	•	•	•	•	0		0
	0				- 4				0		0	9	0		
ł	0	0	0	0	0	9		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•
6	9	р 0	9	9			0		0	0	0	0	0		
Þ		9					0								
Ľ	0	0	0	•	•	0	0	•	0	•	•	•	0		•
ſ		9	•		•	•	•	•	•	• •	•	0	C C		AVEJVNLE 9
Ł	•	0	0	Ċ		•			•	•	8	•	0	. 4	
ĥ	0 0	0	0		6		0		•	•	•	•			237793694
þ	ů,	;	•	0						, 0 1 2				· • •	, .
°.		•	0				•	ŧ	532250	•	•	•			18180737
6							0		9	9		1			
•	0	0											. 0		
ľ.	0	•	6			0	•		0	•		•	•	0	
Ľ.		i				, .			0						
										-	-		-	•	-
	44401194	43476445	.38781724	. 36244602	.33873460) .31457439 	. 27584392	. 27650833	.25841900	24151309	. 22571317	. 21074488	19714662		
								•••••	•••••			•••••		••••••	-
0 b 7	able Mean	Value													PARTIAL
5	1.2342090	1.2330416	1,2314787	1776	1997	1998 1.2244172	1,2220724	2000	2001	2002 1.2150449	2003	2004 1.2104154	2003 . 1 2080974	2004	VARIANCE
15	1.5002538	1.5735757	1.6727873	1,7985805	1.9110334	2.0307123	2.1580736	2.2936860	2.4380323	2.5717124	2.7553458	2.9295934	3.1151615	3.3128045	1.3883238
5	1 3344018	1.3764657	1.4622338	1.5317871	1.4057884	1 1.6842429	1.7673187	1.8553578	1.9484793	2.0474000	2 1524541	2.2434939	2.3814194	2.3043041	•
2	1.1578745	1.1559234	1.1539547	1.1519706	1.1500311	1 1.1480749	1.1441254	1.1441793	1.1422377	1.1403004	1.1383679	1.1344394	1 1345158	1.1325944	I I I
3	1.3438333	1.4321312	1.5048140	1.5821631	1.6644780	1.7528774	Ł.8453008	1.9445891	2.0500844	2.1624422	2.2820110	2.4892541	2.5446703	2.6887781	•
10	1 4404445	1.4478477	1.4371441	1.7670070	: 1.7628340 : 1.5427728) 1.8187142) 1.5953515	1.4287715	3.7347402 1.4430538	1.4982204) 2.9644126 1.7342947	2.1318132	2.2017883 1.8092591	2.274434U 1.8481979	: 2.3478483 : 1.8881414	
4	1.2848228	1.2918395	1.2976914	1.3035777	1.3874784	1.3154549	1,3214441	1.3274726	1.3335347	1.3374325	1.3457644	1.3519344	1.3581428	1.3643851	
ζ,	1.2584243	1.2570753	1.2555479	1.2540424	1.3533187	/ 1.2597947	1.2474749	1.2479588	1.2444425	1.2449281	1.2434155	1.2417047	1.2403958	1.2388887	1.4596E-4
5.	3.6764666	1.7023486	1 7286773	1.7553993	1.7825417	1.8101096	1.8381115	1.8643536	1.8754432	1.9247872	1.9545931	1.9848481	2.8154194	2.0468551	.37977445
P O	1.5708171	1.4144557	1.4593080	1.7054074	1.752788	7 1.8014875	1.8515406	1,9829857	1.7558614	2.0102077	2.0660455	2.1234767	2.1624847	2.2431346	.03077494
	1.9477584	1.9444297	1.2700037	1 3243557	/ 1 3596232 2 8235231	L 1.3758307 L 2 8429213	1.4330037 2 0425847	1.4711679 2.0822759	1.3183494	1.5505735 2 1223889	1.3718741		: 1.6778041 : 2 1840123	. 1.7224756 : 2.2849486	1 .88777787 1 .81349481
62	1.5307587	1.4097973	1.6927752	1.7801144	1.8720481	1.9488229	2.8786782	2.1779482	2.2708614	1.4497432	2.5349143	2.4447139	2.8834797	2.9534498	.74483943
92	1993	1994										*****			- PARTIAL
•	•	•	.,,,) () ()) 1	•		4	•					
	454544 18	444798 11	•		•	•		•	•	•					•
•	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••		••••1.37		, ,AA797.00 	, risiut.30 [- + + 1 + 7 . 71 0	ra4388.17	14.75757 9	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	/#788.73 0	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, rrava7.60 L	, vvass7.30	
) () i	•	· i	, -) •) i	•	•	• •
															1 1 1
. 47	457577.18	469798.21	, . 480141.27	478454.74	781333.88	712164.50	. 723177.71	734388 17	745754 44	. 757299.94	747826.93	788738.3	793837.4		4
. 98	292849.93	377939.11	243770.51	250325.13	237566.02	225458 1	213948.1	202044 43	192717.11	7 182897.83	173579.50	164736.3	5 136344.6	148388.9	Energy
															o invest O Nontuol
) i) i				i					Replace
6.0	-272867.9	-277939.1	-143778.5	-258325.1	-237544.1	-225458 1	-213968.1	L -383864.4	-198717.1	2 -182877 4	-173579.3	-164736	5 -136344.	7 -148388.5	
) (•) () (•		•		. (•	
	•) 1) () () () () () (• •) () (•	•	• •
. 44	\$31428.55	539431.1	2 547978.73) 554441.30) 543899.94 	1 573783.04 1 5) 382448.1(B) 571675.73 N	488833.3(8 410135.31 4	61 7583 .41	627188.2	8 438728.1 8	9 448829 41 •	3 3 8237518
								, i) (- I (•	•	
			2 ~ '							•			•	•	•
			ーケー							•					
					i (,				•) (•	PRESENT VI
. 84	\$31428.55	539631.1	1 147978.71	534441.3		6 373783.8·	• 382469.20	0 391673.92 6 143455 -		8 610135 3: 	1 41 7583 41	. 4 37180 .3	\$ 438728 1 	9 648829 6	5
	******7.01 •	, ************************************	- 117517.50) (1 #W3477.93 8 (, 312444 XI 9	, (*1*43.3) 8	, 1,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, 195248 83)	a 197333.01 € (, , <i>,,,,,,,</i> ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, 196763.0)		- 117346.3 0	· LAVEST
)()() () (•)	• (• •	6 Nonfuel

	PHYSIC Resid	AL UNIT CO Comm	ST(19815) Indus1	NET HETU (Seurce)	1982 Existing	RETROFIT				
			•		•	•				
	•	•	747	24128	373444 84	334788.44				
		•	•							
		:		i	i					
	•	8	•							
	2001	2002	2003	2884	2005	2004	VARIANCE			
	•	•			0					
	;									
	0	0			0	0	e 1			
	a a	0		0	0					
	•	0	0	0	0	0	0			
		0		•	0					
	0	•	٠	•	D	0	1			
	•		9	•	0		, d VARIANCE			
	•	6	•	•	0		•			
		0	•	•	0		437773494			
)	•		•	•	. 0		••••••			
	332250		6 	•	0		: 18180759.)			
		i	i	i		i i				
ł	•	0 B	6	6	0 0			I		
)		•	•	•	•	i i) (t		
ł	9	•	•	٠	6					
•	25841900	24151307	. 22371317	. 21894488	. 19714642	. 1842471				
	•.818 	7.984	7.354	7.411	7.87		•			
							PARTIAL			
	2991 1.2173763	2092 1.2150449	2003 1,2127380	7404 1.2194156	zud5 1.2080976	ZUQ 1.205784) VARIANCE 5.9422E-(L		
	2.4380323	2.5917126	2.7553458	2.9295934	3.1151415	3.312804	1.3883230			
	1 7486773	4.9474000 1.9455893	1 1324541	1.2636034 2.9592781	2.3814174	; z.306304) ; 2.157433)	 6.6894E=4	, I		
ŀ	1 1422377	1 1403004	1.1383679	1.1344394	1.1345150	1.132594	1 (Ì		
1	7.8500044 1.9994928	2.1424422	2.2820110	2,4072541 2,2017885	. 2.3446703 5 2.2744341	; Z.600778; ; <u>Z</u> .349848;		 		
ŀ	1.4782284	1 7342947	1.7712995	1.8072571	1.8481979	1.888141	1			
6 1	3.3335347	1.3376325 1.2449281	1.3457664	;],]517344 ;], 2419047	: 1.3581424 1.2403954	5],364385 1.238888	7].4374E-4			
•	2. 0475317	2.1597233	1.2771175	2.4861761	2.541393	2.485270) (
,	1 8754432 1 9558414	1,9247872 2 8182872	1.9545931	. 1.9848601 . 2.1234747	2 0136190 7 2 182484	1 2,844855 [,] 7 2,243134	F .37977443 6 .0309949/	i.		
,	1.5183474	1.5505755	1.5918741	1.4342734	1 1.4778041	1.722495		1		
	2.1022347	2.122388:	2.1427343	2.1432740 2.4447134	; ;,1840;;;; ; ;,885499;	2 2,204948 7 2,951449	9 .8134948: 9 .7448394:	1		
							- PARTIAL			
	2001	2002	2083	2004) 2001) (5 200. D	VARIANCI			
i	i					•				
7	745754.44	757299.94	747024.93	760730.31 	5 77303 7.40	1 883327.3 D	6 8,974951(L			
ĺ	1				• *	•	•	7		
ò					•	•	•			
•					•	•	6 PRESENT	VALUE	VARIANCE	
,	745754 64	. 757297.94	747824.92	788738.5	2 793837.6	4 105327.3	6	-		
5	192717.17	/ 182897.81	173577.5(164736.5	5 136344.6 8	17 148288.9 8	V Energy Ø Invent	4730694.3 4	1.7188E13 •	
•					•	•	8 Nonfuel	í	•	
•	-192717 4) () -171574 ⁽	-164796	9 3 -136344	4 7 -148368.	v Replace 9	•	•	
	· • • • • • • • •			_		-	PARTIAL V	ARIANCE		
					•	T 9	•	•		
2	400823.50	410135.3	417583.4	629180.2	- 5 638728.1	÷ 448829.4	5 5.8257E1	•		
0 P					•	F 4	т 1 —	•	_	
•		•		•	•	•	•	•	へ	
8				•	•	•	•			
•		•			•	•	. PRESENT	VALUS	VARIANCE	
)) -	489833 5	8 418135.3	1 61 7583 .4	1 439108.3 1 139994 4	\$ 638728.1 1 174444	7 698829.4	1	5428194	2 911AP19	
	178384 Bi	# 397333.8 #	- 127040.1; 8	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	e invest	511716 #	7 3 3274E1#	
		•	•	•	•	•	8 Nontuel			
			_	_	-	-				

IFAM MICROCOMPUTER LCC INPUT/OUTPUT LEDGER SHEET

APPENDIX B

Discount	Factor	73437744	. 87343873	81427788	74289521	71298418	44434222	42274974	58200910	54393374	58834929	47509280
GNP Defi	ator	2.123	2.3353	2.5477	1 74	2.982	3 244	3 424	3 448	3 87	4 138	4 404
			••••••									• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
DOL	REGION NO	•	1	ANNUAL	ENERGY DI	FFERENTIAL	ESCALATIO	N RATES***			Estimate in	s Most Prob
		1782	1983	1784	1985	1784	1987	1988	1989	1998	1991	1 7 7 2
Resid.	Electricity	1.0528	1.1083881	1.1449115	1.2285252	1.2314737	1.2344292	1.2373918	1.2403414	1.2433385	1.2489574	1 2385887
	Distillate	1.025235	1.0511091	1.0774384	1.1040401	1.1328757	1.1616697	1.1711804	1.2214471	1.2524891	1 3300337	1 4125145
	LPG	1.01744	1.0357245	1.0542448	1.0732723	1.0714442	1.1109431	1.1298791	1 1485425	1.1485837	1.2206139	1.2758387
	Natural Gas	1.087195	1.1817771	1.2858748	1.3971588	1 4145795	1 4322248	1 4588938	1 4481832	1 4844995	1 5215114	1 5573473
Comp.	Electricity	1.83494	1 8758715	1 1148375	1 1599445	1 1487485	1 1415157	1 1472905	1 1438444	1 1438433	1 1418545	1 1508747
	Bi at 1 1 1 + 1 +	1 41 75 7			1							
						1.073/033	1.1191197	1.13/0424	1.1373300	1 1026807	1.4373478	1.7448331
	Residual	1.06273	1.1313174	1.2063798	1.2877446	1.3138210	1.3403857	1.3688374	1.3742541	1 4251752	3.4601776	1 5128920
	Natural Gas	1.86173	1.1273826	1.2427429	1.2426792	1.2770243	1.3113827	1 3263528	2.3413348	1.3545403	2.3837998	1 4117610
	Steam Coal	1.94277	1.0881532	1.1363894	1.1874879	1.2031150	1.2171002	1.2353482	1.2519243	1 2487733	1.2744891	1.2802304
Indust.	Electricity	1.05252	1.1077985	1.1457885	1.2272184	1.3343364	1.2414756	1 2484744	1.2559389	1 2432234	1 2414884	1 2401554
	Distillate	1.01757	1.6355810	1 8546441	1.0729704	1.0735316	1.1146396	1.1363090	1.1585548	1 1813923	1 2379777	1.2981959
	Residual	1 898725	1.1877240	1.2977628	1.4154424	1 4597335	1.4879738	1.5241454	1.5621724	1 4011380	1.4238576	1.4507451
	Natural Gas	1.08724	1.1821471	1.2853287	1.3975318	1.4072401	1.4178544	1.4249210	1 4348545	1 4448574	1 4878494	1 5283590
	N-GAS MFEI	3.008175	1.1841941	1.2884788	1.4024376	1.3434120	1.2848757	1.2327226	1.1888529	1.1311494	1 1452874	1 1922041
	Steam Coal	1.13725	1.2733482	1.4788571	1.4727425	1 7144854	1 7575147	1	1 8445488	1 8978877	1	1
Transe.	Gaseline	1.832445	1.10884492	1 1444194	1 2778512	1 7437744		1 3847374				1 4548547
											1	1.4364341
PETISTI	ING SYSTEMAN	1087	1883	1884								
U Flast	tielty (bub)				1763	1766	1787	1788	1787	1770	1771	1772
	illets (Ma 9)						•	•	•	•	•	•
N DISTI				•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	0
D Resid	IEAL (No.6)	•	468872.78	510577.35	5\$4784.78	578864.88	\$85891.17	599676.96	414430.58	427741.43	437487.25	449545.49
J Natus	ral Gas	P	•			•	•				•	
S N-Gas	neri	•	•	• •	•		• •) (•	• •	י (
C LPG.1	Propane,eto.	•) •) () () ()	•	• () 0
a tua	sineus Ceal) () ()	•	• •) 0
Gasel	line	•) 🖉) ()		• (• •
Elect	tricity (EV)	•				i e)		6 1	• •
ENERG	SY TOTAL		448872.78		554984 24	178844 4					3 439487 25	
D Energy	r Casts		488454 54	414881 14	474977 54			377444 41		. 147457 J		
1 Invest	thent Conte									•	* *******	
S Non-fr	terat Costa									•		
Mak he	The free Plan									•		
. MEL AN	RE. LONG FIOW		-400038.3	-419941.2	-924922.3	-407018.2	-389871.0	-373448 7	-357720.	6 -342657.	1 -122104.4	-308604.0
-RETROI	ELT STATEMAN	_										
V Elec	tricity (EVB)			•	•					•	e (90
N Disti	illate (No.2)	•) •	•) () () ()	0	• •	e 0
D Resi	dual (No.4)	•	377129.30	411375.54	448748.61	L 459789.11	471391.53	483142.8	. 475178 4	1 507542.2	4 515378.00	6 523336 84
I Natu	ral Gas	•) 1) () () ()	•	e (
S N-Ga	# MEB1) () () (• •						• •
C LPG.I	Propage.etc.) 8								
Rita	Biness Cast									- -		
Greek												
Floo												
ENTR	··········											
ENER.	UT LUIAL		377167.30	, 411373.30		437727.1/	471391.33		473170.6	1 30/342.4	9 313370 00	323336 84
U Lnerg	Y CONTS		327377.40	133663.00	141148.11	327923 14		309877.3.	288203.4	4 274849.3	5 241772 02	248633 56
I INVEST	THENT CODIS	341720.77			6					•		
a Ren-r	Wel LUSTS									•	•	
L Repiso	cement Costs			9	Q	•		, (t			
ROT A	BR. CASE IIOW	-321729 0	-327377.4	~333885.8	-342348.2	2 -327923.1	-314198 1	-300877.1	-288203.	4 -276067.	3 -261992.3	1 -248433 4
		EXISTING	MP VALUE	. VARIANCE	ETROFIT	r mp value	VARIANCE					**MILCON A
TLCC			4738494.5	5.9898E13	1	4088451.1	3.8715E13)				1783
NLCC			-	•	:	450245.40		l I			D+CVE-Sal	414873
SIR			-	-	1	2.145174	30572987.					
E/C (HB1	TU's/CVE)/\$188	•	-	-	:	45.317050	1.3034E11	l I				
E/C (HET	TU'S/PV INVEST		-	-	:	44.230744) 1.8788E11					
		1	,		, ,		4		,		• •	
Eniet Ac	ns. Cash Flew		-448893	-518599 3	-554984						4 -439487 5	
Retro A	na Cash Flam		_177174 4									
	ng. usuk 1199	-338638.8	-377147.9			-437747.2		-483142.	7 4973170.	347342.	4 -313370.	1 -323334
Texal A	NH. CASA TION	->>#239.9	79763.684	77223.785	148238.17	7 110934.91	113499 44	114534.8	7 119439 9	7 122419.1	7 124309 1	7 124228.85
.		-358250	-417356.4	-344762.1	-20123.44	212817.40	483888.57	7 782408.4	L 1109025.	4 1442917	6 1849412	8 2241344 1
Simple I	rayback is>	•	•	•	•	4.1239950) 1)	0	• •	• •
Esist Di	ise Cask Flow	9	-408858.5	-416881 3	-424922.5	5 -407018.3	387871.8	-373448	7 -357728	4 -342457	3 -325184	6 -308604 (
Retre Di	ise Cash Flow	-521729.0	-329399.4	-335805.0	-342348.2	-327923.1	-314108.1	-308877.	-288285	4 -276869	3 -261992	1 -248433 4
Tetal D	ise Cash flow	-521729.0	77451.134		02574.37	. 77875.84	75762.841	72571.55	. 49515 15	3 44587.92	7 43192.48	
		-521729.4	-442277	-361281 7	-178787 1	-199412 1	-123849 4	-51277 4	14217 14		7 148817 7	
Dine P	avhank to	A								1	A	N N
		•		•				-		-	-	- '

Watch recorder the construction of the second of the secon

	•										_				
	•		•	•	•	•	•	9	9						
	18781774														
					31657439	27564372	1/420113	12041400	24151309	22571317	21074688	19714662	18424918		
	3 41		3 478	3 744	6 014	4.282	4.55	4 818	7 886	7 354	7 622	7 87	8.151		
														PARTIAL	
	1775	5	1976	1997	1998	1999	2866	2601	2882	2083	2004	2885	2004	VARIANCE	
	1.2314787	71	2291284	1.2247445	1 2244172	1 2228724	1.2197321	1.2173743	1.2158449	1.2127380	1.2104154	3.2089974	1.2057041	5 94228-4	
	1.4727873	1	.7785883	3 7110334	2 0307123	2.1588934	2.2934848	2.4388323	2 3917124	2 7553458	2 9295934	3 1151415	3 3128845	1 3883238	
	1.4422538	8 1	5319891	1.4837884	1 4842429	1 7473187	1.4553578	1 9484793	2 9474800	2 1524541	2 2434834	2 3814194	1 384384	•	
	1 4708020	8 1	7893367	1 7495942	1 7984043	1 #329#93	1.8741441	1.9283541	1 9455893	2 8118883	2 8587781			4 48848-4	
	1.1539547	7 1	1519984	1 1548311		1 1441254	1 1441793	1 1477377	1 1483664						
	1 5848144		4871411		1 1400/60					1.13030/7		1 1343138	1 1323764		
	1 4571441		2484488		1./324//4					4.4848118	2.4072361	2.3446703	2.4087781	•	
				1.7060340	1.0107142	1 8/8/371	3.7367698	1.7774749	4.0044126	2.1318132	2.2017085	2 2744348	2.3478683		
	1.3444343			1.2427728	1.3953515	1 6287713	1 . 6638338	1.4782286	1.7342947	1.7712995	L.8973571	1.8481979	1.8881414	•	
	1.2774714	• 2	3835777	2.3874788	1 3154549	1.3214441	1.3274726	1.3335347	1.3394325	1.3457664	1.3519344	1 3581428		•	
	1 2353479	9 1	. 2348424	1.2535187	1.2589747	1.2494769	1.2479588	1.2464425	1.2447281	1.2434155	1.2417847	1.2403950	1 2386667	1 45962-4	
	1 2938223	2 1	. 5802913	3 4424848	1 7499576	1 8438447	1.7421884	2.0475317	2.1597233	2.2791175	. 2.4061769	2.5413934	2.4852969	•	
	3 7284773	3 3	7553793	1 7825412	1.8181094	1 8381115	1 \$645536	1 8754432	1.9247872	1.7545731	1.9848481	2 0154178	2.8468559	57977443	
	1.4573888	1	7854874	1.7527887	1 8014875	1.8515406	1 9029857	1.7558614	3 0102077	2 8448453	2.1224747	2.1824847	1.2431344		
	1 2708037	. 1	3243557	1 3594232	1.3958309	1 4330037	1.4711479	1.5183494	1.5503755	1.5918741	1 4342736	1 4778841	1 7724914		
	1.9852797	7 2	4043185	2 8235238	2 8438713	7 8475847	2 8872758	2 1877147	2 1773889	1 1477141					
	1 4927757		7881144	1 4738483			3 1338483	3 3888414							
		•••			1.7000447						4.0007137	4.0034777	2.7314478	.74883743	
				*										PARTIAL	
	1775	3	1776	1997	1998	1777	2000	2441	2002	2 # # 3	2884	2805	2084	VARIANCE	
	•	•	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•) (•	•		
	0	0	•	•	•	• •	•	•			•	0	•		
	488141 27	7 6	78654.74	741333.66	712188.54	723197.71	734388.17	745754.44	737299.94	747824.93	788738.52	793837.44	885327.34	8.9749220	
4	•	•			•		•	e		0	•			¢.	
			•	•		• •	•	•		• •	r i	1	r i	r V	
1	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•		1 4		
	•		•	•	•) 🕴	•	•	•	•) (• •) (• •	
	6	5	•		•		•	6							
) 🕴			•) i) 1		PRESENT VALUE	VARIANCE
11	488141 27			781333 88		723197 71	734348 17	745754 44	757299 94	749874 93		791817 44			
12	343778 51		SA335 13	237544 82		31 1048 11	787844 45	182212 19	1					·	
			30343.13		443436 11			174717.17				130144.01		Laergy 1/3	
				•	9				9					Invest	•
		•	•	9	G) –	• •		• •	•) () () Nemfuel	6 6
0	•		•	•	0	1 🔮	• •	•		• •) (•) (Replace	a 🔹
. 1	-263770.5	5 -	250325.1	-237544.0	-225458)	-213968.1	-393944.4	-192717.2	-182897.8) =173579.5	i -164736.9	5 -156344.7	7 -146388.9	1	
														PARTIAL VARIAN	C E
٠	4		•) 0	. 0	· · · •		•) () (
) 0) (• •) () () (•	
12	\$47978.73	3 5	54441.30	545844.76	573783.04	382440.10	591475.93	400833.58	410135.31	417583.41	429180.25	638728.11		5 8257810	
) () (B	
															っ
	\sim														2
	T	•													
		•		•									p (•	-
		•	•	•	• •) (• •	• •	, ,	• •	, 1) () (PRESENT VALUE	VARIANCE
17	547978 73	3 5	56441 38	365844 76	573713.44	t 582640.10	1 391475.93	400833.54	0 410135.31	437583.43	1 427180.25	5 438928.1	P 648827 65	i	
75	212512.50	0 2	81479.93	191408 28	181645.27	1 172388.14	143403.33	155244.82	1 147335.44	139848.13	1 132723.41	125942 53	117546.33	Energy 542	9178 6 7 9116E12
•		•	•	•) (• •	• •	> () () (lavest 521	714 97 3 2294E10
•		•			· 4	• •) I) () () () () () (Nontuel	• •
	(•	•		0 í) (137543.5	L () () (Resiace 137	543 51 Z.46708E7
. 8	-212512.5	5 -	201479.9	-191408.3	-181645.3	172388.1	-143603.3	-292810.3	-147355.7	-139848.1	-132723.4	-123942.5			
**	al Amount													ERIST Invest a	ndree 🛛 🕯
83	1984	4	1987	1988										PETRO Inseat a	
3.8	784174 94		47542 59											DIFF leset -	4 558358
••	/													Diri invest en	0186 336430
13	10	4	15	14	11	7 10	1 11	24	3 21	: 23	1 33) 20	4 25	1	
. 1	-480141.3	3 -	478454.9	-701333.8	-712188.1	5 -723197.1	/ -734368.2	L -745754.0	-757299.1	749024.1	780738.5	-793037.3	7 -805327.4	1	
. 2	-347978 7	7 -	556441.3	-565845.8	-573783 1	582448 1	-591475 1	-1133084	-410135.5	-417582.4	-639180 2	-438728 2		51	MPLE
	132178 4		34211 44	134288 84	138394 4	4 148519 41	1 142712 74		. 147144 4		1 151758	1 154104 4	134497 9		BACK
5	3578478		847453 1	4577384 8				4787834 9							
															A 13
_		•				•			-						4.14
-				-117366 0			383884 4	172717 2		-173379.3	s -164736.3	1 -136399.3	/ -148388 '	7	
1	-143778	5 -													
1	-363778 -312512	5 - 5 -	201679 9	-171400 2	-181445.	3 -172388	1 -143683.3	-392810.	3 -147355	7 -139848 1	1 -131723 (-125962.	5 -117546.	DISC	OUNTED
1	-243778 5 -212512 5 51258 815	5 - 5 - 5 4	-201677 7	-171400 2 44143.747	-181445. 43812 831	3 -172388. 9 41580 88	1 -163683.3 9 39461.123) -372810. -100073.	3 -147355 2 38542 18	7 -139848 1 5 33731 370	1 -131723 (32012.93	6 -125942. 5 30382.16	5 -117546. 3 20834.57	DISC PAY	OUNTED BACK
1 8 73	-343778 5 -312512 5 51258 815 378178 8	5 - 5 - 5 4 13 4	-201679 9 18645 200 180815 62	-171400 2 44143.747 444981.34	-181645. 43812 831 588794.3	3 -172388 7 41586 88 8 558374.2	1 -143483.3 9 39441.123 1 389835.33) -272810. -100073. 487742 1	3 -147355 2 35542 185 7 525284 3	7 -137848 1 5 33731 370 6 559015.71	1 -131723 (32012.935 3 591828.6(6 -125962.1 5 36382.16 6 621410.0	5 -117546. 3 20834.57 3 650245.4	DISC DISC PAY	OUNTED Back

and the second second

ł

DATE ILME