Appendix A - Evaluation of the CDM Plan

Highlighted boxes are to be completed manually, white boxes are linked to Appendix C and will be brought forward automatically.

	₅ Cumulative Totals Life Cycle	Total for 2006	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Agricultural	LDC System	₄ Smart Meters	Other #1	Other #2
Net TRC value (\$).	1945243.949	\$ 1,904,713	\$ 1,904,713	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-		\$-	\$-
Benefit to cost ratio.	2.47	2.77	2.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Number of participants or units delivered.	53689	27111	27111	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Lifecycle (kWh) Savings.	21,280,539.52	18,356,815	18,356,815	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh).	2,008,391	367,020	367,020	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total peak demand saved (kW).	2,012	2,012	2,012	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total kWh saved as a percentage of tota. kWh delivered (%).		0.04%	0.04%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%).		1.34%	1.34%	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$0	\$0
 Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures (\$) 	3650.647	\$ 650,647	\$ 650,647	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-
² Expenditures per KWh saved (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.32	\$ 1.77	\$ 1.77	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-		\$-	\$-
з Expenditures per KW saved (\$/kW)	\$ 323.31	\$ 323.31	\$ 323.31	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-	\$-		\$-	\$-
Utility discount rate (%):	0.0752										

1 Expenditures are reported on accrual basis.

2 Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate energy savings.

3 Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate capacity savings.

4 Please report spending related to 3rd tranche of MARR funding only. TRC calculations are not required for Smart Meters. Only actual expenditures for the year need to be reported.

5 Includes total for the reporting year, plus prior year, if any (for example, 2006 CDM Annual report for third tranche will include 2005 and 2004 numbers, if any.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Energy Star Appliance Rebate

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

This program provides a rebate incentive to customers purchasing new 'Energy Star' rated appliances. It is a continuation of the original rebate program which we applied for to assist customers forced to replace appliances after the July 2004 Flood. The program involves the customer completing a form and bringing in the receipt. Customer Service activity involves researching that the appliance qualifies as an Energy Star appliance and applying the rebate to the customer's utility account.

Appliance retailers participated in the program by notifying customers that it was available and by providing forms.

The true benefit of this program will be realized over the 15 year life cycle

	Measure(s):					
		Measure 1		Measure 2 (if applicable)		Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	Replace old appliance				
	Efficient technology:	Energy star appliance				
	Number of participants or units					
	delivered for reporting year:	700				
	Measure life (years):	15				
	Number of Participants or units					
	delivered life to date	1844				
B.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year		Life Cycle TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	8,990.23	¢	248,653.71
	r TRC Costs (\$):		ψ	0,990.23	φ	246,055.71
	(+)	program aget (avaluding incentives);	¢	4 245 00	¢	11 700 OF
	-		\$	4,315.00	Φ	11,788.05
	Increment		\$	63,756.00		195,316.00
		Total TRC costs:		68,071.00	_	207,104.05
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-\$	59,080.77	\$	41,549.66
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits	/TRC Costs):	\$	0.13		1.200622128
C.	Results: (one or more category may apply)					Cumulative Results:
	Conservation Programs:					
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer				
	Demanu savings (KW).					
		Winter				
						Cumulative
		lifecycle		in year		Annual Savings
	Energy acred (kl/h);	1,982,044.72		125,064.40		237,170.32
	Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved :	1,902,044.72		120,004.40		237,170.32
	Natural Gas (m3):					
	Other (specify):					
	Demand Management Programs:					
	Controlled load (kW)					
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peal	k (kWh):				
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	(kWh):				
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak (kWh):					
	Demand Response Programs:					
	Demand Response Programs:					
	Demand Response Programs:					
	Dispatchable load (kW):	re).				
	Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hou	,				
	Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hou Power Factor Correction Program	,				
	Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hou Power Factor Correction Program Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	<u>IS:</u>				
	Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hou Power Factor Correction Program	is: begining of year (%):				

	Peak load savings (kW):					
		lifecycle		in year		
	Energy savngs (kWh):					
	Distributed Generation and Load	Displacement Programs:				
	Amount of DG installed (kW):					
	Energy generated (kWh):					
	Peak energy generated (kWh):					
	Fuel type:					
	Other Programs (specify):					
	Metric (specify):					
D.	Actual Program Costs:			Reporting Year		Cumlative Life to Date
D.	Actual Program Costs: Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	Reporting Year 63,756.00	\$	Cumlative Life to Date 167,992.00
D.		Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	\$ \$			
D.				63,756.00	\$	167,992.00
D.		Incremental O&M:	\$	63,756.00 50.00	\$ \$	167,992.00 100.00
D.		Incremental O&M: Incentive:	\$ \$	63,756.00 50.00 34,979.00	\$ \$	167,992.00 100.00 93,304.00
D.		Incremental O&M: Incentive:	\$ \$	63,756.00 50.00 34,979.00	\$ \$ \$	167,992.00 100.00 93,304.00
D.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental O&M: Incentive: Total:	\$ \$ \$	63,756.00 50.00 34,979.00 98,785.00	\$ \$ \$	167,992.00 100.00 93,304.00 261,396.00
D.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental O&M: Incentive: Total: Incremental capital:	\$ \$ \$	63,756.00 50.00 34,979.00 98,785.00 4,224.50 40.50	\$ \$ \$	167,992.00 100.00 93,304.00 261,396.00 10,018.10

Accumulative results calculted from 2004 as we received approval from OEB to run this program prior to C&DM for appliance replacement due to major Peterborough Flood.

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.

2 For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Storage Heating

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

In co-operation with the local social housing authority, the LDC provided financial, technical and administrative assistance to convert 124 electrically heated units from baseboard electric heating to electric thermal storage heating. The non-ducted heaters are designed to heat the room or area into which they are placed. During off-peak hours, heaters convert electricity into heat and store that heat in specially designed high-density ceramic bricks capable of storing vast amounts of heat for extended periods of time. A fan inside the unit circulates this stored heat evenly and quietly as the room thermostat calls for heat.

	Measure(s):				
		Measure 1	Measu	re 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	Baseboard heating system			
	Efficient technology:	Storage heating system			
	Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	85			
	Measure life (years):	85 18			
	Measure me (years).	10			
	Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	124			
В.	TRC Results:		Re	porting Year	Life Cycle TRC Results:
1	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	16,189.29	\$ 723,979.71
2	² TRC Costs (\$):				
	Utility	program cost (excluding incentives):	\$	96.018.00	\$ 152,644.00
	Increment	al Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$	234,000.00	\$ 372,000.00
		Total TRC costs:	\$	330,018.00	\$ 524,644.00
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-\$	313,828.71	\$ 199,335.71
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits	/TRC Costs):	\$	0.05	\$ 1.38
C.	Results: (one or more category ma	y apply)			Cumulative Results:
	Conservation Programs:				
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer			
		Winter			
		Winter			
		lifecycle		in year	Cumulative Annual Savings
	Energy saved (kWh):	4123863.4	224477.2	,	307751
	Other resources saved :				
	Natural Gas (m3):				
	Other (specify).				
	Demand Management Programs:				
	Controlled load (kW)				
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	k (kW/h)·			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak				
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak				
	Demand Response Programs:				
	Dispatchable load (kW):				
	Peak hours dispatched in year (hou	rs):			
	Power Factor Correction Program	IS:			
	Amount of KVar installed (KVar):				
	Distribution system power factor at	begining of vear (%):			
	Distribution system power factor at				

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	Peak load savings (kW):				
		lifecycle	in year		
	Energy savngs (kWh):				
	Distributed Generation and Load I Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type: Other Programs (specify): Metric (specify):	Displacement Programs:			
			Dementing Verse		Demolation Life to Data
D.	Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year		Cumlative Life to Date
D.		Incremental capital:	\$ 234,000.00	\$	372,000.00
D.	Actual Program Costs:	Incremental capital: Incremental O&M: Incentive:		\$	
D.	Actual Program Costs:	Incremental O&M:	\$ 234,000.00	\$ \$	372,000.00

With the availability of Smart Meters and Time of Use rates, the conversion will have a large impact on the reduction of Social Housing and/or the tenant's electrical bill.

The annual savings in electricity costs is approximately \$383 per unit or \$47,492 for current 124 units converted. This was calculated by taking a case study of 20 units and comparing the direct cost difference between Time of Use and Price Protected rates as well as the overall shift of consumption to a reduced rate time period.

The residential load profile found that with baseboard heat, consumption was Off Peak for 34% of the total consumption. After the conversion to Thermal Storage Electric Heat, the Off Peak consumption increased to 88% with majority of the remaining portion being for Hot Water Tanks.

Assuming that carbon fuel, coal, is burnt in peaking generating stations, there will also be a reduction in green house gas production. This initiative has allowed us to extend our past experience with shifting demand from on peak to off peak by using radio control signals through the SCADA program.

This initiative was successful in shifting consumption from on peak to off peak in partnership with the local municipality however, in accordance This initiative has been completed.

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.

2 For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

2006 Annual Report - CDM Third Tranche Funding, Peterborough Distribution Inc ED-1999-023	2006 Annual Report -	CDM Third Tra	nche Fundina.	Peterborough	Distribution Inc.	ED-1999-0238
---	----------------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	--------------------------	--------------

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Public Education

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

Our goal is to promote electrical safety, conservation and demand management through participation in trade shows, home shows and advertisement through various media.

At present the LDC provides a safety program to all of the schools within its service territory. This program has been augmented to provide electricity conservation along with the safety messages

Savings are as recognized in the other initiatives within the CDM portfolio.

Measure(s):					
	Measure 1		Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3	(if applicable)
Base case technology:	promote electrical safety				
Efficient technology:	promote conservation and dema	nd			
Number of participants or units					
delivered for reporting year:	25904				
Measure life (years):	3				
Number of Participants or units					
delivered life to date	50909				
TRC Results:			Reporting Year	Life Cycle	TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):					
² TRC Costs (\$):		\$	39,864.99	\$	72,219.71
	program cost (excluding incentives):				,
	al Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)				
indi di la d	Total TRC costs:	\$	39,864.99	\$	72,219.71
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC COSts.	φ -\$		-\$	72,219.71
Net The (in year CDN \$).		- p	39,004.99	-ψ	72,213.71
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits	/TRC Costs):	\$	-		-
Results: (one or more category may apply)				Cumulat	ive Results:
Conservation Programs:					
	0				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer				
	Winter				
					Cumulative
	lifecycle		in year		Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):					
Other resources saved :					
Natural Gas (m3):					
Other (specify):					
Demand Management Programs:					
Controlled load (kW)					
()					
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peal					
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	. ,				
Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peal	k (kWh):				
Demand Response Programs:					
Dispatchable load (kW):					
Peak hours dispatched in year (hou	rs):				
Power Factor Correction Program	,				
	13.				
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):					
Distribution system power factor at					
Distribution system power factor at	end of year (%):				

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):	
-------------------------	--

		lifecycle	in year	
	Energy savngs (kWh):			
	Distributed Generation and Load I Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type: Other Programs (specify): Metric (specify):	Displacement Programs:		
D.	Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
D.	Actual Program Costs: Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
D.		Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	Reporting Year \$ 39,864.99	
D.		•		
D.		Incremental O&M:		

Budget was re-allocated in June of 2006 from \$104,278 to \$78,167.

Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.
 For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Radio Signal Control

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

We have developed a radio signal system that may be used by customers to control appliances and shift discretionary use of electricity to off peak times. The signals are currently provided at no cost to the customer and will automatically disable appliances connected to the in-home controller and enable the appliance at an 'off peak' time. Appliances such as electric water heaters, dishwashers, pool pumps, clothes washers and electric dryers may be controlled, but have a manual override button to permit the customer to use the appliance during a control period if necessary.

Measure(s):				
measure(s).	Measure 1 - Controllers		Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Appliance Consumption not controlled			
Efficient technology:	Appliance consumption controlled			
Number of participants or units				
delivered for reporting year:	124			
Measure life (years):	12			
Number of Participants or units				
delivered life to date	126			
TRC Results:			Reporting Year	Life Cycle TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	17,687.75	\$ 1,030,572.13
² TRC Costs (\$):				
	Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$	29,016.00	50,544.00
Inc	cremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$	72,832.00	113,800.00
	Total TRC costs:		101,848.00	164,344.00
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	10101 1110 00313.	-\$	84,160.25	\$ 866,228.13
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits	/TRC Costs):	\$	0.17	6.270822999
Results: (one or more category ma	y apply)			Cumulative Results:
Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer			
	Winter			
				Cumulative Annual
	lifecycle		in year	Savings
Energy saved (kWh):			-	
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				
Demand Management Programs:				
Controlled load (kW)			96.348	2012
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	. ,		367040	7666400
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak			52700	1100750
Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	k (kWh):			
Demand Response Programs:				
Dispatchable load (kW):				
Peak hours dispatched in year (hou	rs):			
Power Factor Correction Program	15:			
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):				
Distribution system power factor at l	beaining of vear (%):			
Distribution system power factor at				
Line Loss Reduction Programs:				
Peak load savings (kW):				
	lifecycle		in year	
Energy savngs (kWh):	· · · · · ·			
Distributed Generation and Load	Displacement Programs:			
Amount of DG installed (kW):				
Energy generated (kWh):				
Peak energy generated (kWh):				

	Fuel type:			
	Other Programs (specify): Metric (specify):			
D.	Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 35,072.00	\$ 36,168.00
		Incremental O&M:	\$ 37,760.00	\$ 38,940.00
		Incentive:		
		Total:	\$ 72,832.00	\$ 75,108.00
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:	29,016.00	\$ 29,640.00
		Total:	29,016.00	\$ 29,640.00

Budget was re-allocated in June of 2006 from \$282,000 to \$165,698. As with 2005 report, The benefits of this program used the TRC Assumptions and Measures List for the control of the water heater. These measures were then extrapolated to the control of appliances based on the Base Annual Energy Usage of the water heater versus the appliances. The benefits include kWh savings and on peak summer demand savings. Assuming that carbon fuel, ie coal, is burnt in peaking generating stations, there will be a reduction in greenhouse gas production as a result of this initiative.

This initiative has been successful because of the availability of Smart Meter technology and Time of Use rates.

Current cost of energy is 3.4 cents per Kilowatt-hour 'Off Peak', 9.7 cents per kilowatt-hour 'On Peak' and 7.1 cents per kilowatt-hour 'Mid Peak'

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.

Total budget was re-allocated in June of 2006 from \$260,000 to \$165,698 for this program. As with 2005 report, The benefits of this program used the TRC Assumptions and Measures List for the control of the water heater. These measures were then extrapol

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Load Monitor

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

The LDC provides the loan of load monitors to customers who use them to measure how much energy is being used by various appliances and devices within their home or business. Customers are asked to complete a form providing information on which appliance(s) they monitored and what action they expect to take to reduce consumption or demand.

This is an educational tool intended to help customers be more prudent with their hydro consumption.

	Measure(s):		_			
		Measure 1	- 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)		Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	n/a Load Monitor				
	Efficient technology: Number of participants or units					
	delivered for reporting year:	298				
	Measure life (years):	290				
	Weasure me (years).	13				
	Number of Participants or units					
	delivered life to date	522				
B.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year		Life Cycle TRC Results:
	¹ TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	1,256.47		39,173.83
	² TRC Costs (\$):		Ψ	1,200.47	Ψ	00,110.00
		program cost (excluding incentives):	\$	2,346.75	\$	10,246.40
	-	al Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		7,524.50	Ψ	32,318.43
	noromona	Total TRC costs:		9,871.25	¢	42,564.83
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC Costs.	ب -\$	8,614.78	<u> </u>	3,391.00
	Net The (in year obly \$).		- ə	0,014.70	Ψ	3,331.00
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits,	/TRC Costs):	\$	0.13	\$	0.92
C.	Results: (one or more category mag	/ apply)				Cumulative Results:
	Conservation Programs:					
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer				
	Demana Savings (KW).	Winter				
		Winer				
						Cumulative
		lifecycle		in year		Annual Savings
		mooyolo				Allitual Savinus
	Energy saved (kWh)	267 457 00		•		•
	Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved :	267,457.00		17,478.88		22,752.68
	Other resources saved :			•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3):			•		•
	Other resources saved :			•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3):			•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify):			•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs:			•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW)	s (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	s (kWh): (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	s (kWh): (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Demand Response Programs:	s (kWh): (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Demand Response Programs: Dispatchable load (kW):	< (kWh): (kWh): < (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Demand Response Programs: Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hour	c (kWh): (kWh): c (kWh): c (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Demand Response Programs: Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hour Power Factor Correction Program	c (kWh): (kWh): c (kWh): c (kWh):		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Demand Response Programs: Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hour Power Factor Correction Program Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	< (kWh): (kWh): < (kWh): < (kWh): rs): <u>s:</u>		•		•
	Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak Demand Response Programs: Dispatchable load (kW): Peak hours dispatched in year (hour Power Factor Correction Program	 (kWh): (kWh): (kWh): (kWh): rs): s: begining of year (%): 		•		•

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	Peak load savings (kW):			
		lifecycle	in year	
	Energy savngs (kWh):			
	Distributed Generation and Load	I Displacement Programs:		
	Amount of DG installed (kW):			
	Energy generated (kWh):			
	Peak energy generated (kWh):			
	Fuel type:			
	Other Programs (specify):			
	Metric (specify):			
D.	Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 7,524.50	\$ 22,293.17
		Incremental O&M:	\$ -	\$ -
		Incentive:		
		Total:	\$ 7,524.50	\$ 22,293.17
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:	2,346.75	\$ 7,593.20
		Total:	2,346.75	\$ 7,593.20

Budget was re-allocated in June of 2006 from \$17,000 to \$13,986.

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.

2 For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Lighting for Social Housing

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

The project consist of replacing incandescent light bulbs in 1688 Social Housing units with approximately 25,320 compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFL). The lighting program brings many benefits to the City of Peterborough, the tenants of Social Housing, and Peterborough Distribution Inc. These include Energy reduction (kWh), environmental savings (GHG), cost savings for tenants, local employment, reduced bulb replacement (5 year life expectancy 8000 hours), and recycling of incandescent bulbs.

	Measure(s):	Bulbs				
		Measure 1		Measure 2 (if applicable)		Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	Incandescent light bulbs				
	Efficient technology:	Compact florescent light bulbs				
	Number of participants or units					
	delivered for reporting year:	0				
	Measure life (years):	4				
	Number of Participants or units					
	delivered life to date	0				
В.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year		Life Cycle TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	-	\$	939,205.38
:	² TRC Costs (\$):					
	Utility	program cost (excluding incentives):	\$	-		-
	Incrementa	al Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$	65,995.19		65,995.19
		Total TRC costs:	\$	65,995.19	\$	65,995.19
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-\$	65,995.19	\$	873,210.19
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	(TRC Costs).	\$	-	\$	14.23
C.			Ψ		Ŷ	
U.	Results: (one or more category may	(apply)				Cumulative Results:
	Conservation Programs:					
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer				
		Winter				
						Cumulative
		lifecycle		in year		Annual Savings
	Energy saved (kWh):	11983449.6				
	Other resources saved :					
	Natural Gas (m3):					
	Other (specify):					
	Demand Management Programs:					
	Controlled load (kW)					
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	(kM/b):				
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	. ,				
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	, ,				
	Energy shinted mid-peak to On-peak	(<i>KVVII)</i> .				
	Demand Response Programs:					
	Dispatchable load (kW):					
	Peak hours dispatched in year (hour	rs):				
	Power Factor Correction Program	<u>s:</u>				
	Amount of KVar installed (KVar):					
	Distribution system power factor at l	begining of year (%):				
	Distribution system power factor at e	end of year (%):				
	Line Loss Reduction Programs:					
	Peak load savings (kW):					
	- · ·					

		lifecycle		in year		
	Energy savngs (kWh):					
	Distributed Generation and Load Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type: Other Programs (specify): Metric (specify):	Displacement Programs:				
D.	Actual Program Costs:		•	Reporting Year	•	Cumlative Life to Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	\$ \$	60,768.00 5,227.19		60,768.00 5,227.19
		Incremental O&M: Incentive:	Ф	5,227.19	Ф	5,227.19
		Total:	\$	65,995.19	\$	65,995.19
			Ŷ	00,000110	Ŷ	00,000110
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:				
		Incremental O&M:				
		Total:				
E.	Assumptions & Comments:					
	Assumptions:					
	§ Incandescent bulb 100W x 5,064 § Incandescent bulb 60W x 20,256					
	§ Total Incandescent build 60W x 20,256 § Total Incandescent = 1,721,760W					
			•			
	§ CFL bulbs 23W x 5,064 = 116,472		kW			
	§ CFL bulbs 15W x 20,256 = 303,84					
	§ Total CFL = 455,634W or	456 k	VV			
	§ Savings (1,721,760-455,634) = 1	,266,126W or 1266 kV	V			
	§ Daily (1266 kW x 6 hours per day)					
	§ Annual (7596 kWh x 365 days) =	2,772,540 KV				
	§ Total kWh savings (2,772,540 x 5 § 5 year cost savings @ .10 per kW					
	g o year cost savings @ .10 per kw	$11 \times 10,002,700 = -91,300,2$	10			
	¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been inc	urred and the technology has been deployed. Be	enefits ref	lect the present value of the measure for	r the	number of units deployed in the year, i.e.

Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred <u>and</u> the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.
 For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Cool Shops

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

The original proposal was to develop an EnerGuide for Small Business, however, once the Cool Shops program became available, it was more efficient to join with other cities in this joint service offering. Cool Shops tried a different approach to engaging the small commercial sector in order to make it easier for businesses to participate and undergo energy efficient changes. Throughout program implementation in Peterborough, Street Teams visited all small commercial areas within the City as well as the outlying communities of Norwood and Lakefield. The Street Teams provided assistance to businesses that exchanged inefficient light fixtures or bulbs to energy efficient versions. This initiative is successful because it provides business owners with the assistance and encouragement to invest in energy conservation.

	Measure(s):			
		Measure 1- Fluorescent	Measure 2 - CFL	Measure 3 - Customers
	Base case technology:	inefficient light fixtures/bulbs	inefficient light fixtures/bulbs	
	Efficient technology:	efficient light fixtures/bulbs	efficient light fixtures/bulbs	
	Number of participants or units			
	delivered for reporting year:	0)
	Measure life (years):	5	2	2
	Number of Participants or units			
	delivered life to date	2325	1308	3 169
В.	TRC Results:		Reporting Year	Life Cycle TRC Results:
	¹ TRC Benefits (\$):		<u>Reporting rour</u>	\$ 285,356.62
	² TRC Costs (\$):			\$ 200,000102
		program cost (excluding incentives):		\$ 30,104.00
	-	al Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	¢	131,736.00
	merement	Total TRC costs:	*	,
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC Costs:		\$ <u>161,840.00</u> 123,516.62
	Net TRC (III year CDN \$).			123;510.02
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits	/TRC Costs):		1.763202038
C.	Results: (one or more category may	/ apply)		Cumulative Results:
	Conservation Programs:			
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
		Winter		
				Cumulative
		16	in wear	Annual Savings
		lifecycle	in year	-
	Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved :	2,923,724.80		1,440,716.80
	Natural Gas (m3):			
	Other (specify):			
	Carer (Speerly).			
	Demand Management Programs:			
	Controlled load (kW)			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	((kWh):		
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	(kWh):		
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	((kWh):		
	Demand Response Programs:			
	Dispatchable load (kW):			
	Peak hours dispatched in year (hou	rs):		
	Power Factor Correction Program	s.		
	Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	<u> </u>		
	, ,			
	Distribution system power factor at a Distribution system power factor at a			

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	Peak load savings (kW):			
		lifecycle	in year	
	Energy savngs (kWh):			
	Distributed Generation and Load	Displacement Programs:		
	Amount of DG installed (kW):			
	Energy generated (kWh):			
	Peak energy generated (kWh):			
	Fuel type:			
	Other Programs (specify):			
	Metric (specify):			
D.	Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
D.	Actual Program Costs: Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date \$ -
D.		Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	Reporting Year	
D.			Reporting Year	\$ -
D.		Incremental O&M:	Reporting Year \$-	\$ -
D.		Incremental O&M: Incentive:		\$ - \$ 30,104.00
D.		Incremental O&M: Incentive:		\$ - \$ 30,104.00
D.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental O&M: Incentive: Total:		\$ - \$ 30,104.00
D.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental O&M: Incentive: Total: Incremental capital:		\$ - \$ 30,104.00 \$ 30,104.00

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Based on the Ontario Energy Board calculation model, the Total Resource Cost Guide (TRC), we anticipate energy savings of 2,923,725 kWh over the 2 or 5-year life cycle of the new bulbs.

The final Cool Shops Report indicated that Businesses saved a total of \$3,600 per year as a result of the free CFL installation and the purchase of discounted energy efficient products.

The 2005 annual report indicated TRC Benefit and Expense as totals for entire budget over life cycle. Budget was re-allocated in June of 2006 from \$50,000 to \$30,104. As this initiative was completed in 2005, TRC results now reflect only total to date (cumulative).

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.

² For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. Name of the Program:

Infra-Red Camera

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

The LDC purchased an infra-red camera. In co-operation with Peterborough Green Up, building audits were to have been performed at the customer's request. Peterborough Green Up was to conduct its audit with the intent of reducing consumption of electricity and other environmental considerations. The building owner could then take remedial measures on the building. This service was to have been available to all electricity customers, however, Peterborough Green Up has indicated that it does not have the resources to be able to continue with this initiative. The camera will, however, be used by the Distribution Company to scan the electric distribution lines within the LDC to detect places where conductors and transformers are abnormally hot and thereby reduce losses in the electric distribution system.

	Measure(s):			
		Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology: Efficient technology:			
	Number of participants or units			
	delivered for reporting year:			
	Measure life (years):			
	weddale me (years).			
	Number of Participants or units			
	delivered life to date			
В.	TRC Results:		Reporting Year	Life Cycle TRC Results:
	¹ TRC Benefits (\$):		\$-	0
:	² TRC Costs (\$):			
	Utility	program cost (excluding incentives):		\$ 82,985.13
	Incrementa	I Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$ -	
		Total TRC costs:		\$ 82,985.13
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):			-\$ 82,985.13
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		
C.	Results: (one or more category may	apply)		Cumulative Results:
	Conservation Programs:			
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
		Winter		
				Cumulative
		lifecycle	in year	Annual Savings
	Energy saved (kWh):			
	Other resources saved :			
	Natural Gas (m3):			
	Other (specify):			
	Demand Management Programs:			
	Controlled load (kW)	(1-14/1-)-		
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak			
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	(KWh):		
	Demand Response Programs:			
	Dispatchable load (kW):			
	Peak hours dispatched in year (hour	s):		
	Power Factor Correction Programs	<u>s:</u>		
	Amount of KVar installed (KVar):			
	Distribution system power factor at b	egining of year (%):		
	Distribution system power factor at e	o o , ()		
	, , , ,			

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	Peak load savings (kW):				
		lifecycle	in year		
	Energy savngs (kWh):				
	Distributed Generation and Load I	Displacement Programs:			
	Amount of DG installed (kW):				
	Energy generated (kWh):				
	Peak energy generated (kWh):				
	Fuel type:				
	Other Programs (specify):				
	Metric (specify):				
D.	Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Li	ife to Date
D.	Actual Program Costs: Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	Reporting Year	Cumulative Li	fe to Date 63,720.00
D.		Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	Reporting Year		
D.		•	Reporting Year	\$	63,720.00
D.		Incremental O&M:	Reporting Year	\$	63,720.00
D.		Incremental O&M: Incentive:	Reporting Year	\$ \$	63,720.00 18,665.13
D.		Incremental O&M: Incentive:	Reporting Year	\$ \$	63,720.00 18,665.13
D.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental O&M: Incentive: Total:	<u>Reporting Year</u>	\$ \$	63,720.00 18,665.13
D.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental O&M: Incentive: Total: Incremental capital:	<u>Reporting Year</u>	\$ \$ \$	63,720.00 18,665.13 82,385.13

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Budget was re-allocated in June of 2006 from \$95,000 to \$82,385.

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.

2 For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.