



CAMBRIDGE AND NORTH DUMFRIES HYDRO INC.

1500 Bishop Street, P.O. Box 1060, Cambridge, Ontario N1R 5X6 • Telephone (519) 621-3530 • Facsimile (519) 621-7420
Website www.camhydro.com

April 2, 2007

Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street Suite 2700
P.O. Box 2319
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Attn: Kirsten Walli,
Board Secretary

**Re: Cambridge & North Dumfries Hydro Inc. – RP–2004-0203/EB-2005-0199
Conservation and Demand Management Annual Report**

Enclosed please find three (3) hard copies and two (2) electronic copies of Cambridge & North Dumfries Hydro Inc.'s 2006 Conservation and Demand Management Annual Report.

The electronic copies are provided on the enclosed CD-ROM. One copy includes the Appendices in MS-Excel format while the other copy includes the entire report in Adobe Acrobat (PDF) format.

Yours truly,

CAMBRIDGE AND NORTH DUMFRIES HYDRO INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Knox".

Michael Knox,
Director, Customer Information Services
and Conservation

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. Smelsky".

David Smelsky, CMA
Controller

cc: John Grotheer, President & CEO





CAMBRIDGE AND NORTH DUMFRIES HYDRO INC.

Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc.

OEB Reporting # RP-2004-0203/EB-2005-0199

Conservation and Demand Management 2006 Annual Report

March 31, 2007
Submitted to Board Secretary
The Ontario Energy Board

March 31st, 2007

Prepared by:

Michael M. Knox
Director, Customer Information Services and Conservation

David Smelsky
Controller

Sarah Colvin
Conservation and Demand Management Coordinator



I. INTRODUCTION

Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. (CND Hydro) is a progressive local distribution company that serves 48,000 customers in the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries. Our vision is that we are a leader in innovation and the preferred choice for the delivery of energy. We are also proud that when it comes to energy conservation, we as the local utility, are leaders in the community.

On January 12, 2005 Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. submitted an application to the Ontario Energy Board for an Order approving their CDM plan. Since receiving approval from the Board, we have sought out innovative means of providing C&DM programs to our customers. Our approved plan outlined elements that would be delivered to 6 different customer classes; Total Customer Base, Residential, Small Commercial, Mid to Large Scale, Government and Institutional and to our own LDC Asset Base. The total budget for the CDM Plan was consistent with the third installment of incremental Market Adjusted Revenue Requirement (MARR) in the amount of \$2,161,652.

As a result of the approved CDM budget and plan, we successfully ran numerous programs throughout 2005, many of which have carried over into 2006. Last years programs resulted in an overall positive TRC value and we built on that going into 2006.

For this 2006 reporting year, we were focused on providing programs to all customer classes. There were opportunities for partnership with several organizations, the Region of Waterloo and the Waterloo Region District School Board in order to expand our CDM initiatives in the community. An important focus of this past year was on advertising and customer awareness and education through our Total Customer Base. We even created a mascot costume of "Switch" our Energy Champion!

Through the 14 programs that were offered to our customers in 2006, Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. were able to take a lead role in educating and promoting energy conservation in the community. Our strong focus on conservation awareness and responsibility, for all ages, will greatly increase the development of a Culture of Conservation across our service territory.

II. EVALUATION OF THE CDM PLAN

The following CDM programs undertaken in 2006 are reported on herein:

1.0 Total Customer Base

- 1.1 Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb Giveaways
- 1.2 Customer Education Campaigns
- 1.3 Conservation Kits
- 1.4 Every Kilowatt Counts Campaign

2.0 Residential Customer Base

- 2.1 Residential Energy Audits
- 2.2 Geothermal and Solar Water Heater Installation Incentive
- 2.3 Regional Housing Upgrades
- 2.4 Seasonal LED Light Strings
- 2.5 Fridge/Freezer Program

3.0 Small Commercial Customer Base

- 3.1 Clean Air Foundation's - Cool Shops

4.0 Mid to Large Scale Customers

- 4.1 Interval Meter Data Consulting

5.0 Government and Institutional Customer Base

- 5.1 Traffic Signal Upgrades

6.0 LDC Corporate Asset Base

- 6.1 LCD Monitor Replacements
- 6.2 Rooftop Heating Equipment Upgrades

A summary of these programs is shown in Appendix A and Appendix B.

III. DISCUSSION OF THE PROGRAMS

1.0 Total Customer Base

1.1 Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb (CFL) Giveaways

CND Hydro distributed a total of 5472 15-W CFLs throughout their service territory in 2006. A number of these were distributed through community events such as the Fall Home Energy Savings Show, energy-conservation speaking engagements, and internal employee campaigns. Those receiving a complimentary CFL were also provided with educational material about the benefits and savings attributed to installing CFLs over a standard incandescent.

1.2 Customer Education

CND Hydro took an aggressive leadership role in educating their customers about the positive benefits of energy conservation this past year. Several innovative new programs were designed to reinforce the culture of conservation that we strive to achieve. These programs and initiatives include;

- a. *Raising Community Awareness* - In order to promote energy conservation throughout our service territory we advertised energy saving tips in the local newspapers, the Ayr News and the Cambridge Times with a combine circulation of just over 40,000 customers. Our website contains similar energy saving information as well as details on the CDM programs that are underway and upcoming.

We have also purchased many giveaway promotional items that serve as reminders to customers about our dedication to energy conservation and our community.

This year we worked in partnership with the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce to create a new Bell Business Award, the "Environment Award - Excellence in Energy Conservation", to be awarded to a business in recognition of their achievements in energy conservation. This award was presented at the annual banquet on March 22nd, 2007.

- b. *Reaching our Youth* - Two partnerships were formed this past year to reach our future generations with the message about learning to conserve. The first was the sponsorship of a new Energy Conservation exhibit at the Waterloo Region Children's Museum.

The other partnership is with the Waterloo Region District School Board, where a pilot Grade 5 module, "Reduce Your Use" was created and launched in 25+ schools in March of 2007. This exciting venture has provided the opportunity to foster a sense of environmental responsibility in our youth. As part of this partnership we had a 'larger than life' energy champion, "Switch", created to visit classrooms and celebrate student's achievements in energy conservation.

1.3 Energy Conservation Kits

We ordered 500 energy kits for distribution internally and in the community. They contained items such as LED night lights, 13-W CFL, foam receptacle gaskets, a water heater temperature card, and a low-flow shower head. On top of this the bag also contained a header card with many tips on using the new products to save energy in customers homes.

1.4 Every Kilowatt Counts Campaign

In both the Spring and the Fall of 2006 CND Hydro participated in the Conservation Bureau's Every Kilowatt Counts coupon campaign. All customers in our service territory received the book of coupons by mail, and also

had the opportunity to use in-store coupons when purchasing any of the 6 featured energy saving products. Participation in the Fall program was much more successful than the Spring session, but both resulted in a positive TRC.



2.0 Residential Customer Base

2.1 Residential Energy Audits

Once again, CND Hydro supported the efforts of the Residential Energy Efficiency Project (REEP) of Waterloo Region in their delivery of residential energy audits. Funding was provided to subsidize the cost of the audit to the customer, the administrative costs of the organization to provide the audits, and matching grants for customers who achieved successful improvements in retrofits as recognized by Natural Resources Canada under the EnerGuide for Houses program.

The cancellation of the EnerGuide program in May of 2006 saw a slight increase in funding to cover the cost of continuing to provide energy audits to our customers.

During the visit, customers were also offered an 'Electrical Audit' on their major appliances and received 2 complimentary CFLs.

2.2 Geothermal and Solar Water Heater Installation Incentive

Through energy audits performed by REEP, CND Hydro customers were offered an incentive of \$1500 to install a geothermal heating system or a solar water heating system in their homes. There were 7 customers who took advantage of the offer to convert to a geothermal system, while no one installed a solar water heating system.

2.3 Regional Housing Upgrades

Funding was provided to the Region of Waterloo to install occupancy based thermostats in 446 Regional Housing Units in Cambridge, that are heated with electric baseboard heaters. The technology in these thermostats allows for a set back on the temperature of the heater when a motion sensor detects no activity in the room.

2.4 Seasonal LED Light Strings

After the highly successful Festive Light Exchange in 2005, CND Hydro did not run a community-wide festive light exchange. Instead, 300 light strings were exchanged with the Cambridge Memorial Hospital Foundation for the Tree of Caring which raises money each Christmas for the Foundation.

Other strands were exchanged internally with the LDC, and given away as charitable donations in gift baskets.

2.5 Fridge/Freezer Program

CND Hydro worked on creating an in-house program to encourage the change-out of old refrigerators in bulk-metered apartment buildings in the latter half of 2006. The program has received interest from local Property Managers but by the end of 2006, no applications had been filed. Therefore, only small administrative costs are associated with this program so far.

3.0 Small Commercial Customer Base

3.1 Clean Air Foundation's - Cool Shops

Energy audits on 202 small businesses in the City of Cambridge and the Township of North Dumfries were conducted through the Clean Air Foundation's Cool Shops program during a three month period. The results of the audits conducted were deemed a success and also saw the purchase of other lighting products at a discounted rate through the program.



4.0 Mid to Large Scale Customers

4.1 Interval Meter Data Consulting

In 2005 we offered many of our Mid to Large Scale customer base the option of a Web Presentment tool showing energy usage, and consulting services to last a duration of 18 months. We contracted with VIP Energy Services Inc. to provide the data and consulting to the 42 customers who chose to participate. As a result of these services, VIP is reporting decreases in total energy consumption and peak demand as shown below;

<i>Average Demand (kW)</i>	-1.01%
<i>Peak Demand (kW)</i>	-1.34%
<i>Average Power Factor</i>	86.91% up 0.38%
<i>Average Load Factor</i>	58.64% down 1.08%
<i>Consumption (kWh)</i>	-4.07% a reduction of 7,939 MWh



5.0 Government and Institutional Customer Base

5.1 Traffic Signal Upgrades

Funding was provided to the Region of Waterloo to upgrade the Traffic Signals at 87 intersections in the CND Hydro service territory with new LED technology, reducing the operating costs to the Region.



6.0 LDC Corporate Asset Base

6.1 LCD Monitor Replacements

With a focus on 'walking the talk' CND Hydro upgraded 48 CRT computer monitors with new ENERGYSTAR LCD computer monitors. The savings with this new technology has helped reduce operating costs in the office and provided a means to educate staff about purchasing electronics with the ENERGYSTAR symbol.

6.2 Rooftop Heating Equipment Upgrades

Upgrades were made to the rooftop heating system at CND Hydro's office. 6 units were replaced with a new gas/electric unit.

IV. LESSONS LEARNED

The following provides an overview of the lessons learned by CND Hydro Inc. for the Conservation and Demand Management Programs administered during the 2006 reporting year;

1. The programs resulting in the highest TRC value were those that distributed compact fluorescent light bulbs.
2. There were no solar assisted water heaters installed in 2006, this could be the result of low advertising of the incentive and poor customer knowledge about the technology.
3. The in-house Refrigerator Replacement Incentive Program had a low uptake in 2006. Early response indicates that there was too much paperwork involved and timing of the program did not provide the appropriate budgeting requirements needed for a large change-out of appliances.
4. We ran a very successful Festive Light Exchange in 2005 but no similar program for customers in 2006. Many calls came into the office about this, it is something that was well received by our customers.
5. Many of our Mid to Large Commercial customers have been inquiring about incentives for lighting upgrades. There appears to be a need in the market for upgrades and incentives for lighting changes in mid to large scale applications.
6. Our presence at the Cambridge Fall Home Show was a great way to reach our customers. We had the highest attendance for our seminar and the booth was always busy with customers who had questions or were looking for information about products and our services. More community outreach events should be held.



V. CONCLUSION

The following table summarizes total spending on Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc.'s Conservation and Demand Management Programs to the end of 2006:

CAMBRIDGE AND NORTH DUMFRIES HYDRO INC.
Conservation and Demand Management Reporting Summary
December 31, 2006

RP-2004-0203 / EB-2005-0199

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Program Status</u>	<u>Rate Class Targeted</u>		<u>Total Approved Budget</u>	<u>Expenditures "Life-to-Date"</u>	
Program 1	Consumer Education and Development Culture (Total Customer Base)					
	Active	All	Capital	\$ -	\$ -	
			Operating	\$ 285,000	\$ 218,950	
Program 2	Conservation and Demand Management Initiatives (Residential Customer Base)					
	Active	Residential	Capital	\$ -	\$ -	
			Operating	\$ 990,000	\$ 676,940	
Program 3	Small Business Customer Base					
	Active	GS < 50kW	Capital	\$ -	\$ -	
			Operating	\$ 100,000	\$ 46,505	
Program 4	Mid to Large Commercial/Industrial Customer Base					
	Active	GS > 50kW	Capital	\$ 70,000	\$ 31,537	
			Operating	\$ 130,000	\$ 101,306	
Program 5	Government/Institutional Customer Base					
	Active	Other	Capital	\$ -	\$ -	
			Operating	\$ 400,000	\$ 335,929	
Program 6	Local Distribution Company - Asset Base					
	Active	Other	Capital	\$ 186,652	\$ 150,742	
			Operating	\$ -	\$ -	
				Capital	\$ 256,652	\$ 182,279
				Operating	\$ 1,905,000	\$ 1,379,630
				Total	\$ 2,161,652	\$ 1,561,909

In a successful second year of providing CDM initiatives to our customers, Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro Inc. has spent approximately 72% of the total third tranche money.



VI. APPENDICES

Appendix "A" - Evaluation of the Conservation and Demand Management Plan

Appendix "B" - Discussion of the Programs

Appendix "C" - Program and Portfolio Totals

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-to-date	Total for 2006	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Agricultural	LDC System	⁴ Smart Meters	Other #1	Other #2
<i>Net TRC value (\$):</i>	(\$415,702)	(\$1,106,525)	(\$57,604)	\$17,184	(\$1,373,801)	\$0	\$0	(\$260,402)	\$0	\$568,097	\$0
<i>Benefit to cost ratio:</i>	0.13	(0.02)	0.54	1.55	(1.16)	0.00	0.00	(1.35)	0.00	4.18	0.00
<i>Number of participants or units delivered:</i>	71,980	35,990	2,243	926	87	0	0	54	0	32,797	0
<i>Lifecycle (kWh) Savings:</i>	61,651,617	36,199,205	4,899,715	2,048,129	9,163,731	0	0	1,542,856	0	18,544,774	0
<i>Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh):</i>	7,359,652	4,819,513	324,255	165,589	1,145,466	0	0	77,856	0	3,106,347	0
<i>Total peak demand saved (kW):</i>	1,655	1,492	288	57	262	0	0	20	0	865	0
<i>Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):</i>	0.2310	0.3120	0.0210	0.0107	0.0742	0	0	0.0050	0	0.2011	0
<i>Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):</i>	0.5156	0.4648	0.0929	0.0184	0.0845	0	0	0.0065	0	0.2790	0
¹ Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures (\$):	\$1,555,642.59	\$749,904.81	\$382,931.80	\$47,472.75	\$89,527.94	\$3,746.82	\$0.00	\$110,902.34	\$0.00	\$115,323.16	\$0.00
² Expenditures per kWh saved (\$/kWh):	\$0.21	\$0.16	\$1.18	\$0.29	\$0.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.42	\$0.00	\$0.04	\$0.00
³ Expenditures per KW saved (\$/kW):	\$939.97	\$502.62	\$1,329.62	\$832.86	\$341.71	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$5,545.12	\$0.00	\$133.32	\$0.00
<i>Utility discount rate (%):</i>	7.5										

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:** Total Customer Base

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

Compact Fluorescent Light Bulb Giveaways; Overall Customer Education through advertising, promotions, community events and education campaigns; Distribution of Energy Saving Kits to customers; Participation and Promotion of the Spring and Fall 2006 Every Kilowatt Counts Campaign.

Measure(s):

	15W CFL Giveaway	Energy Saving Kits	Every Kilowatt Counts
Base case technology:	60 W incandescent light bulb	Average Existing Stock	Average Existing Stock
Efficient technology:	15W	Various	Various
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	5,472	500	26,825
Measure life (years):	4	varied	varied
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	21,516	500	26,825

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$744,898.20	\$1,106,210.78
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$8,401.80	\$9,470.93
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$172,600.00	\$221,800.00
Total TRC costs:	\$181,001.80	\$231,270.93
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	\$925,900.00	\$1,337,481.71
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	4.12	4.78

C. **Results:** (one or more category may apply) **Cumulative Results:**

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	168		
	Winter	697		
Energy saved (kWh):	lifecycle	18,544,774	in year	2036
Other resources saved :			Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Natural Gas (m3):			26,092,662	5,834,369
Other (specify):				

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 (hours):	

Power Factor Correction Programs:

Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	
Distribution system power factor at beginning of year (%):	
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 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:

Utility direct costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Incentive:

Total:

Utility indirect costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Total:

Reporting Year

Cumulative Life to Date

\$0.00

\$0.00

\$106,921.36

\$106,921.36

\$0.00

\$8,401.80

\$8,401.80

\$0.00

\$1,069.13

\$177,159.20

\$178,228.33

\$0.00

\$8,759.46

\$8,759.46

E. Assumptions & Comments:

1. General CDM indirect costs not attributed to a specific program were evenly divided by the 14 programs completed and allocated respectively.
2. The cost figures listed in Appendix B also take into consideration the costs of item 1.2 - Customer Education, although there is no TRC calculation. This represents expenses for the website, advertising, home shows, community outreach, and school pilot projects.
3. The LED nightlight was entered as a Direct Input in the TRC Calculations with the following assumptions: replacing a 5W incandescent bulb, turned on for 8760 hours a year, has a lifespan of 10 years according to the manufacturer and the value is \$3/unit.
4. The Spring and Fall campaign results were grouped together for the Every Kilowatt Counts. TRC Calculations were performed with the following assumptions; All CFLs purchased were 15W, 2.86 bulbs were purchased for each coupon redeemed - according to the program results, baseboard thermostats were considered as a typical programmable thermostat, the number of installed programmable thermostats was reduced by a percentage of the coupons redeemed, motion sensor light fixed were entered with a proxy of motion detectors, the coupons redeemed for the Seasonal LED light strands was split between mini lights and 5W strands, ceiling fans were entered in the calculator as 'change/airflow fix' and the Free Ridership Rate for ceiling fans was set at 10%.

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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

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

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Residential Customer Base

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

Five programs were conducted to service the residential customers specifically. The home energy audits conducted by the Residential Energy Efficiency Project delivered information and CFLs to customers through in-home audits. This program also helped to encourage the installation of 7 ground-source heat pumps in customers homes. Dollars were spent to upgrade the thermostats in housing units owned and operated by the Region of Waterloo. Strands of LEDs were exchanged with the Cambridge Memorial Hospital Foundation for their Tree of Caring. A refrigerator replacement program started but had yet to show any measurable savings at the end of 2006, but successfully continued into 2007.

Measure(s):

	REEP Initiative - CFLs	Geothermal Incentive	Regional Housing	SLED Exchange
<i>Base case technology:</i>	40W incandescent light bulb	Existing Equipment	Existing Equipment	5W incand. light string
<i>Efficient technology:</i>	11/13W Compact Fluorescent	Ground Source Heat Pump	Smart Thermostats	LED festive light string
<i>units delivered for reporting year:</i>	1,490	7	446	300
<i>Measure life (years):</i>	4	20	18	30
<i>Number of Participants or unites delievered lfe to date</i>	2,156	9	529	15,300

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$64,597.75	\$181,710.68
² TRC Costs (\$):		
<i>Utility program cost (excluding incentives):</i>	\$10,502.25	\$83,639.45
<i>Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)</i>	\$115,900.00	\$177,500.00
<i>Total TRC costs:</i>	\$126,402.25	\$261,139.45
<i>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</i>	\$191,000.00	\$442,850.13
<i>Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):</i>	0.51	0.71

C. **Results:** (one or more category may apply)

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
<i>Demand savings (kW):</i>				
<i>Summer</i>		123		
<i>Winter</i>		165		
<i>Energy saved (kWh):</i>	4,899,715	2036	14,351,738	708,562
<i>Other resources saved :</i>				
<i>Natural Gas (m3):</i>				
<i>Other (specify):</i>				

Demand Management Programs:

<i>Controlled load (kW)</i>	
<i>Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):</i>	
<i>Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak (kWh):</i>	
<i>Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak (kWh):</i>	

Demand Response Programs:

<i>Dispatchable load (kW):</i>	
<i>Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):</i>	

Power Factor Correction Programs:

<i>Amount of KVar installed (KVar):</i>	
---	--

Distribution system power factor at beginning of year (%):

Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):

Energy savings (kWh):

lifecycle

in year

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	Cumulative Life to Date
<i>Utility direct costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$0.00	\$151,361.18
	<i>Incentive:</i>	\$372,292.60	\$526,897.60
	<i>Total:</i>	\$372,292.60	\$678,258.78
<i>Utility indirect costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$10,639.20	\$12,174.91
	<i>Total:</i>	\$10,639.20	\$12,174.91

E. Assumptions & Comments:

- General CDM indirect costs not attributed to a specific program were evenly divided by the 14 programs completed and allocated respectively.
 - For the EnerGuide Home Energy Audits conducted by REEP a TRC calculation was only able to be performed on the CFLs that were distributed at each visit. Calculations used a proxy of 11W to represent both the 11W and 13W bulbs that were distributed to homeowners.
 - Part of the REEP program was encouraging the installation of Geothermal heating systems, and we provided customers with an incentive towards the install. TRC calculations used the commercial table to properly account for the energy savings from this system and respect that a 5.0 ton unit is larger than what is typically installed in a residential application.
 - Thermostats installed in Regional Housing Units were programmable baseboard. TRC calculations were done using a proxy of a programmable thermostat, and entered with an overriding Free Ridership Rate rate of 0%.
 - The Free Ridership Rate for the SLED program was 0%.
 - The cost figures listed in Appendix B also take into consideration the costs of item 2.6 - Fridge/Freezer Program, although there is no TRC calculation. This represents expenses visits to Property Management Offices, Direct Mailings, Advertising and other promotional requirements. The program has continued into 2007 and these costs represent a 'set up' of the program.
- 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: Small Commercial Customer Base

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

Delivery of the Clean Air Foundation's Cool Shops program. 202 energy audits conducted on local business which included complimentary CFLs and LED Exit Sign Retrofits plus the opportunity to purchase products at a discounted rate.

Measure(s):

	15W/13W CFL Installed	27W CFL Installed	LED Exit Sign Retrofit
Base case technology:	60W incandescent light bulb	100W incandescent light bulb	30W incandescent bulb
Efficient technology:	15/13W CFL	27W CFL Installed	3W LED bulb
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	596	20	310
Measure life (years):	4	4	25
Number of Participants or unites delievered lfe to date	596	20	310

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$48,191.89	\$48,191.89
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$2,308.11	\$2,308.11
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$28,700.00	\$28,700.00
Total TRC costs:	\$31,008.11	\$31,008.11
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	\$79,200.00	\$79,200.00
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	1.55	1.55

C. Results: (one or more category may apply)	Cumulative Results:			
Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	27		
	Winter	30		
	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	2,048,129	2031	2,048,129	165,589
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				
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 (hours):				
Power Factor Correction Programs:				
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):				
Distribution system power factor at begining of year (%):				
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 Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

<u>D. Actual Program Costs:</u>		<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Cumulative Life to Date</u>
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Incremental O&M:	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Incentive:	\$45,164.64	\$46,385.24
	Total:	\$45,164.64	\$46,385.24
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Incremental O&M:	\$2,308.11	\$2,314.23
	Total:	\$2,308.11	\$2,314.23

E. Assumptions & Comments:

1. General CDM indirect costs not attributed to a specific program were evenly divided by the 14 programs completed and allocated respectively.

2. 13W CFLs purchased as a result of the program were entered into the TRC Calculator using a proxy of 15W.

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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

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

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Mid to Large Scale Customers

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

Providing Emeter Data services to a number of our Mid to Large Scale Customers along with consulting services.

Measure(s):

	Interval Meter Consulting
Base case technology:	
Efficient technology:	
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	42
Measure life (years):	
Number of Participants or unites delievered lfe to date	42

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ -	
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):		
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		
Total TRC costs:	\$ -	
<hr/> Net TRC (in year CDN \$): <hr/>		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

C. Results: (one or more category may apply)	Cumulative Results:			
<u>Conservation Programs:</u>				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer			
	Winter			
	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):				
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				
<u>Demand Management Programs:</u>				
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):				
<u>Demand Response Programs:</u>				
Dispatchable load (kW):				
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):				
<u>Power Factor Correction Programs:</u>				
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):				
Distribution system power factor at begining of year (%):				
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 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:

Utility direct costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Incentive:

Total:

Utility indirect costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Total:

Reporting Year

Cumulative Life to Date

\$0.00

\$1,343.00

\$0.00

\$1,343.00

\$0.00

\$2,403.82

\$2,403.82

\$0.00

\$102,552.07

\$30,193.54

\$132,745.61

\$0.00

\$3,062.96

\$3,062.96

E. Assumptions & Comments:

1. General CDM indirect costs not attributed to a specific program were evenly divided by the 14 programs completed and allocated respectively.
2. All costs to administer the consulting services and interval meter installation for the program were reported on in 2006. Some system maintenance charges and other indirect costs to continue the program are reflected above.
3. Actual data demonstrating kWh saved by the 42 participating customers was not recorded as a TRC Calculation.

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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

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

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Government and Institutional Customer Base

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

Upgrade of traffic signals at 87 intersections performed in partnership with the Region of Waterloo.

Measure(s):

Traffic Light Replacement

Base case technology:	incandescent bulbs - varied
Efficient technology:	LED light technology
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	87
Measure life (years):	8
Number of Participants or unites delievered lfe to date	87

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	(\$736,900.45)	(\$975,447.32)
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$2,100.45	\$250,542.58
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$634,800.00	\$634,800.00
Total TRC costs:	\$636,900.45	\$885,342.58
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	(\$100,000.00)	(\$90,104.74)
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	(1.16)	(1.10)

C. **Results:** (one or more category may apply) **Cumulative Results:**

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	131		
	Winter	131		
	lifecycle		in year	
Energy saved (kWh):	9,163,731		2014	16,949,267
Other resources saved :				1,456,887
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

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 (hours):	

Power Factor Correction Programs:

Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	
Distribution system power factor at begining of year (%):	
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 Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

<u>D. Actual Program Costs:</u>		<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Cumulative Life to Date</u>
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Incremental O&M:	\$427.49	\$486.73
	Incentive:	\$87,000.00	\$335,442.13
	Total:	\$87,427.49	\$335,928.86
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Incremental O&M:	\$2,100.45	\$3,346.95
	Total:	\$2,100.45	\$3,346.95

E. Assumptions & Comments:

1. General CDM indirect costs not attributed to a specific program were evenly divided by the 14 programs completed and allocated respectively.
2. TRC Calculations were performed using the following assumptions for Traffic Signal Upgrades; The EE Life of traffic signals is 8 years, there was a total of 87 intersections converted with a monthly savings of 91050kWh, each intersection therefore has a savings of 1.503kW, the Free Ridership Rate value is 0%, operating time was considered to be 730 hours/month, and the individual cost per intersection to upgrade is \$7,296.

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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

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

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** LDC Asset Base

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

Two programs were conducted to improve energy efficiency at Cambridge and North Dumfries Hydro's corporate office. The first was an upgrade of CRT Monitors to new ENERGystar qualified LCD screens. The second was an upgrade of the rooftop HVAC units.

Measure(s):

	Monitor Upgrades	Rooftop Heating Equipment
Base case technology:	Existing CRT monitors	Existing electric heaters
Efficient technology:	LCD monitors	Gas/Electric units
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	48	6
Measure life (years):	15	20
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	48	6

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	(\$149,500.90)	(\$160,622.94)
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$4,200.90	\$4,200.90
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$106,700.00	\$135,100.00
Total TRC costs:	\$110,900.90	\$139,300.90
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	(\$38,600.00)	(\$21,322.04)
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	(1.35)	(1.15)

C. **Results:** (one or more category may apply) **Cumulative Results:**

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	10						
	Winter	10						
Energy saved (kWh):	lifecycle	1,542,856	in year	2026	Cumulative Lifecycle	2,209,821	Cumulative Annual Savings	178,813
Other resources saved :								
Natural Gas (m3):								
Other (specify):								

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 (hours):	

Power Factor Correction Programs:

Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	
Distribution system power factor at beginning of year (%):	
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 Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

<u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Cumulative Life to Date</u>
<i>Utility direct costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$106,701.44	\$106,701.44
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$0.00	\$3,710.00
	<i>Incentive:</i>	\$0.00	\$68,007.50
	<i>Total:</i>	\$106,701.44	\$178,418.94
<i>Utility indirect costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$0.00	\$0.00
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$4,200.90	\$4,418.32
	<i>Total:</i>	\$4,200.90	\$4,418.32

E. Assumptions & Comments:

1. General CDM indirect costs not attributed to a specific program were evenly divided by the 14 programs completed and allocated respectively.
2. TRC Calculations for the upgraded monitors were performed using the following assumptions; the EE life of an LCD monitor is 15 years, the savings associated with each monitor is 26W and the annual hourly usage is 2,286 and was subsequently broken down by time of day.
3. TRC Calculations for the heating equipment upgrade were performed using the following assumptions; the EE life of the heating equipment is 20 years, the annual energy savings, as reported by the HVAC contractor is 75,000kWh/year, and that all 6 units were the same.

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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

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

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006 CDM

1. Residential Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
<i>Residential Energy Audits</i>	\$11,700	\$5,100	\$6,599	2.29	90,222	360,890	19	\$146,626
<i>Geothermal/Solar Incentive</i>	\$8,500	\$90,300	(\$81,801)	0.09	131,119	2,622,375	195	\$12,600
<i>Regional Housing Upgrades</i>	\$45,800	\$26,200	\$19,599	1.75	97,540	1,755,224	72	\$215,665
<i>Seasonal LED light strings</i>	\$699	\$2,700	(\$2,001)	0.26	5,374	161,226	2	\$5,802
<i>Fridge/Freezer Program</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$2,237
*Totals App. B - Residential	\$66,698	\$124,302	(\$57,604)	0.54	324,255	4,899,715	288	\$382,932
<i>Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>	→	\$ -						
Total Residential TRC Costs		\$ 124,302						
**Totals TRC - Residential	\$66,698	\$124,302	(\$57,604)	0.54				

2. Commercial Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
<i>CAF - Cool Shops</i>	\$48,192	\$31,008	\$17,184	1.55	165,589	2,048,129	57	\$47,473
*Totals App. B - Commercial	\$48,192	\$31,008	\$17,184	1.55	165,589	2,048,129	57	\$47,473
<i>Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>	→	\$0						
Total TRC Costs		\$31,008						
**Totals TRC - Commercial	\$48,192	\$31,008	\$17,184	1.55				

3. Institutional Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
<i>Regional Traffic Signal Upgrades</i>	(\$736,900)	\$636,900	(\$1,373,801)	(1.16)	1,145,466	9,163,731	262	\$89,528
*Totals App. B - Institutional	(\$736,900)	\$636,900	(\$1,373,801)	(1.16)	1,145,466	9,163,731	262	\$89,528
<i>Institutional Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>	→	\$0						
Total TRC Costs		\$636,900						
**Totals TRC - Institutional	(\$736,900)	\$636,900	(\$1,373,801)	(1.16)				

4. Industrial Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
<i>Interval Meter Data Consulting</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	3,747
*Totals App. B - Industrial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$3,747
<i>Industrial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>	→	-						
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Industrial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

5. Agricultural Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
*Totals App. B - Agricultural	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
<i>Agricultural Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>	→							
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Agricultural	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

6. LDC System Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
LCD Monitor Upgrades	(\$38,200)	\$20,800	(\$59,001)	(1.84)	2,853	42,794	2	\$20,820
Heating Equipment Upgrades	(\$111,300)	\$90,100	(\$201,401)	(1.24)	75,003	1,500,062	18	\$90,082
*Totals App. B - LDC System	(\$149,501)	\$110,901	(\$260,402)	(1.35)	77,856	1,542,856	20	\$110,902
LDC System Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→	\$0						
Total TRC Costs		\$110,901						
**Totals TRC - LDC System	(\$149,501)	\$110,901	(\$260,402)	(1.35)				

7. Smart Meters Program

Only spending information that was authorized under the 3rd tranche of MARR is required to be reported for Smart Meters.

Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$) →

8. Other #1 Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.


Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
CFL Giveaways	\$100,900	\$11,900	\$88,999	8.48	514,149	2,056,596	111	\$20,833
Customer Education	\$0	\$0	\$0	0.00	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$79,446
Energy Kit Distribution	\$169,800	\$7,700	\$162,099	22.05	308,203	3,291,055	75	\$7,621
Every Kilowatt Counts Coupons	\$476,300	\$159,300	\$316,999	2.99	2,283,995	13,197,123	679	\$7,423
*Totals App. B - Other #1	\$746,999	\$178,901	\$568,097	4.18	3,106,347	18,544,774	865	\$115,323
Other #1 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→	\$0						
Total TRC Costs		\$178,901						
**Totals TRC - Other #1	\$746,999	\$178,901	\$568,097	4.18				


9. Other #2 Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
			\$ -	0.00				
			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Other #2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
<i>Other #2 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Other #2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

LDC's CDM PORTFOLIO TOTALS

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
*TOTALS FOR ALL APPENDIX B	(\$24,513)	\$1,082,013	(\$1,106,525)	(0.02)	4,819,513	36,199,205	1,492	\$749,905
<i>Any other Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>		\$0						
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS		\$1,082,013						
**LDC' PORTFOLIO TRC	(\$24,513)	\$1,082,013	(\$1,106,525)	(0.02)				

* The savings and spending information from this row is to be carried forward to Appendix A.

** The TRC information from this row is to be carried forward to Appendix A.