

2007-03-30

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

Dear Ms. Walli:

Re: *ENWIN* Utilities Ltd. - RP-2004-0203/EB-2004-0531 - Conservation and Demand Management Annual Report

Please find attached 3 copies of our Conservation and Demand Management Annual Report for the year 2006. The report follows the reporting guidelines provided by the Board on March 1, 2007. Also attached are the required electronic copies.

If you require any further information, please contact me or alternatively, Mr. Steven Bastounas, Conservation and Demand Management Coordinator at (519) 251-7300 Extension 212.

Sincerely,

ENWIN Utilities Ltd.

Giovanna Gesuale Manager, Regulatory Affairs Tel: (519) 251-7330 Fax: (519) 251-7308 ggesuale@enwin.com

Enclosure

ENWIN Utilities Ltd. 787 Ouellette Avenue, P.O. Box 1625, Stn. "A", Windsor, ON N9A 5T7



2006 Annual Report, CDM Third Tranche Funding, ENWIN Utilities Ltd.

March 30, 2007

Annual Report of CDM Initiatives

1. Introduction

Highlights in 2006 include:

- System Loss Reduction:
 - Within budget on line loss reduction program.
- GS > 50, Intermediate and Large Use Remaining:
 - Completion of four GS>50 customer projects resulting in a total of greater than 2,600 MWh in annual energy savings and incentives totaling approximately \$37,000.
- Residential and GS < 50:
 - Reviewed other LDC annual reports and conducted an analysis to determine a course of action with respect to our residential program in 2006; the result was to concentrate on an educational compact fluorescent lighting event at a local retailer.
 - Through a very successful project at a local retailer, *ENWIN* helped educate customers while distributing 31,310 CFL light bulbs and providing discounts that accounted for another 22,646 bulbs in spillover sales.
 - Participant in the pilot OPA refrigerator retirement program which resulted in over 1,500 refrigerator pickups in the *ENWIN* territory.
- Overall Project Management:
 - Provided information to KPMG who provided guidance with respect to *ENWIN*'s internal project management process.

ENWIN's initial CDM budget for 2006, total budget (as approved by the OEB), total budget after allowable transfers, actual spending in 2006 and spending to date is illustrated in the table below. This budget was approved in early 2005.

	Original Budget	Total Budget	Total Budget	Actual			Total Remaining
	for 2006	Before	After	Snending	2006	Snending	Budget
Program	(\$)	Transfers	Transfers	in 2006	Shortfall	to Date	Available
1. System Loss	(\$)				~		
Reduction/Power	000.000	000.000	000.000	000 550	15 520	000 550	15 520
Factor	909,090	909,090	909,090	893,552	15,538	893,552	15,538
Correction							
2. Energy							
Conservation	50,000	150,000	150,000	27,850	22,150	79,499	70,501
Media Campaign							
3. Distributed							
Generation with							
Local Large	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufacturer							
(Cancelled)							
4. Local Large	118,000	354,000	354,000	0	118,000	13,399	340,601
$\frac{1}{5} \text{ GS} > 50$							
5.05 > 50,							
Large Use	134,283	402,850	402,850	37,838	96,445	46,480	356,370
Remaining							
6 Residential							
and $GS < 50$	33,333	100,000	277,710	251,762	0	251,802	25,908
7. Home							
Improvements -	49.750	50.000	50.000	1 200	47 251	2 0 1 2	16 000
Little River	48,750	50,000	50,000	1,399	47,331	3,912	46,088
Acres							
8. Educational							
Program for							
Elementary	59,237	177,710	0	0	0	0	0
School Students							
(Cancelled)							
9. Traffic	110.000	110.000	110.000		110.000	1.7	110.000
Engineering –	110,000	110,000	110,000	0	110,000	17	110,000
LED Lights	1 462 602	2 252 650	2 252 650	1 010 401	400 40 4	1 000 ((2	065.006
1 otals	1,402,693	2,233,630	2,233,630	1,212,401	409,484	1,288,663	905,006

The main spending shortfalls came with Programs 4, 5 and 7. However, with all of the existing proposals taken into account, the potential for additional spending on all programs as of January 2007 is \$384,788. This would bring total spending to 77% of the total CDM budget. (NOTE: *ENWIN* will attempt to utilize the remaining 23% of its CDM budget by signing up additional customers to its commercial and industrial incentive programs.) Program 6 will surpass budget in 2007 given *ENWIN*'s plans to run another major retail program. This will be accommodated by transferring funds out of Program 7 or Program 9. *ENWIN* will still be within the OEB-allowable 20% transfer limit following this transfer.

1. System Loss Reduction/Power Factor Correction

In 2005 *ENWIN* completed the design for a distribution system enhancement, the conversion of a 4.16 kV feeder to 27.6 kV. In 2006, after the contract was awarded, this project was completed on-schedule and within budget. The result is reduced line losses resulting in a savings of approximately 429,000 kWh per annum, enough energy to supply 50 homes for one year.

2. Energy Conservation Media Campaign

ENWIN immediately embarked on an energy conservation information campaign on the very popular AM 800 radio station. This program is hosted by *ENWIN*'s corporate spokesperson and has included various expert guests, including home auditors and electrical suppliers. *ENWIN* also presented/participated at various public forums/town halls and seminars.

3. Distributed Generation with Local Large Manufacturer

Cancelled.

<u>4&5. Local Large Manufacturers, GS>50, Intermediate and Large Use Remaining</u>

In 2006, *ENWIN* continued to correspond with its largest commercial and industrial customers in relation to this program which awards local large manufacturing customers \$13.79 per megawatt-hour of annual energy savings for approved projects once the project is complete and appropriately verified. This program is focused on obtaining maximum benefit per dollar spent. The incentive is available for upgrades to more energy-efficient technology, for example, T8/T5 fluorescent fixtures, compact fluorescent lighting, LED Exit signs, premium efficiency motors, variable speed drives, etc. *ENWIN* arrived at this incentive amount by taking its total available dollars for CDM (\$2,253,650) and dividing by 5% (government target) of the recent average annual kWh consumption for the *ENWIN* system.

Administration of the program is performed as follows:

- Customer submits a proposal to ENWIN;
- *ENWIN* reviews the proposal and approves if appropriate;
- Both parties sign an agreement outlining the terms and conditions;
- Customer implements the program;
- Completed Program is verified in manner agreed to at outset of agreement;
- *ENWIN* issues a cheque for the incentive amount according to the energy savings reported by an engineer or auditor.

To date there have been a number of successful projects and proposals, mainly lighting upgrades to industrial and commercial facilities, compressor upgrades, variable speed drive installations, building envelope improvements, exhaust controls and individual metering.

NOTE: Appendices A and B of this report only includes projects completed by December 2006. Projects that were in progress at the end of 2006 but not complete will be reflected in the 2007 annual report. The total estimated incentive value of these projects is \$187,847.

<u>6. Residential and GS<50</u>

In 2006, *ENWIN* Powerlines set out to establish a residential Conservation and Demand Management program. Analysis of various initiatives at other LDCs throughout the province was performed and it was concluded that a retail CFL event would result in the greatest return on investment (kilowatt-hour savings/dollar spent). Through an RFP process, various vendors submitted proposals for a retail CFL contract. After final review and *ENWIN* Board approval, the contract was awarded to the Summerhill Group. The *ENWIN* CFL event took place between October 17 and October 29, 2006 at Windsor's two Home Depot stores.

Program objectives compared to final results are summarized in the following table:

	Objective	Actual	Difference
Giveaway	16,000 2-packs (32,000 bulbs)	15,655 2-packs (31,330 bulbs)	-345 2-packs (670 bulbs)
Bulb spillover sales	15,000 bulbs	22,646 bulbs	+7,646 bulbs
TRC NPV*	\$923,150	\$1,111,184	+\$188,034
Budget	\$249,558	\$242,530	-\$7,027

*Total Resource Cost Test Net Present Value (TRC NPV) is the OEB-adopted measure of the net present value of the benefits less the costs of a program from a societal perspective.

Event Highlights

- Event was a success
 - Under budget each line item on or under budget.
 - Surpassed our goal for Net Present Value.
 - Surpassed goal for additional bulb purchases by 50%.
- Ratepayers educated on use and benefits of CFLs.
- Helped to transform the market by encouraging consumers to make better choices for the environment.
- Summerhill's professionalism and dedication.
- Friendliness, knowledge and dedication of in-store representatives.
- Home Depot's cooperation with *ENWIN* and the Summerhill Group.
- Home Depot give-away of free washer-dryer to one lucky ENWIN customer who submitted a survey at the event.

7. Home Improvements – Little River Acres

In 2005, *ENWIN* established a relationship with the Little River Acres Association, an electrically heated subdivision, and a local Energuide for Houses home auditor. Efforts culminated in a discount energy audit program for electrically heated homes and an agreement to match NRCan grants for upgrades verified in a second home audit. This program garnered significant media attention and further promotion by the mayor and then Energy Minister, Dwight Duncan. *ENWIN* has contributed toward 10 free audits and 23 discounted audits. *ENWIN* is most pleased to report that four households took steps to improve their efficiency by way of window and door upgrades. As agreed, *ENWIN* rewarded these efforts by matching the Natural Resources Canada grant given to households that improve their energy efficiency rating. Unfortunately, the government's Energuide for Houses program was cancelled in 2006 and so there were no further discounted audits conducted.

8. Educational Program for Elementary School Students

Cancelled with budget transferred to Program 6.

9. Traffic Engineering/LED Lights (City of Windsor)

The City of Windsor is no longer going forward on an LED traffic light program. However, the City is undertaking a feasibility study relating to energy upgrades to a number of buildings. At this time, *ENWIN* is unsure if the City will be able to complete any upgrades in time to take part in our CDM incentive plan.

Overall Project Management

ENWIN produces monthly CDM compliance reports and holds monthly meetings attended regularly by our President and COO, Director of Operations, CEO of our holding company, as well as Regulatory Affairs, Corporate Communications, Finance and Engineering.

ENWIN has engaged KPMG LLP, to provide guidance in regard to the project management process. This includes providing feedback on key aspects of *ENWIN*'s project management process including planning and initiation, monitoring, communication and information management as well as specific aspects of project management including authorization controls, expenditure tracking, benefit tracking, key communications tracking and verification. KPMG is also performing specified procedures on a quarterly basis. These procedures have been agreed upon by KPMG and *ENWIN*, and focus on expenditures and utilization of the internal project management process.

2. Evaluation of the CDM Plan – See Appendix A, C attached

3. Discussion of the Programs – See Appendix B attached

4. Lessons Learned

System Loss Reduction

 This program was a success from a budget standpoint and met its end of year completion target per ENWIN's CDM plan approved by the OEB.

Energy Conservation Media Campaign

- ENWIN continued to promote energy conservation through its CHUM Windsor Energy Savings 101 radio program, providing a recognizable and consistent message to listeners.
- This program is successful due to a good working relationship with AM 800 CKLW and its large audience.
- This program will continue in 2007.

Local Large Manufacturers, GS>50, Intermediate and Large Use Remaining

- The time required for industrial facilities to submit proposals and implement initiatives is often greater than is required for smaller commercial customers due to the size and scope of the projects and the requirement for high level corporate approval.
- Administrative aspects of this Program (i.e. follow up on required documents, communication) are significant.
- Capital investment decisions require a very fast payback, usually less than two years; hence, it is difficult for large manufacturers to obtain internal approval.
- This program is successful with respect to TRC but less successful with respect to level of uptake.
- Based on communications with this customer segment, a much larger incentive rate (perhaps two or threefold) is needed to drive greater uptake on projects where the incentive is only a small percentage of the capital cost.
- This program will continue given that the potential for additional participants and benefits (i.e., TRC, kW and kWh) is high.

Residential and GS<50

- Residential customers want to learn more about energy savings measures.
- We were partly able to leverage costs for this program with OPA funding.
- In order to help drive additional traffic and add value for the customer, we also provided customers with OPA coupons specifically identified with the *ENWIN* logo for this campaign.
- This program is extremely successful, surpassing all expectations for additional sales and TRC while staying within budget.
- The retail avenue is an effective forum for engaging residential customers; as a result, *ENWIN* fully intends to run another educational retail event.

<u>Home Improvements – Little River Acres</u>

- Those who acted upon the suggestions of the auditor achieved energy savings that were verified in the follow-up audit.
- This program is a success for the customers who took part; however, the program is unsuccessful with respect to the level of uptake.
- ENWIN will honour grant-matching for customers who completed the initial audit before the cancellation of the government's Energuide for Houses program.
- Since the Energuide for Houses program is no longer available, delivery of the ENWIN program is also suspended.

5. Conclusion

In 2006 *ENWIN* was able to complete two major CDM initiatives: a line loss reduction program and the large-scale retail compact fluorescent lighting program. There has also been some success in the area of incentives provided to >50 kW customers. *ENWIN* will continue to pursue energy saving opportunities with these customers going forward. *ENWIN* also plans to run another large residential event at a local retailer as a follow-up to our success in 2006.

Steve Bastounas, Conservation and Demand Management Coordinator

Appendix A - Evaluation of the CDM Plan

5 Cumulative Totals Life-to-Total for 2006 Residential Commercial Institutional Industrial Agricultural LDC System 4 Smart Meters Media Home Audits date Net TRC value (\$): \$ 1,775,478.12 \$ 1,689,349 \$ 1,032,574 \$ 951,725 \$ \$ \$ \$ (280,217 \$ (27,850) \$ 13,118 Benefit to cost ratio: \$ 1.73 1.77 5.10 1.95 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.69 0.00 3.62 Number of participants or units delivered: 80,000 80,000 75.921 4 0 0 636 75.921 4 78,752,012.48 Lifecycle (kWh) Savings: 73,746,650 20,594,240 35,588,160 0 0 0 17,169,600 0 394,650 Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh): 17,520,110.90 16,027,879 5,148,560 2,619,744 0 0 0 429,240 7,814,549 15,786 Total peak demand saved (kW): 1,158 938 588 299 0 0 0 49 0 2 Total kWh saved as a percentage of total 0.5361% 0.4905% 0.0802% 0.0000% 0.0000% 0.0000% 0.0005% 0.1576% 0.0131% 0.2391% kWh delivered (%): Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC 0.2125% 0.1721% 0.1079% 0.0549% 0.0000% 0.0000% 0.0000% 0.0090% 0.0000% 0.0003% peak kW load (%): 1 Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures \$ 1,288,663.24 \$ 1,212,402 \$ 37,838 \$ 251,762 \$ 893,552 27,850 \$ 1,399 S \$ \$ \$ \$ (\$): 2 Expenditures per KWh saved (\$/kWh): \$ 0.07 \$ 0.08 \$ 0.05 \$ 0.01 \$ \$ \$ 2.08 \$ 0.00 \$ 0.09 \$ --3 Expenditures per KW saved (\$/kW): 1.112.95 \$ 1.293.10 \$ 428.36 126.52 \$ \$ 18.235.76 \$ 776.34 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ --

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

Utility discount rate (%):

6.12 Note: Per discussion with OEB, Enwin has provided 2006 Utility Discount Rate

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 C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year:

<u>1. Residential Programs</u>

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

2006

Note: To ensure the integrity of th	e forn	nulas, please	insert the addition	nal r	ows in the midd	le of the list b	elow.				
	TR	C Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ N	et TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Re Gro Expe	eport Year oss C&DM enditures (\$)
Residential <50 Total	\$	1,284,336	\$ 251,762	\$	1,032,574	5.10	5,148,560	20,594,240	588	\$	251,762
Name of Program B				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program C				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program D				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program E				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program F				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program G				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program H				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program I				\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program J				\$	-	0.00					
*Totals App. B - Residential	\$	1,284,336	\$ 251,762	\$	1,032,574	5.10	5,148,560	20,594,240	588	\$	251,762
Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program											
Total Residential TRC Costs			\$ 251,762								
**Totals TRC - Residential	\$	1,284,336	\$ 251,762	\$	1,032,574	5.10					

2. Commercial Programs

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

|--|

	TR	C Benefits	тр	Costs (P)/)	¢ No	at TPC Bonofite	Benefit/Cost	Report Year Total	Lifecycle (kWh)	Total Peak Demand (kW)	Rep Gros	ort Year ss C&DM
GS>50 Total	¢	1 956 058	\$	1 004 333	¢ Ne	051 725	1.95	2 610 7//	35 588 160	200	¢	37 838
Name of Program B	Ψ	1,000,000	Ψ	1,004,000	\$		0.00	2,010,744	00,000,100	200	Ψ	07,000
Name of Program C					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program D					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program E					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program F					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program G					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program H					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program I					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program J					\$	-	0.00					
*Totals App. B - Commercial	\$	1,956,058	\$	1,004,333	\$	951,725	1.95	2,619,744	35,588,160	299	\$	37,838
Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program												
Total TRC Costs			\$	1,004,333								
**Totals TRC - Commercial	\$	1,956,058	\$	1,004,333	\$	951,725	1.95					

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.

	TDO Damafita			Demofit/Oeet			Total Peak	Report Year
	(PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Ratio	kWh Saved	Savings	Saved	Expenditures (\$)
Name of Program A			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program B			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Institutional	\$-	\$-	\$-	0.00	0	0	0	\$-
Institutional Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program								
Total TRC Costs		\$-						
**Totals TRC - Institutional	\$-	\$ -	\$-	0.00				

<u>4. Industrial Programs</u> List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.

Note: To ensure the integrity of th	e formulas, please	e insert the additio	mai rows in the midd	ne of the list b	elow.			
	700 D			D	D		Total Peak	Report Year
	IRC Benefits			Benefit/Cost	Report Year Total	Lifecycle (kwh)	Demand (KW)	Gross C&DM
	(PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Ratio	kWh Saved	Savings	Saved	Expenditures (\$)
Local Large Manufacturers - Total	\$-	\$-	\$-	0.00	0	0	0	\$-
Name of Program C			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$-	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Industrial	\$-	\$-	\$-	0.00	0	0	0	\$-
Industrial Indirect Costs not								
attributable to any specific program								
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.

	TDO D			D	Design (Marco Tatal		Total Peak	Report Year
	(PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Ratio	kWh Saved	Lifecycle (Kwh) Savings	Demand (KW) Saved	Expenditures (\$)
Name of Program A			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$-	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$-	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Agricultural	\$-	\$-	\$-	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
Agricultural Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program								
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 th	TR	C Benefits	msen				Benefit/Cost	Report Year Total	Lifecycle (kWh)	Total Peak Demand (kW)	F G	Report Year ross C&DM
		(PV)	TRC	Costs (PV)	\$ N	et TRC Benefits	Ratio	kWh Saved	Savings	Saved	Exp	penditures (\$)
System Loss Reduction - Total	\$	613,335	\$	893,552	-\$	280,217	0.69	429,240	17,169,600	49	\$	893,552
Name of Program B					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program C					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program D					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program E					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program F					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program G					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program H					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program I					\$	-	0.00					
Name of Program C					\$	-	0.00					
*Totals App. B - LDC System	\$	613,335	\$	893,552	-\$	280,217	0.69	429,240	17,169,600	49	\$	893,552
LDC System Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program												
Total TRC Costs			\$	893,552								
**Totals TRC - LDC System	\$	613,335	\$	893,552	-\$	280,217	0.69					

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.

Note. To ensure the integrity of th	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Co	osts (PV)	\$ Net TRC Bene	Benefit/Cos fits Ratio	t Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
Energy Conservation Media - Total	\$ -	\$	27,850	-\$ 27,8	50 0.00	7,814,549	0	0	\$ 27,850
Name of Program B				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program C				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program D				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program E				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program F				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program G				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program H				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program I				\$	- 0.00				
Name of Program J				\$	- 0.00				
*Totals App. B - Other #1	\$-	\$	27,850	-\$ 27,8	50 0.00	7,814,549	0	0	\$ 27,850
Other #1 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program									
Total TRC Costs		\$	27,850			_			
**Totals TRC - Other #1	\$ -	\$	27,850	-\$ 27,8	50 0.00				

9. Other #2 Programs

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

note. To ensure the integrity of th	TR	C Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (P	V)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Repo Gross Expend	rt Year C&DM itures (\$)
Home Improvements	\$	18,118	\$ 5,0	00	\$ 13,118	3.62	15,786	394,650	2	\$	1,399
Name of Program B					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program C					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program D					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program E					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program C					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program G					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program H					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program I					\$-	0.00					
Name of Program J					\$-	0.00					
*Totals App. B - Other #2	\$	18,118	\$ 5,0	00	\$ 13,118	3.62	15,786	394,650	2	\$	1,399
Other #2 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program											
Total TRC Costs			\$ 5,0	00							
**Totals TRC - Other #2	\$	18,118	\$ 5,0	00	\$ 13,118	3.62					

LDC's CDM PORTFOLIO TOTALS

	TR	C Benefits (PV)	TRC	Costs (PV)	\$ Ne	t TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Re	port Year Total kWh Saved	Lif	ecycle (kWh) Savings	[Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Re Gro Expe	eport Year oss C&DM enditures (\$)
*TOTALS FOR ALL APPENDIX B	\$	3,871,846	\$	2,182,497	\$	1,689,349	1.77	\$	16,027,879	\$	73,746,650	\$	938	\$	1,212,402
Any <u>other</u> Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program															
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS			\$	2,182,497											
**LDC' PORTFOLIO TRC	\$	3,871,846	\$	2,182,497	\$	1,689,349	1.77								

* 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.

A. Name of the Program:

System Loss Reduction/Power Factor Correction: Total

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

In 2006, Enwin completed its line loss reduction program, converting a heavily loaded 4.16 kV feeder to 27.6 kV.

Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delive 636 Measure life (years):	
Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delive 636 Measure life (years): Efficient technology:	applicable)
Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delive 636 Measure life (years):	
Number of participants or units delive 636	
Measure life (vears)	
Departing Very Life to date T	
IRC Results: Reporting fear Life-to-date I	RC Results
TRC Benefits (\$): \$ 613,334.69 \$	613,334.69
TRC Costs (\$): \$ 893,552.00 \$	893,552.00
Utility program cost (less incentives): \$ 893,552.00 \$	893,552.00
Participant cost: \$ - \$	-
Total TRC costs: \$ 893,552.00 \$	893,552.00
Net TRC (in year CDN \$): -\$ 280,217.31 -\$	280,217.31
	0.00
	0.69

Results: (one or more category may	y apply)		Cumulative Results
Conservation Programs:			
Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
	Winter		
	lifecycle	in year	
Energy saved (kWh):			
	cumulative lifecycle	cumulative in year	
Energy saved (kWh):			
Other resources saved :			
Natural Gas (m3):			
Other (specify):			
Demand Management Programs:			
Controlled load (kW)			
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	(KVVh):		
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	(<i>kWh</i>):		
Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	((kWh):		
Demand Response Programs:			
Dispatchable load (kW):			
Peak hours dispatched in year (hour	rs):		
Power Factor Correction Program			
Power Factor Correction Program	<u>15.</u>		
Amount of Kvar installed (Kvar).	hadining of year (9/);		
Distribution system power factor at a			
Distribution system power factor at e	end of year (%):		
Line Loss Reduction Programs:			
Peak load savings (kW):		49	
	lifecycle	in year	
Energy savngs (kWh):	17169600	429240	
Distributed Generation and Load	Displacement Programs:		
Amount of DG installed (kW).	Displacement r lograms.		
Energy generated (kW/h):			
Peak energy generated (kWh):			
Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type:			
Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type: Other Programs (specify):			

D.	Program Costs*:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life-to-Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 893,552.00	\$ 893,552.00
		Incremental O&M:		
		Incentive:		
		Total:	\$ 893,552.00	\$ 893,552.00
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:		
		Total:		
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		
		Incremental O&M:		
		Total:		

No charges to date.

¹ 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.

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.

A. Name of the Program:

Energy Conservation Media Campaign: Total

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

This is primarily a qualitative program, consisting of a radio campaign and print advertising.

Measure(s):

		Measure 1	M	easure 2 (if applicable)	Ν	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology: Efficient technology:					
	Number of participants or units delive	75921				
	Measure life (years):					
В.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year	L	ife-to-date TRC Results
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	-	\$	6,915.37
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	27,850.00	\$	79,401.55
	Ui	tility program cost (less incentives):	\$	27,850.00	\$	79,401.55
		Participant cost:	\$	-	\$	-
		Total TRC costs:	\$	27,850.00	\$	79,401.55
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-\$	27,850.00	-\$	72,486.18
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		0.00		0.09

Conservation Programs:			
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	0	10
	Winter	0	10
	lifecycle	in year	
Energy saved (kWh):	0	7814548.53	
	cumulative lifecycle	cumulative in year	
Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved :	205860	7866013.53	
Natural Gas (m3	<i>)):</i>		
Other (specify	<i>):</i>		
Demand Management Programs	<u>:</u>		
Controlled load (kW)			
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-pea	ak (kWh):		
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-pea	k (kWh):		
Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-pea	ak (kWh):		
Domand Boonanaa Bragrama			
Dienetekekle leed (kM):			
Dispatchable load (kvv).			
Peak nours dispatched in year (no	urs):		
Power Factor Correction Progra	ms:		
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):			
Distribution system power factor a	t begining of vear (%):		
Distribution system power factor a	t end of vear (%):		
Line Loss Reduction Programs:			
Peak load savings (kW):			
	lifecycle	in vear	
	mooyoro	in your	
Energy savngs (kWh):		in your	
Energy savngs (kWh):			
Energy savngs (kWh): Distributed Generation and Load	d Displacement Programs:		
Energy savngs (kWh): <u>Distributed Generation and Load</u> Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh):	d Displacement Programs:		
Energy savngs (kWh): <u>Distributed Generation and Load</u> Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh):	d Displacement Programs:		
Energy savngs (kWh): <u>Distributed Generation and Load</u> Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type:	d Displacement Programs:		
Energy savngs (kWh): <u>Distributed Generation and Load</u> Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type:	d Displacement Programs:		

D.	Program Costs*:		Reporting Year	Cu	mulative Life-to-Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:			
		Incremental O&M:	\$ 27,850.00	\$	79,499.05
		Incentive:		\$	-
		Total:	\$ 27,850.00	\$	79,499.05
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:			
		Incremental O&M:			
		Total:			
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:			
		Incremental O&M:			
		Total:			



¹ 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.

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.

A. Name of the Program:

Local Large Manufacturers: Total

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

All programs with large manufacturers are included here.

Measure(s):

		Measure 1	Μ	easure 2 (if applicable)	I	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology: Efficient technology:					
	Number of participants or units delive	1 in 2005				
	Measure life (years):					
В.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year	L	ife-to-date TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	-	\$	233,105.63
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	-	\$	171,015.29
	Ui	tility program cost (less incentives):	\$	-	\$	108.89
		Participant cost:	\$	-	\$	170,906.40
		Total TRC costs:	\$	-	\$	171,015.29
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	-	\$	62,090.34
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		0.00)	1.36

Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kM/)	Summer	0		156
Demand Savings (KW).	Winter	0		156
	lifecycle	U	in vear	150
Energy saved (kWh):	0	0	in year	
	cumulative lifecycle	0	umulative in vear	
Energy saved (kWh):	2890698	963566		
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas	(<i>m</i> 3):			
Other (sp	ecify):			
Demand Management Progra	ams:			
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 Decension Drawner				
Demand Response Programs	<u>s:</u>			
Dispatchable load (kw):	<i>"</i>			
Peak hours dispatched in year	(hours):			
Power Factor Correction Pro	grams:			
Amount of KVar installed (KVa	r):			
Distribution system power facto	or at begining of vear (%):			
Distribution system power facto	or at end of vear (%):			
,				
Line Loss Reduction Program	<u>ms:</u>			
Peak load savings (kW):				
	lifecycle		in year	
Energy savngs (kWh):				
Distributed Generation and L	oad Displacement Programs			
Amount of DG installed (kM).	Louis Displacement i Togranis.			
Energy generated (kWh).				
Peak energy generated (kWh):				
Fuel type:				

ar	Cumulative Life-to-Date
\$	-
- \$	55.40
- \$	13,290.68
- \$	13,346.08
0	53.49
0	53.49
- \$	120,549.60
- \$	50,356.80
- \$	170,906.40
	<u>ar</u> \$ -\$ -\$ -\$ 0 0 -\$ -\$ -\$

¹ 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.

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.

A. Name of the Program:

GS>50: Total

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

All programs with commercial/industrial customers excluding Large Use customers are included here.

Measure(s):

		Measure 1	Me	easure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:				
	Efficient technology:				
	Number of participants or units delive	3 in 2005, 3 in 2006			
	Measure life (years):				
В.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	1,956,058.04	\$ 2,058,144.24
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	1,004,332.60	\$ 1,034,080.28
	U	tility program cost (less incentives):	\$	663.72	\$ 2,723.89
		Participant cost:	\$	1,004,332.60	\$ 1,032,020.11
		Total TRC costs:	\$	1,004,996.32	\$ 1,034,744.00
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	951,725.44	\$ 1,024,063.96
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		1.95	1.99

Results: (one or more category m	ay apply)		Cumulative Results
Conservation Programs:			
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	299.0575765	353.3475765
	Winter	299.0575765	353.3475765
	lifecycle	in year	
Energy saved (kWh):	35588160.48	2619744.37	
	cumulative lifecycle	cumulative in year	
Energy saved (kWh):	37496964.48	3096945.37	
Other resources saved :			
Natural Gas (m3	3):		
Other (specify	/):		
Demand Management Programs	<u>::</u>		
Controlled load (KVV)			
Energy snifted On-peak to Mid-pea	ak (kvvn):		
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-pea	K (KVVN):		
Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-pea	ak (kWh):		
Demand Response Programs:			
Dispatchable load (kW):			
Peak hours dispatched in year (ho	urs):		
Power Factor Correction Progra	ms:		
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):			
Distribution system power factor a	t begining of vear (%):		
Distribution system power factor a	t end of year (%):		
Line Loss Reduction Programs			
Peak load savinas (kW):			
J	lifecycle	in year	
Energy savngs (kWh):			
Distributed Generation and Load	d Displacement Programs:		
Amount of DG installed (kW):	· · · · · · · · ·		
Energy generated (kWh):			
Peak energy generated (kWh):			
Fuel type:			
Other Programs (specify):			

D.	Program Costs*:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life-to-Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:	\$ 663.72	\$ 2,663.72
		Incentive:	\$ 37,174.53	\$ 43,756.68
		Total:	\$ 37,838.25	\$ 46,420.40
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:		60.17
		Total:	0	60.17
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	\$ 1,004,332.60	\$ 1,032,020.11
		Incremental O&M:	\$ -	\$ -
		Total:	\$ 1,004,332.60	\$ 1,032,020.11



¹ 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.

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.

A. Name of the Program:

GS>50, Intermediate and Large Use Remaining: Confidential Customer 1 - Various Upgrades Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

Incentive provided to Confidential Customer 1 for successful completion of various upgrades including installation of VSD's to control City water booster pumps, lighting upgrade to T8 and HPS, building envelope improvements, CO garage exhaust control, individual metering, in-suite conservation measures. Details of each of these measures can be obtained from the utility by request.

	Measure(s):				
		Measure 1	ſ	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:				
	Efficient technology:				
	Number of participants or units delive	1			
	Measure life (years):				
_				-	
З.	TRC Results:				
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	1,900,960.40	
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	995,413.00	
	U	Itility program cost (less incentives):	\$	-	
		Participant cost:	\$	995,413.00	
		Total TRC costs:	\$	995,413.00	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	905,547.40	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		1.91	

Results: (one or more category may	/ apply)	
Conservation Programs:		
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	260.5768265
• • • •	Winter	260.5768265
	lifecycle	in year
Energy saved (kWh):	34239795	2282653
Other resources saved :		
Natural Gas (m3):		
Other (specify):		
Domand Management Programs:		
Controlled load (kW)		
Energy shifted On-neak to Mid-neak	(k M/b)	
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	(kl/h):	
Energy shifted Mid-neak to Off-neak	(k(M))	
Energy shinted wild peak to on peak		
Demand Response Programs:		
Dispatchable load (kW):		
Peak hours dispatched in year (hour	rs):	
Power Factor Correction Program	s:	
Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	<u></u>	
Distribution system power factor at b	pegining of vear (%):	
Distribution system power factor at e	and of vear (%):	
Line Loss Reduction Programs:		
Peak load savings (kW):		
	lifecycle	ın 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.	Program Costs*:		
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Incentive:	\$ 31,485.13
		Total:	\$ 31,485.13
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	0
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	\$ 995,413.00 based on proposal
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	\$ 995,413.00 based on proposal



¹ 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.

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 custome 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.

A. Name of the Program:

GS>50, Intermediate and Large Use Remaining: Confidential Customer 2 - Lighting Upgrade Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

Incentive provided to Confidential Customer 2 for successful completion of lighting upgrades.

Measure(s):

	()	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if a	pplicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	40, 50, 60, 75 and 100 W incande	escent		
	Efficient technology:	11, 15 and 23 W CFLs			
	Number of participants or units delive	s 1209			
	Measure life (years):	4	4		
B.	TRC Results:				
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	27,055.22	
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	4,459.80	
	L	Jtility program cost (less incentives):	\$	-	
		Participant cost:	\$	4,459.80	
		Total TRC costs:	\$	4,459.80	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	22,595.42	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		6.07	

Results: (one or more category may	apply)		
Conservation Programs:			
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	5.58075	
	Winter	5.58075	
	lifecycle	in y	/ear
Energy saved (kWh):	195549.48	48887.37	
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 Beenenee Dreamone			
Demand Response Programs:			
Dispatchable load (KW):	2):		
Feak nours dispatched in year (nours	5).		
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	nd of year (%):		
Line Loss Reduction Programs:			
Peak load savings (kW):			
U (<i>)</i>	lifecycle	in y	/ear
Energy savngs (kWh):			
Distributed Constation and Load F	Visplacoment Programs:		
Amount of DG installed (kW).	Displacement Programs.		
Energy generated (kWh):			
Peak energy generated (kWh):			
Fuel type:			
Other Programs (specify):			
Metric (specify):			

D. Program Costs*:		
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Incentive:	\$ 1,715.07
	Total:	\$ 1,715.07
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	0
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	\$ 4,459.80
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	\$ 4.459.80



¹ 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.

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 custome 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.

A. Name of the Program:

GS>50, Intermediate and Large Use Remaining: Confidential Customer 3 Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):

Incentive provided to Confidential Customer 3 for successful completion of lighting upgrades.

Measure(s):

		Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	60W incandescent		
	Efficient technology:	13W fluorescent		
	Number of participants or units deliv	¢ 1200		
	Measure life (years):	4		
	TDO De sultas			
В.	IRC Results:			
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$ 28,042.42	
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$ 4,459.80	
	U	tility program cost (less incentives):	\$ -	
		Participant cost:	\$ 4,459.80	
		Total TRC costs:	\$ 4,459.80	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$ 23,582.62	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):	6.29	

C. <u>Results:</u> (one or more category may apply)

Conservation Programs:			
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	32.9	
	Winter	32.9	
	lifecycle	in year	
Energy saved (kWh):	1152816	288204	
Other resources saved :			
Natural Gas (n	n3):		
Other (spec	ify):		

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	(kWh):					
Demand Response Programs:						
Dispatchable load (kW):						
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours	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	nd 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):						
ruel type:						
Other Programs (specify):						

D.	Program Costs*:		
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Incentive:	\$ 3,974.33
		Total:	\$ -
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	\$ 4,459.80
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	\$ 4,459.80

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 custome 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.

A. Name of the Program:

Residential and GS<50: Total

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

Educational retail event primarily involved CFL giveaways, discounts off additional CFLs, programmable thermostats and SLEDs

Measure(s):

		Measure 1	Me	easure 2 (if applicable)	ſ	Veasure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	60W incandescent	100W incandescent		Existing Thermostat	
	Efficient technology:	15W Philips CFL	27W P	hilips CFL	Prog	rammable Thermostat
	Number of participants or units delive	52936	1039		101	
	Measure life (years):	4	4			
В.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year	Li	ife-to-date TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	1,284,335.97	\$	1,284,335.97
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	251,762.41	\$	251,802.52
	U	Itility program cost (less incentives):	\$	251,762.41	\$	251,802.52
		Participant cost:				
		Total TRC costs:	\$	251,762.41	\$	251,802.52
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	1,032,573.56	\$	1,032,533.45
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		5.10		5.10

Results: (one or more category ma	ay apply)		Cumulative Results		
Conservation Programs:					
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	587.7351598	587.7351598		
	Winter	587.7351598	587.7351598		
	lifecycle	in year			
Energy saved (kWh):	20594240	5148560			
	cumulative lifecycle	cumulative in year			
Energy saved (kWh):	20594240	5148560			
Other resources saved :					
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				
Demand Management Programs					
Controlled lood (kM)	<u>-</u>				
Energy obiffed On peak to Mid per	$\lambda (k A/b)$				
Energy shifted On peak to Off pea	k (k V I I)				
Energy shifted Mid peak to Off-pea	K (KVVII).				
Energy shined Mid-peak to On-pea	ik (KVVII).				
Demand Response Programs:					
Dispatchable load (kW):					
Peak hours dispatched in year (ho	urs):				
Power Factor Correction Progra	ms:				
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):					
J	lifecvcle	in vear			
Enerav savnas (kWh):					
Distributed Generation and Load	I Displacement Programs:				
Amount of DG Installed (KW):					
Energy generated (KWN):					
Feak energy generated (KWN): Fuel type:					
Other Programs (specify):					

D.	Program Costs*:		Reporting Year		Cumulative Life-to-Date	
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:				
		Incremental O&M:	\$ 251,762.41	\$	251,762.41	
		Incentive:				
		Total:	\$ 251,762.41	\$	251,762.41	
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:				
		Incremental O&M:			40.11	
		Total:			40.11	
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:				
		Incremental O&M:				
		Total:				



¹ 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.

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.

A. Name of the Program: Home Improvements - Little River Acres (Home Audit and Retrofit Grant Program)

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

In 2005, ENWIN established a relationship with the Little River Acres Association, an electrically heated subdivision, and a local Energuide for Houses home auditor. Efforts culminated in a discount energy audit program for electrically heated homes and an agreement to match NRCan grants for upgrades verified in a second home audit. This program gamered significant media attention and further promotion by the mayor and then Energy Minister, Dwight Duncan. ENWIN has contributed toward 10 free audits and 23 discounted audits. ENWIN is most pleased to report that four households (two in 2006) took steps to improve their efficiency by way of window and door upgrades. As agreed, ENWIN rewarded these efforts by matching the Natural Resources Canada grant given to households that improve their energy efficiency rating. Unfortunately, the government's Energuide for Houses program was cancelled in 2006 and so there were no further discounted audits. conducted.

Measure(s):

		Measure 1	Me	easure 2 (if applicable)	Measur	e 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	Pre-retrofit home				
	Efficient technology:	Post-retrofit home				
	Number of participants or units deliv	ε 4				
	Measure life (years):	25				
B.	TRC Results:			Reporting Year	Life-to-d	ate TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	18,117.56	\$	18,117.56
	TRC Costs (\$):		\$	5,000.00	\$	8,663.81
	L	Itility program cost (less incentives):	\$	-	\$	2,513.81
		Participant cost:	\$	5,000.00	\$	6,150.00
		Total TRC costs:	\$	5,000.00	\$	8,663.81
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	13,117.56	\$	9,453.75
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		3.62		2.09

Results: (one or more category ma	ay apply)		Cumulative Results	
Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	1.802054795	1.802054795	
	Winter	1.802054795	1.802054795	
	lifecycle	in year		
Energy saved (kWh):	394650	15786		
	cumulative lifecycle	cumulative in year		
Energy saved (kWh):	394650	15786		
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3)):			
Other (specify):			
Demand Management Programs:	<u> </u>			
Controlled load (kW)				
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-pea	k (kWh):			
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peal	k (kWh):			
Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-pea	k (kWh):			
Demond Deeneyee Dreament				
Dispetabable lood (kM/):				
Dispatchable load (KVV).				
reak nours dispatched in year (not				
Power Factor Correction Program				
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).	bioplacement rograms.			
Energy generated (kWh):				
Peak energy generated (kWh):				
Fuel type:				
-71° -				
Other Programs (specify):				
Metric (specify):				

D.	Program Costs*:			Reporting Year		Cumulative Life-to-Date	
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:					
		Incremental O&M:			\$	2,513.81	
		Incentive:	\$	1,399.00	\$	1,399.00	
		Total:	\$	1,399.00	\$	3,912.81	
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:					
		Incremental O&M:					
		Total:					
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	\$	5,000.00	\$	5,000.00	
		Incremental O&M:	above	number is an estimate	\$	1,150.00	
		Total:	\$	5,000.00	\$	6,150.00	



¹ 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.

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.

A. Name of the Program:

Traffic Engineering-LED: Total

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

The City of Windsor is no longer going forward on an LED traffic light program. However, the City has selected a contractor to commence a feasibility study with the intent to enter into an energy performance agreement with the City for 122 buildings. Once this feasibility study is complete, the City will be in the position to apply for the conservation and demand management incentives. ENWIN is at this stage unsure if the City will be able to complete any upgrades as a result of this performance contract in time to take advantage of incentives.

	Measure(s):				
		Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3	(if applicable)
	Base case technology:				
	Efficient technology:				
	Number of participants or units delive	ered:			
	Measure life (years):				
	700 0 1				TRO R 14
в.	TRC Results:		Reporting Year	Life-to-date	e TRC Results:
	TRC Benefits (\$):				
	TRC Costs (\$):			\$	16.72
	U	tility program cost (less incentives):		\$	16.72
		Participant cost:			
		Total TRC costs:		\$	16.72
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):			-\$	16.72
	Repetit to Cost Ratio (TRC Repetits/	TRC Costs):			0.00
	Beneficite Cost Mallo (The Deficitio)	nno oosisj.			0.00

C.	Results: (one or more category may	r apply)		Cumulative Results
	Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW):	Summer Winter		
		lifecycle	in year	
	Energy saved (kWh):	aumulativa lifaavala	oumulativa in voor	
	Energy saved (kWh):	cumulative mecycle	cumulative in year	
	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): Distribution system power factor at b Distribution system power factor at b Distribution system power factor at e	(kWh): (kWh): (kWh): s): <u>s:</u> negining of year (%): and of year (%):		
	reak loau 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:	Displacement Programs:		
	Other Programs (specify): Metric (specify):			

D.	Program Costs*:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life-to-Date
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:		
		Incentive:		
		Total:		
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
		Incremental O&M:		16.72
		Total:		16.72
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		
		Incremental O&M:		
		Total:		



¹ 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.

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.