

GRIMSBY POWER INCORPORATED

ANNUAL REPORT

to

ONTARIO ENERGY BOARD

on

Conservation and Demand Management Programs

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
Shared NEPPA Activities	4
GPI/Local Activities	4
2. Evaluation of the CDM Plan.....	5
3. Discussion of Programs	5
➤ Co-branding	6
• Don't be a Fridge Magnet.....	6
• LED Christmas Light Exchange Program	6
• Conserver Joe.....	6
➤ Energy Audit.....	6
• Windows Program	7
➤ Energy Audit (GS>50 class).....	7
• Lighting Seminar	7
➤ Smart Metering	7
➤ Distribution Loss.....	8
Next Steps	8
4. Lessons Learned.....	8
Utility Size Challenges	8
Shared Initiatives	9
Local Initiatives	9
Customer Education Programs	9
Summary	10
5. Conclusion	10

**Grimsby Power Incorporated
C&DM Plan Annual Report for 2006**

1. Introduction

The following report is the Grimsby Power Incorporated (GPI) results and activities relating to Conservation and Demand Management (CDM) during the calendar year 2006. In this introductory section we will provide some of the approval background for the plan and then an overview of the activities and results of those activities.

The GPI CDM plan was based on Niagara Erie Public Power Alliance (NEPPA) Conservation and Demand Management Plan (Ontario Energy Board File No. RP-2004-0203). The GPI Market Adjusted Revenue Requirement of \$221,750 over the plan period was approved by the OEB on March 23rd, 2005 (Board File No. RP-2004-0203 / EB 2004-0523). The NEPPA plan had nine (9) applications filed and comprised of Canadian Niagara Power Inc. Grimsby Power Inc., Haldimand County Hydro Inc. Niagara Falls Hydro Inc., Niagara On The Lake Hydro Inc., Norfolk Power Distribution Inc., Peninsula West Utilities Limited Inc., St. Catharines Hydro Utility Services Inc., and Welland Hydro-Electric System Corp. Each LDC filed a separate schedule, which outlined their specific plan. Schedule 2 of the plan documents the GPI projects and customers associated with the various initiatives.

The following table shows the approved plan expenditures by project as well as actual expenditures to December 31, 2006.

Project	Target Customers	Approved Expenditures	Expenditures in 2006	Expenditures to Dec. 31, 2006	Percent Spent
Co-branded Mass Market Program	All Users	\$50,250	\$31,500.54	\$42,319.17	84.22%
Smart Metering / Prepaid Metering Program	Residential and small commercial (<50 kW)	\$39,750	-	\$5,128.28	12.90%
Energy Audits Programs	Residential and small commercial (<50 kW)	\$15,500	\$6,718.77	\$7,992.74	51.57%
Smart Metering / Interval Metering Program	Large commercial (>50kW)	\$22,500	-	\$00.00	0%

**Grimsby Power Incorporated
C&DM Plan Annual Report for 2006**

Energy Audits / Feasibility Audits	Large commercial (>50kW)	\$2,750	\$2,612.53	\$2,838.56	103.22%
Distribution Loss Reduction	All Users	\$91,000	-	\$27,208.44	29.90
Total		\$221,750	\$40,831.84	\$85,487.73	38.55%

As shown in the table, some of the planned projects are underway and smart metering is not going to be implemented due to government regulation. However, it is now our intention to shift these funds to other programs that is going to benefit the same customer groups.

To make our initiatives as cost effective and beneficial for our customers as possible, we have shared and continue to share programs with other utilities as well as implementing local programs specifically designed for our customers and their needs. In the following information we provide an overview of each of these shared and local programs.

Shared NEPPA Activities

As an active participant with the NEPPA group we have helped and continue to develop the “Conserver Family” customer education and information program. This program includes an introductory booklet, energy saving bill inserts, radio scripts and a web site for “Conserver Family” energy saving tips directly at www.conserverjoe.com/np/ or on our website at www.grimsbypower.com/conservation. GPI has paid to continue this ongoing program to educate customers on ways of saving energy and monies.

NEPPA utilities also used the group buying power to purchase LED Christmas lights to be distributed locally.

GPI/Local Activities

The following is a listing and an overview of local programs initiated by GPI specifically for our customers:

- Educational Initiatives:
We continued to provide educational sessions to customers, which does not form part of the spending with the exception of Conserver Joe, which requires on going website maintenance. This initiative was delivered to:
 - Town Council, which is delivered via the local community channel to customers in our area both live and later by videotape.

Grimsby Power Incorporated
C&DM Plan Annual Report for 2006

- Service Clubs have invited GPI to speak to them on critical issues and we have taken advantage of the opportunity to deliver our key message.
- Lighting Seminar:
Large industrial users of power were invited to participate in a seminar aimed at reducing their power bill through more energy efficient lighting.
- Load Control
We are studying ways to implement load control systems along with the Smart Meter Technologies.
- Electrical Distribution System Loss Reduction and system improvements.
In 2005 preliminary work was completed to analyse opportunities and plan for distribution system efficiency improvements. We were delayed in implementation in 2006. However, we expect to complete this activity in 2007.
- Green Power Study
We have initiated a proposal regarding Green Energy and potentially Greening the Community.

2. Evaluation of the CDM Plan

We have continued to move cautiously throughout 2006 as we are examining some lessons learned by others so that we can be assured of prudent programs aimed at delivering a high value for our customers. We remain concerned that there is now an adjustment to the total resource costing (TRC) due to OEB decisions.

Despite our decision, the programs we offered our customers were well received and appeared to be accepted by many consumers. We continue to believe that many consumers want/need some financial incentive/rebate to prod them into purchasing more expensive items like a CFL versus an incandescent bulb.

In our preliminary discussions with larger commercial customers it appears they need a minimum one-year payback to cover it off in an existing budget. This will be a challenge to effectively deliver programs to this customer class.

For 2006, we were focused on Co-branding / Mass Marketing and Residential Energy Audit programs. Our programs were successful in reducing 2,000,000 lifetime kWhs and 150,000 kWh for the year. The benefit / cost ratio was 3.76 to 1 while peak demand was reduced by 51kW.

For 2007, we plan to focus Distribution Loss programs and the Smart Metering monies, which we plan to move into other areas to assist that customer group conserve. We have purchased software in 2007 to effectively calculate and reduce our distribution losses as an indication of our commitment to this area.

3. Discussion of Programs

GPI delivered the following programs to customers.

➤ **Co-branding**

These programs were targeted at residential and small commercial customers.

• ***Don't be a Fridge Magnet***

This program encouraged customers to remove old secondary “beer” refrigerators. GPI offered free pickup and recycling of the secondary fridge through a local appliance recycler. The cost was slightly more than the value in the TRC to ensure the refrigerator was disposed of in an environmentally friendly way so that landfills were not be burdened by the program. GPI also offered a free \$30 Coupon Package that allowed customers to redeem coupons at a local Canadian Tire for 6 free 13 watt CFLs and a free appliance timer. The energy savings were substantial for the 62 customers who participated. The net present value (NPV) of the Total Resource Cost (TRC) was \$17,700 with a 3 to 1 benefit/cost ratio for the refrigerator retirement only. The benefit/cost ratio of the CFLs and appliance timer giveaways were 12 to 1 because only incremental costs were included. Next year, the OPA is administering an appliance retirement program (not just refrigerators) that should have greater benefits if more than one type of appliance is picked up for the same service call.

• ***LED Christmas Light Exchange Program***

Two (2) free sets of LED lights were given to our customers in exchange for one (1) set of old incandescent lights. This program proved very popular as 2,148 sets of lights were given out. The program was promoted by newspaper advertising and customer bill inserts. This program was a huge success as the NPV of the TRC was \$31,400 with a 4.3 to 1 benefit / cost ratio. This program could be run again but on a smaller scale as customer demand may be lower as we had some lights left over, which we were able to sell to another NEPPA LDC who had not run the program.

• ***Conservor Joe***

This was an educational program that was jointly developed by the NEPPA group. We made Conservor Joe a few years back in an initial attempt to promote conservation prior to a regulated requirement. We further developed Conservor Joe to have a family consisting of a wife and children. The booklet we developed was an effort to reach the entire family through the educational messages.

For 2006, we maintained our website. We also worked with District School Board of Niagara that has developed an entire educational program.

➤ **Energy Audit**

This program was targeted at residential and small commercial customers.

- ***Windows Program***

This was a rebate program offered in partnership with 5 local window contractors. A \$75 rebate was offered for each window having a price over \$250. The window installed had to be Energy Star efficient. GPI paid \$25 of the rebate and the \$50 balance was offered by the local contractor. This joint program saw 179 energy efficient windows installed by 17 customers. The NPV of the TRC was \$6,900 with a 2.5 to 1 benefit/cost ratio. We expect to re-introduce the program in 2007 because it is an effective program and appeared additional customers would participate again in this type of program. We found that the rebates provided by the retailers as an incentive, \$50, actually reduced the incremental cost to customers to a negative value. This means that the customer is saving more than the cost to go to an energy efficient window than the actual incremental cost.

This should see the balance of the budgeted funds spent in 2007.

- ***Energy Audit (GS>50 class)***

- ***Lighting Seminar***

Nine (9) individuals representing six (6) large industrial users of power attended our lighting seminar held at the Casablanca Winery Inn. A spreadsheet presentation by Bill Dodds was shown over breakfast with Linda Conejo from Sylvania available to answer questions about lighting products. The seminar was well received with positive responses and questions. Unfortunately, no TRC benefit can be calculated but we showed our large users of power how to save through energy efficient lighting, which we consider as 'low hanging fruit'. However, we feel that these programs are important in educating the consumer. We plan on assisting this customer group to install LED lamps that could be placed in exit signs as we transfer Smart Metering monies to this group.

- ***Smart Metering***

This program was targeted at residential and small commercial customers.

GPI joined the Ontario Utility Smart Metering group (OUSM) to partner with other LDCs to effectively pilot and study the best solutions for GPI. Cooperatively, OUSM tested many technologies from Smart Meters to communication protocols. OUSM proactively engaged LDCs and manufacturing companies to provide a detailed analysis of the test results, which were shared between all participants. December 13, 2005 the results of this initiative were presented to the participants. Unfortunately, the government introduced legislation prohibiting LDCs from further funding this initiative. Therefore, this project from a CDM initiative is complete and it is difficult to assess any TRC benefit, so none is provided.

No further programs were spent in 2006. However, we plan to shift these monies to other programs to benefit the targeted customer groups.

➤ ***Distribution Loss***

This program was targeted to assist all customer classes served by GPI.

GPI has initiated a long-term plan to analyze the overall lowest cost line construction methodology to reduce the system losses within our LDC. In 2005, we initiated a line rebuild, which will eventually tie into an alternative power supply, which will lower our overall system losses. One portion of this project was completed in 2005 and the balance was to be done in 2006. As part of this work, we are optimizing conductor size and installing lower impedance transformers to reduce the losses currently in the system. It is also our intention to eliminate older distribution stations. The transformers in these distribution stations have high impedance losses that compound the overall system losses. Since this project is only partially finished, we have estimated the TRC benefit solely for the portion of the line that was constructed in 2005.

No additional programs were initiated in 2006 but software was purchased in 2007 to calculate and reduce distribution loss. We also plan to complete the new in 2007. We had previously expected to do this work in 2006. This new line will bring power to the community and reduce the system losses.

Next Steps

GPI is committed to working with partners to deliver programs\joint ventures to effectively deliver CDM. In 2007, we plan to:

- Continue customer education through the further development of Conserver Joe with NEPPA LDCs;
- Deliver energy saving ideas and free products such as fridge/freezer thermometers, an energy saving board game and four 13 watt CFLs at trade shows or senior homes.
- Sign a master agreement with the OPA to participate in 4 new programs: appliance retirement, business incentive, summer challenge and residential demand;
- Our focus will be on finding ways to effectively spend our Distribution Loss and Smart Metering monies
- We are planning to continue with the Windows Replacement program, as this would be an effective way to spend our approved Energy Audit budget.

4. Lessons Learned

Utility Size Challenges

As a relatively small utility (approximately 9,500 customers) we face challenges that larger utilities do not share. Costs to initiate and operate CDM programs are generally not dependent on utility size. This makes program development and administration cost control difficult. In addition, meeting regulatory and reporting requirements, while important, become a high cost when compared to the overall program budget. These regulatory costs are typically independent

Grimsby Power Incorporated
C&DM Plan Annual Report for 2006

of utility size. A regulatory cost of \$20,000 may be a relatively insignificant in a budget of millions of dollars but significantly reduces the funds available for customer programs when a total CDM budget is \$221,750! Further, larger utilities are able to use dedicated staff while smaller LDCs assign CDM to an existing staff member along with the myriad of other duties they are required to perform.

A smaller budget restricts the programs that smaller LDCs can offer their customers. This means that customers in smaller LDCs are being disadvantaged to the types of programs being run in larger neighbouring LDCs. This means that the province as a whole is missing an opportunity to reduce load symmetrically across the province.

It appears the provincially funded CDM programs locally delivered allows the province to collectively reduce load. Thereby it maintains the confidence of customers in their local LDC, with a continued position of trust and reliability, and it provides customers with a common collective message from all entities, government, OPA and LDCs. This avoids mixed and confused messages if we are all trying to do our own CDM 'thing'.

GPI has determined that the Windows Replacement program is worth repeating in 2007, as budgeted monies in Energy Audit must be spent. This program has a positive NPV as determined by the TRC software that we use. Our customers responded positively to this program in 2006.

Shared Initiatives

Without question shared initiatives reduce the cost component in delivery of CDM programs. Where they apply to our customer groups, they have proven to be a very effective way of implementing CDM.

Programs can be offered provincially and delivered locally. This way it reduces administration costs and offers a common province wide initiative to the benefit of all consumers and the reduction of demand for the province, which benefits all consumers. Therefore, the 4 new OPA C&DM initiatives listed in Next Steps above should benefit GPI customers with reduced costs.

Local Initiatives

Our own local programs can be effective as long as we can minimize staff time, which has not had any administration costs to date. For example, keep it simple and partner with others who are willing/able to provide administrative support and management of the initiative. This we believe can be best done by the OPA with utility involvement in program design. Customers appear to have a trust in their local utility and see them as their trusted expert in electricity matters. However, the OPA needs to save LDC harmless of risk and work with LDCs to adequate plan the programs at the grass roots versus the '35,000' level.

Customer Education Programs

Grimsby Power Incorporated
C&DM Plan Annual Report for 2006

Customer education remains extremely important, as most customers know little about electricity. An educated customer helps energy efficiency become more of a focus for future consumers of electricity. Certainly one of the lessons learned during 2006 is that, while education is important, it is impossible to quantify the results of customer education. (There is no test.) Statistically accurate survey information is expensive and this expense is of particular concern when the CDM budget is relatively small. Further studies have shown that a cultural change takes many years of continued efforts to achieve the desired results.

The result of this issue with customer education and the validation of results is that this type of CDM component may be stopped in future, unless some type of reduction in the requirements for TRC analysis is made for important customer education initiatives.

Summary

There are 3 key aspects that we should be emphasised on C&DM for the future. They are:

- Customer Education – we need to continue to educate customers on the value of CDM from a total resource adequacy perspective and that while some costs may increase, overall their total costs will go down.
- Consistent Messages – customers need to hear a clear and consistent message from all players to avoid duplication of effort.
- Pay Back – customers want and need to know the pay back of their efforts. Unfortunately, many will not engage a program that is outside of 12 months. Some how we need to determine a strategy that will see these customers engaged.

5. Conclusion

In 2006 CDM the programs GPI was involved with were well received by our customers. Many customers appear to understand and they appear to want to help reduce demand. However, most are unwilling to change/ forfeit comfort. GPI saw a decrease in our total kWh sales despite adding about 100 new customers and our demand grew over 2005, which was significantly warmer than 2006. Customers also need to hear a consistent message from all players active with CDM.

Grimsby Power Incorporated is committed to CDM. It makes sense for everyone and we will continue to offer programs that benefit our customers (in both the short and long term). However, we believe that the best way to deliver CDM is provincially funded locally delivered programs.

Sharing costs and ideas only makes sense to effectively deliver CDM programs and to achieve the desired results.

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.

	⁶ Cumulative Totals Life-to-date	Total for 2006	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Agricultural	LDC System	⁴ Smart Meters	Other #1	Other #2
Net TRC value (\$):	126700.00	\$ 77,200	\$ 77,200	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
Benefit to cost ratio:	2.42	5.61	5.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Number of participants or units delivered:	41714.35	12440	12,431		9						
Lifecycle (kWh) Savings:	3111252.83	1,999,566	1,999,566	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh):	243826.48	154,152	154,152	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total peak demand saved (kW):	51	51	51	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):	0.14%	0.17%	0.17%								
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):		0.03%	0.03%								
¹ Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures (\$):	\$ 85,488	\$ 40,831	\$ 37,881	\$ -	\$ 2,950	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
² Expenditures per kWh saved (\$/kWh):	0.35	\$ 0.02	\$ 0.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
³ Expenditures per kW saved (\$/kW):	1,676.63	\$ 800.81	\$ 742.95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -
Utility discount rate (%):	8.13										

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:** Refrigerator Retirement Program

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

Pick up of old refrigerators and a free \$30 Coupon Package which includes 6 Free 13W CFL Bulbs and 1 Appliance Timer

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
<i>Base case technology:</i>	Keep using secondary fridge		
<i>Efficient technology:</i>	Removal of secondary fridge		
<i>Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:</i>	62		
<i>Measure life (years):</i>	6		
<i>Number of Participants or units delivered life to date</i>	62		

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 26,732.00	
² TRC Costs (\$):		
<i>Utility program cost (excluding incentives):</i>	\$ 2,336.00	
<i>Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)</i>	\$ 6,696.00	
<i>Total TRC costs:</i>	\$ 9,032.00	
<i>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</i>	\$ 17,700.00	
<i>Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):</i>	\$ 2.96	

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

Conservation Programs:

<i>Demand savings (kW):</i>	<i>Summer</i>	15.19212329		
	<i>Winter</i>	16.05205479		
<i>Energy saved (kWh):</i>	<i>lifecycle</i>	401760	<i>in year</i>	66960
<i>Other resources saved :</i>			<i>Cumulative Lifecycle</i>	<i>Cumulative Annual Savings</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>		
<i>Distribution system power factor at beginning of year (%):</i>		
<i>Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):</i>		

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW): lifecycle in year

Energy savings (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. <u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Cumulative Life to Date</u>
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 7,440.00	
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 2,336.00	
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$ 9,776.00	
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

For the \$30 Coupon Package items the TRC Benefits are calculated separately

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:** 6 Free 13W CFLs

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

Distributed as part of the refrigerator retirement program.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
<i>Base case technology:</i>	Incandescent 60W bulb		
<i>Efficient technology:</i>	13W CFL Bulb		
<i>Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:</i>		372	
<i>Measure life (years):</i>		4	
 <i>Number of Participants or units delivered life to date</i>			

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 8,370.00	
² TRC Costs (\$):		
<i>Utility program cost (excluding incentives):</i>	\$ -	
<i>Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)</i>	\$ 670.00	
<i>Total TRC costs:</i>	\$ 670.00	
<i>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</i>	\$ 7,700.00	
 <i>Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):</i>	\$ 12.49	

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

Conservation Programs:

<i>Demand savings (kW):</i>	<i>Summer</i>		
	<i>Winter</i>	7.533	
 <i>Energy saved (kWh):</i>	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>	<i>Cumulative Lifecycle</i>
<i>Other resources saved :</i>			<i>Cumulative Annual Savings</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>		
<i>Distribution system power factor at beginning of year (%):</i>		
<i>Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):</i>		

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW): lifecycle in year

Energy savings (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. <u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Cumulative Life to Date</u>
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 939.31	
	Incremental O&M:		
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$ 939.31	
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

TRC Benefits calculated for a 15W CFL as a 13W CFL was not in the Assumptions and Measures listing.

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:** Appliance Timers

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

1 Free Appliance Timer was given for each refrigerator pick up. This timer controls one of the following: heaters, air conditioners, heavy-duty lamps or appliances.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
<i>Base case technology:</i>	No appliance timer		
<i>Efficient technology:</i>	Timer		
<i>Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:</i>	62		
<i>Measure life (years):</i>	20		
 <i>Number of Participants or units delivered life to date</i>			

	<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Life-to-date TRC Results:</u>
B. TRC Results:		
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 6,749.62	
² TRC Costs (\$):		
<i>Utility program cost (excluding incentives):</i>	\$ -	
<i>Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)</i>	\$ 549.62	
<i>Total TRC costs:</i>	\$ 549.62	
<i>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</i>	\$ 6,200.00	
 <i>Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):</i>	 \$ 12.28	

	<u>Cumulative Results:</u>	
C. Results: (one or more category may apply)		
Conservation Programs:		
<i>Demand savings (kW):</i>	<i>Summer</i>	
	<i>Winter</i>	5.267327586
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
<i>Energy saved (kWh):</i>	162936	8,146.80
<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>		
<i>Distribution system power factor at beginning of year (%):</i>		
<i>Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):</i>		

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):			
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>	
Energy savings (kWh):			

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):		
Energy generated (kWh):		
Peak energy generated (kWh):		
Fuel type:		

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):		
-------------------	--	--

D. Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 610.69	
	Incremental O&M:		
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$ 610.69	
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Used outdoor lights for TRC Benefits and assumed 1/2 energy savings by reducing the number distributed by 1/2.

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:** Window Replacement

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

Energy efficient windows over \$250 were installed with a \$50 rebate per window from the vendor. Grimsby Power paid an additional \$25 rebate.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Existing windows		
Efficient technology:	Energy efficient windows		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	179		
Measure life (years):	25		
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	179		

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 11,236.98	
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$ 2,573.33	
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	-\$ 6,436.35	
Total TRC costs:	-\$ 3,863.02	
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	\$ 15,100.00	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	-\$ 2.91	

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	2		
	Winter	5.325581395		

	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	138532.5406	5,541.30		
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):	43554	1742.16		
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 savings (kWh):				

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):		
------------------------------	--	--

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

D. Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 2,573.33	
	Incentive:	\$ 4,475.00	
	Total:	\$ 7,048.33	
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

The Calculated TRC values were not done using the TRC tables but rather with the data and information contained within a report titled "Potential Savings for Energy Star Windows, Doors and Skylights" completed on behalf of Natural Resources Canada by Enermodal Engineering in 2005. Vendor rebates of \$50 per window were included as an incentive in this program because they are neither utility customer costs. The incremental cost of installing an energy efficient 15 square foot window was determined to be \$10 from an independent vendor. Natural gas savings are calculated based on future gas pricing supplied by Union Gas and using the NPDI discount rate for the NPV calculation of those savings.

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:** LED Christmas light exchange

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

Exchange 1 set of incandescent lights for 2 new sets of LED lights

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Incandescent Christmas lights		
Efficient technology:	LED lights		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	2148		
Measure life (years):	40		
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	1076		

TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 40,875.25	
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$ 1,152.20	
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$ 8,323.05	
Total TRC costs:	\$ 9,475.25	
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	\$ 31,400.00	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	\$ 4.31	

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
	Winter	16.80996014	

	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	1156525.258	38,550.84		
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 savings (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):		
------------------------------	--	--

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

D. Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 13,046.36	
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 1,152.20	
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$ 14,198.56	
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

The 2 for 1 exchange adjusted the incremental equipment costs: 1 set @ \$5.99(full cost) & 1 set @ \$2.00 incremental cost

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:** Educational Lighting seminar for large industrial users

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

Breakfast seminar showing how to conserve power through energy efficient lighting. A feedback form on the seminar was distributed.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Use existing lighting		
Efficient technology:	Energy efficient lighting products		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	9		

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):		
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$ 2,404.77	
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$ -	
Total TRC costs:	\$ 2,404.77	
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		

Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
	Winter		

	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):				
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

Controlled load (kW)		
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-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 savings (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):		
------------------------------	--	--

Energy generated (kWh): [] []
 Peak energy generated (kWh): [] []
 Fuel type: [] []

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify): [] []

D. Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	[]	[]
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 2,404.77	[]
	Incentive:	\$ 545.60	[]
	Total:	\$ 2,950.37	[]
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	[]	[]
	Incremental O&M:	[]	[]
	Total:	[]	[]

E. Assumptions & Comments:

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:** Conservor Joe Educational Awareness

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

See report. Started in 2005.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Limited Education on C&DM		
Efficient technology:	Promote C&DM		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	9604		
Measure life (years):	10		
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	9604		

B. TRC Results:	<u>Reporting Year</u>	<u>Life-to-date TRC Results:</u>
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):		
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$ 900.00	9318.4
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		
Total TRC costs:	\$ 900.00	9318.4
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		

Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):

C. Results: (one or more category may apply)	<u>Cumulative Results:</u>	
<u>Conservation Programs:</u>		
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	
	Winter	
	lifecycle	in year
Energy saved (kWh):		Cumulative Lifecycle
Other resources saved :		Cumulative Annual Savings
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 beginning of year (%):		
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):		

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):			
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>	
Energy savings (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>
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 900.00	\$ 9,318.40
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$ 900.00	\$ 9,318.40
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Expenses for 2006 related to web hosting. Grimsby Power customers could obtain energy saving tips on-line.

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:** Every Kilowatt Hours Counts Coupon Program

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

This was a program from 2005. The TRC results were calculated correctly but the incentives and expenses of the program were recorded

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date			

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

C. Results: (one or more category may apply)	<u>Cumulative Results:</u>	
<u>Conservation Programs:</u>		
Demand savings (kW):	Summer	
	Winter	
	lifecycle	
Energy saved (kWh):	in year	
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 beginning of year (%):		
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):		
<u>Line Loss Reduction Programs:</u>		
Peak load savings (kW):		
	lifecycle	
Energy savings (kWh):	in year	
<u>Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:</u>		
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:

Reporting Year

Cumulative Life to Date

\$	933.58	
\$	3,475.00	
\$	4,408.58	

Utility indirect costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Total:

E. Assumptions & Comments:

The TRC was calculated correctly for 2005 but the gross C&DM expenditure reporting did not include the above.

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 C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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			TRC Costs (PV)			Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle Savings (kWh)	Total Peak		Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	(PV)	\$	TRC Benefits	TRC Costs (PV)	\$	Net TRC Benefits				Demand (kW)	Saved	
Refrigerator Pick Up	\$ 26,732	\$	17,700	\$ 9,032	\$	2.96	66,960	401,760	16	\$	9,776	
6 Free CFLs with Fridge Pick Up	\$ 8,370	\$	7,700	\$ 670	\$	12.49	34,953	139,812	8	\$	939	
Free Indoor Timer - Fridge Pick Up	\$ 6,750	\$	6,200	\$ 550	\$	12.28	8,147	162,936	5	\$	611	
Windows Replacement	\$ 11,237	\$	15,100	\$ 3,863	\$	-2.91	5,541	138,533	5	\$	7,048	
LED Xmas Light Exchange	\$ 40,875	\$	31,400	\$ 9,475	\$	4.31	38,551	1,156,525	17	\$	14,199	
EKC Program												
*Totals App. B - Residential	\$ 93,964	\$	78,100	\$ 15,864	\$	5.92	154,152	1,999,566	51	\$	37,881	

Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program

Total Residential TRC Costs

**Totals TRC - Residential	\$ 93,964	\$ 16,764	\$ 77,200	5.61
----------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------

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			TRC Costs (PV)			Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle Savings (kWh)	Total Peak		Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	(PV)	\$	TRC Benefits	TRC Costs (PV)	\$	Net TRC Benefits				Demand (kW)	Saved	
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 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	\$ -	\$ -	-	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$	-	

Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program

Total TRC Costs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	0.00
**Totals TRC - Commercial	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	0.00

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.

Name of Program	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 (\$)
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	0	\$ 2,950

Institutional Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program

Total TRC Costs	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	0.00
**Totals TRC - Institutional	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	0.00

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.

Name of Program	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 (\$)
Lighting Seminar				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					

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.

Name of Program	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle Savings (kWh)	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM 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 - Other #2		\$	-	0.00	0	0	0	\$

Other #2 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program

Total TRC Costs	\$	-	\$	0.00
**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 Savings (kWh)	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
\$ 93,964	\$ 16,764	\$ 77,200	5.61	\$ 154,152	\$ 1,999,566	\$ 51	\$ 40,831
Any other Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program							
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS	\$ 16,764						
**LDC PORTFOLIO TRC	\$ 93,964	\$ 77,200	5.61	\$ 154,152	\$ 1,999,566	\$ 51	\$ 40,831

* 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.

Summary of kW and kWh Reductions

Total Project kWh	1,999,566
Total Annual kWh	154,152
Total Kw	50.5579582

		Ontario Seasonal Average Avoided Energy											
		Winter (December - March)											
Year	Hours/Period	On Peak 7 - 11 am, 5 - 8 pm		Mid-Peak 11 am - 5 pm, 8 - 10 pm		Off Peak 10 pm - 7 am		On Peak 11 am - 5 pm					
		Hours	kW	Hours	kWh	Hours	kW	Hours	kWh	Hours	kW	Hours	kWh
1	602	16	4,602	688	5,259	1,614		522	15	3,990			
2		16	4,602		5,259				15	3,990			
3		16	4,602		5,259				15	3,990			
4		16	4,602		5,259				15	3,990			
5		16	4,602		5,259				15	3,990			
6		16	4,602		5,259				15	3,990			

Total

27,610

31,554

74,023

23,940

Total Project kWh	401,760
Total Annual kWh	66,960
Total Kw	15.622089

Cost (\$/MWh)													
Summer (June - September)				Shoulder (April May October November)						On Peak			
Mid-Peak		Off Peak		Mid-Peak		Off Peak		Mid-Peak		Off Peak		On Peak	
7 - 11 am, 5 - 10 pm	kW	kWh	10 pm - 7 am	kW	kWh	7 am - 10 pm	kW	kWh	10 pm - 7 am	kW	kWh	\$/MWh	Total
Hours			Hours			Hours			Hours				
783			1,623			1,305			1,623				
	5,985	12,406				9,975						12,406	#N/A
	5,985	12,406				9,975						12,406	#N/A
	5,985	12,406				9,975						12,406	#N/A
	5,985	12,406				9,975						12,406	#N/A
	5,985	12,406				9,975						12,406	#N/A
	5,985	12,406				9,975						12,406	#N/A
	35,911	74,436				59,851						74,436	

opment
N-yr

		Ontario Seasonal Average Avoid									
		Winter (December - March)									
Year	Hours/Period	On Peak 7 - 11 am, 5 - 8 pm		Mid-Peak 11 am - 5 pm, 8 - 10 pm		Off Peak 10 pm - 7 am		On Peak 11 am - 5 pm			
		Hours	kW	Hours	kWh	Hours	kW	Hours	kWh	Hours	kW
1	602	8	5,183	688	2,591	1,614		522			
2		8	5,183		2,591				6,810		-
3		8	5,183		2,591				6,810		-
4		8	5,183		2,591				6,810		-

Total 20,731 10,365 27,239

Total Project kWhs	139,812
Total Annual kWhs	34,953.12
Total kW	8

ed Energy Cost (\$/MWh)													
Summer (June - September)				Shoulder (April May October November)									
kWh	Mid-Peak			Off Peak			Mid-Peak			Off Peak			On F
	7 - 11 am, 5 - 10 pm	Hours	kWh	10 pm - 7 am	Hours	kWh	7 am - 10 pm	Hours	kWh	10 pm - 7 am	Hours	kWh	
-	783		3,932	1,623		4,670	1,305		5,846	1,623		5,921	\$/MWh
-			3,932			4,670			5,846			5,921	#N/A
-			3,932			4,670			5,846			5,921	#N/A
-			3,932			4,670			5,846			5,921	#N/A

23,684

23,382

18,682

15,729

opment
N-yr

		Ontario Seasonal Average Avoided												
		Winter (December - March)						On Peak						
		Mid-Peak			Off Peak			On Peak			On Peak			
		11 am - 5 pm, 8 - 10 pm		10 pm - 7 am		7 - 11 am, 5 - 8 pm		11 am - 5 pm		11 am - 5 pm		11 am - 5 pm		
Year	Hours/Period	Hours	kWh	kW	Hours	kWh	Hours	kWh	Hours	kWh	Hours	kWh	Hours	kW
1	602	5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
2		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
3		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
4		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
5		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
6		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
7		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
8		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
9		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
10		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
11		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
12		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
13		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
14		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
15		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
16		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
17		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
18		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
19		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-
20		5	1,208	604	688	604	1,614	522	1,587	-	522	1,587	-	-

Totals

24,159

12,080

31,744

Total Project kWh	162,936
Total Annual kWh	8,146.80
Total Kw	5

Ontario Seasonal Average Avoided Energy Cost (\$/MWh)

Year	Winter (December - March)												Summer									
	On Peak 7 - 11 am, 5 - 8 pm			Mid-Peak 11 am - 5 pm, 8 - 10 pm			Off Peak 10 pm - 7 am			On Peak 11 am - 5 pm			7 - 1									
	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kW	kWh							
	602			688			1,614			522			783									
1	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
2	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
3	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
4	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
5	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
6	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
7	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
8	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
9	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
10	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
11	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
12	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
13	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
14	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
15	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
16	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
17	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
18	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
19	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
20	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
21	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
22	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
23	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
24	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
25	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
26	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
27	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
28	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
29	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							
30	17		11,565			7,710						19,275			-							

Totals 346,958 231,305 578,263

Total Project kWh	1,156,525
Total Annual kWh	38,550.84
Total Kw	17

		Ontario Seasonal Average Avoided																	
		On Peak 7 - 11 am, 5 - 8 pm				Mid-Peak 11 am - 5 pm, 8 - 10 pm				Winter (December - March)				Off Peak 10 pm - 7 am				On Peak 11 am - 5 pm	
Year	Hours/Period	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kWh	Hours	kWh	Hours	kW	kWh	Hours	kW			
		602			688			1,614		522									
1		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
2		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
3		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
4		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
5		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
6		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
7		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
8		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
9		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
10		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
11		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
12		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
13		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
14		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
15		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
16		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
17		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
18		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
19		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
20		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
21		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
22		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
23		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
24		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							
25		172	5	916	197	5	1,049	461	5	2,455	500	2							

Totals

22,900

26,228

61,377

Total Project kWh	138,533
Total Annual kWh	5,541.30
Total Kw	Winter
	5
	Summer
	2

