Hydro One Brampton Networks Inc.

Conservation and Demand Management Plan

Annual Report to December 31, 2006

RP-2004-0203 \ 2006 Annual Report
CDM Third Tranche Funding

March 31, 2007

Table of Contents

Introduction

On February 18, 2005 Hydro One Brampton Networks Inc. ("HOB") received final approval from the Board for their Conservation and Demand Management Plan ("CDM Plan") covering the period 2005 – 2007.

On October 5, 2004, the Board issued a *Procedural Order*, which contained the reporting filing requirements (paragraphs 26 through 30) applicable to MARR CDM funding. On December 21, 2005 the Board issued the *Guidelines* for Annual Reporting to the OEB. In this second annual report, HOB has complied with the requirement of the Procedural Order. HOB has provided the information requested in the Guideline.

In preparing the CDM Plan, HOB based its initiatives on the following objectives:

- Contribute to the creation of a conservation culture in Ontario
- Help consumers and businesses manage their electricity use
- Contribute to the Province's target of reducing energy demand
- Support community-based programs and foster co-operation with municipal local distribution companies

The following criteria were used to assist in program design and cost allocation:

- Customer Needs – programs meet the needs of HOB's customer base
- Benefit Allocation – benefits arising from the planned initiatives be distributed across HOB's customer base
- Benefit Assurance – potential to realize energy savings and cost of delivery
- Leveraging Partnerships – partnerships that will make use of economies associated with greater scale of delivery or existing delivery channels
- Activities Support the Minister's Plans – preferred concepts or initiatives fit within the activities identified in the Minister's May 31, 2004 letter to distributors

Results Summary

HOB has been successful at launching programs across various sectors, including residential and commercial and industrial. HOB has worked in conjunction with the Ontario Power Authority (OPA) to promote their provincial programs. HOB has also participated in various communication and education initiatives to contribute to the goal of culture change within the province.

Several programs were continued in 2006 and we launched specific commercial and industrial programs. Evaluation of the pilot projects undertaken in 2005 led to either improved or modified programs in 2006.

In addition to continue to develop programs, HOB launched various specific programs for the residential and commercial and industrial markets. The residential programs were designed to promote the use of energy efficient technologies. The commercial and industrial programs were designed to encourage customers to undertake energy efficient projects, HOB provided both educational support and a financial incentive to offset any potential financial barriers.

HOB's CDM Plan presents a balanced approach to both conservation and load control initiatives. Our programs are designed to offer opportunities for all customers within our service territory to contribute to and benefit from a culture of conservation. HOB's programs will deliver financial savings for our customers, as well as kilowatt hour (kWh) and kilowatt (kW) savings that will contribute to meeting the Province's goals.

Figure 1 provides an overview of HOB's CDM approved budget, life to date spending as at December 31, 2006, as well as kWh and KW savings earned associated with the various programs. Various pilot projects and programs were completed in 2005 and were not extended beyond their original scope. Extensive data and customer analysis resulting from the new technologies provided customers with opportunities to change behaviour resulting in significant savings.

Figure 1

PROGRAM	3Year BUDGET ($K)	LIFE TO DATE DEC 2006 ($K)	LIFE TO DATE SAVINGS KW	LIFE TO DATE SAVINGS kWh	LIFECYCLE SAVINGS kWh	LIFECYCLE $/kWh
Residential						
Smart Meters	140					
Real Time Monitoring Pilot	40	40.5				
Mass Market Coupon Initiative	500	350.7	166.2	22,283,126	120,000,569	0.00292
LED	100	126.8		178,265	5,347,938	0.02371
Residential Load Control Pilot	80	69.8				
Total	860	587.8	166.2	22,461,391	125,348,507	0.00468
Commercial/Industrial						
Conservation Assets Program (Interval Meters)	1,285	818.9				
C/I Power Factor Correction Pilot	150	60.4	2,730 kVAR		2,730kVAR	
C/I Load Control Technology Demonstration Project	500 135	12.6 102.1				
Total	2,070	994	2,730 kVAR		2,730kVAR	
Common						
Distribution Loss Reduction	100	64.5	199	1,743,678	17,436,780	0.00369
Research Planning and Development	36	11.2				
Communication and Education	165	159.0				
Internal Building Efficiency	5	3.6				
Total	306	238.3	199	1,743,678	17,436,780	0.00369
Grand Total	3,236	1,820.1	365.2	24,205,069	142,785,287	0.01275

Overview of Programs

Residential: Smart Metering Pilot Program

Description:
The provincial government set a target for installing smart meters on all residential services in Ontario by 2010.

Design:
HOB recognizes that many LDC's are undertaking smart metering pilot projects, utilizing metering from various manufacturers. HOB reviewed the results and lessons learned and commenced our initiative in the last quarter of 2007.

Intent:
Smart meters will provide the ability to record consumption in time intervals that can be matched to price signals, which differ throughout the day to reflect the true cost of power. Understanding and reacting to proper price signals is an essential component to creating a conservation culture and managing customer demand. The largest benefit of smart meters is providing customers with the ability to understand their consumption patterns so they can make effective decisions on usage.

Delivery:
HOB was scheduled to implement this project in 2005. In light of the uncertainty surrounding smart metering legislation during that year, HOB staff contacted OEB staff to confirm if HOB should proceed with this pilot. After discussing these issues it was decided by that it was better to delay the implementation of this pilot until further clarification was provided. In the last quarter of 2006 HOB commenced the smart metering deployment pilot project. The pilot project will be completed in the first quarter of 2007.

Evaluation:
There are no results to report for 2006.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
Smart Meters	140	NIL	N/A	N/A

Residential: Residential Real Time Monitoring Pilot

Description:
In 2004, 45 customers were provided with monitors that measured the electrical consumption of their homes in real-time. Customers were able to view their current usage rate and cumulative consumption in kWh, as well as in dollars. The pilot field tests were completed in Fall 2005. This pilot was conducted together with Hydro One Networks Inc. and was the largest pilot project of its kind in Canada.

Design:
In order to assess the impact of the device on electricity consumption, the kWh usage was monitored on a monthly basis. This data was compared to usage from a year prior to determine the savings. The data was normalised for changes in weather, number of household occupants and other relevant factors. A control group was also used to determine if the savings could be attributed to the monitor. Customer questionnaires were administered during the pilot to assess customer behaviour, as well as collect relevant demographic data.

Intent:
The objectives of the pilot were to determine whether provision of a real-time feedback device is sufficient to empower residential customers with the information needed to change behaviours so that they reduce their electricity consumption. Also, whether it could be determined, from usage data, if a change in behaviour could be quantified in energy savings.

Delivery:
The delivery of the pilot consisted of five stages: pilot design, customer recruitment, technology deployment, customer usage and data acquisition, and data analysis. External consultants and service providers were employed during all stages to supplement available HOB's resources and expertise.

Evaluation:

The model for the evaluation of this pilot, as well as the findings and conclusions, were prepared by Professor Dean Mountain, McMaster Institute for Energy Studies. The detailed findings for the province as a whole are as follows:

- The results (for the entire study) indicate a significant positive impact on customer usage. Overall, the aggregate reduction in electricity consumption across the study sample was 6.5% at a high level of statistical accuracy. An important observation from the study is that the behavioural response remained persistent and did not decrease over time during the study period.

- Within the overall sample, the households with non-electric heating showed energy savings of 8.2% with a range within this sample of a 5.1% reduction (for a non-electric water heating house) to a reduction of 16.7% (for an electric water heating house). We also observed that households with electric heating are not responding in a significant way to real-time feedback. Separating out the feedback from the electric heating load and the rest of the load would be required to encourage conservation in this sector.
- No other price or conservation incentives were given to participants in the study. Therefore, the conservation results observed in the pilot are interpreted as the minimum to be garnered in the absence of other possible conservation incentives. Thus, if a real time feedback monitor is used in conjunction with the provision of additional literature and tips on conservation or price measures, an overall average reduction of between 7% and 10% is feasible.

The favourable results from this project will be used for the basis of developing future programs.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Life to Date Savings KW	Lifecycle kWh
Real Time Monitoring Pilot	40	40.4	N/A	N/A	N/A

Residential: Mass Market Coupon Initiative- Every Kilowatt Counts (EKC)

Description:
The OPA introduced two mass marketing coupon initiatives EKC in the spring and fall of 2006. Hydro One Brampton participated in both of these initiatives.

In addition to direct mailing programs HOB attended various civic functions also promoting the programs.

Design:
Using the HOB's customer database, customers were mailed a coupon booklet. Coupons were instantly redeemable at the point of purchase at various retail stores. The OPA tracked the results for reporting purposes.

Intent:
The objective of the initiative was to heighten awareness of conservation among customers, as well as achieve energy savings in kWh and kW. The coupons encouraged customers to take simple, low-cost actions to save both energy and money.

Delivery:
This was a joint project along with the OPA, other LDCs, and various retail partners to offer this coupon program to every household in Ontario.

Evaluation:
A total of **52,601** coupons were redeemed at various retailers in Brampton during the two campaigns. The redeemed coupons amounted to **104,109** energy saving products being sold.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Life to Date Savings KW	Lifecycle kWh
Mass Market Coupon Initiative	500	305	21,705,687	132.8	113,796,459

Residential: Seasonal Light Emitting Diodes (LED)

Description:
Brampton customers were encouraged to exchange their old incandescent holiday lights for efficient LED holiday lights. This was one for one exchange program This program was designed for delivery in both 2005 and 2006.

Design:
The program was designed so that it would receive significant community exposure. It was also executed with internal resources to curtail costs. Partnerships with the City of Brampton were established to help facilitate and promote this program.

Intent:
The objective of the LED program was to create awareness of the benefits of LED lights to drive change in consumer behaviour and to reduce the seasonal load. LEDs use up to 95% less energy, last longer and emit less heat. These benefits equal both energy savings and cost savings for the customer.

Delivery:
HOB partnered with the City of Brampton in their annual tree lighting ceremony as well as a local shopping mall. The program was promoted through various channels such as: bill inserts, local print media and the City of Brampton flyers.

Evaluation:
A product manufacturing defect caused a setback in 2006. Approximately 6300 incandescent stings of lights were exchanged for either LED strings or gift cards towards the purchase of LED lights.

The results of 2006 campaign are not yet finalized.

The program was delivered using internal HOB resources to minimize costs.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
SLEDs Distributed	100	126.8	178,262	5,347,938

Residential: Load Control Pilot

Description:
In 2004, 30 HOB customers had load control units installed in their homes, controlling central air conditioners and pool pumps. Differing hours of interruption and incentive levels were offered to customers with particular profiles of controllable variables, to ensure that the results would be representative of HOB's customer base.

Design:
An interval meter was installed in each home and set to collect five minute interval data for the duration of the pilot. This level of consumption data was necessary in the pilot phase to accurately estimate the load interruption that could be obtained from each device during each control event. This approach provides information required to adequately design a large scale residential load control program.

Over the course of the pilot, equipment was controlled for varying time intervals and at various times of the day, using a programmed schedule. The schedule was designed so that an analysis of the results would yield a "load interruption profile". This is effectively a map of what load interruption could be achieved for each equipment type at any time of the day and under varying circumstances. Customer questionnaires were administered throughout the pilot to assess customer acceptance, as well as collect relevant demographic data.

Intent:
The objectives of this pilot were to determine the potential load impact of controlling residential equipment during system peak periods through the installation of load control units and to assess customer response to those interruptions. The amounts of monthly incentives were also assessed.

Delivery:
The delivery of the pilot consisted of five stages: pilot design, customer recruitment, technology deployment, data acquisition and data analysis. External consultants and service providers were employed during all stages to supplement available resources and expertise.

Evaluation:
Professor Dean Mountain, McMaster Institute for Energy Studies was retained to design the pilot and analyse the results. Results are as follows:

- The average load savings during summer peak
  - 0.60 KW/unit for air conditioners
- The number of units controlled
  - 27 air conditioners
- Summer peak savings are 16.2 KW

The results for this pilot program are favourable. HOB believes there could be benefits in further development of load control programs.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kW
Res. Load Control Pilot	80	69.8	N/A

Commercial/Industrial: Power Factor Correction Program

Description:
The program offers incentives to HOB's commercial and industrial customers to install power factor correction equipment in their facilities. This reduces the KVA penalty which is good for the customer. This benefits HOB as it increases the capacity of the distribution system.

Design:
HOB offered an incentive that will reduced the cost barrier that impeded installation of power factor correction equipment. Customers with power factors below 90%, with demands greater than 200 kW, will be educated about power factor and encouraged to install power factor correction capacitors. Individual customer power factor analysis were performed to determine a customers specific incentive.

Intent:
The intent is to have customers who have poor power factors install power factor correction equipment thereby reducing the kVA demand on the grid. Encouraging commercial and industrial customers to correct low power factors will benefit both the customer and the electricity system as a whole. The benefit will be the reduction of system losses and increased capacity of the distribution system.

Delivery:
The program will be delivered though a customer targeted direct mailings and workshops. The programs will be supported and administered by HOB staff.

The program was launched in April 2006 for all eligible customers.

Evaluation:

Since the programs inception a total of 14 customers applied for the power factor incentive program during 2006. Of these 6 were completed in 2006. The total amount of KVAR added to the distribution system as a result of this program in 2006 was 2,730.

Program	3 Year Budget ($K)	Spending Life to Date ($K)	KVAr Added
Power Factor Correction	150	60.4	**2,730**

Commercial Industrial: Conservation Assets Program

Description:
Interval metering provides the ability to record customer consumption for specific time intervals. This consumption can be matched to price signals aligned to reflect the true cost of power. HOB's current phase of this project is to install interval metering on customers that have monthly demands greater than 150 kW. In conjunction with the installation of interval metering the customers are provided with an e-Meter data presentment program where they can access their usage data via a secure web service. This provides the customers with the ability to manage their usage accordingly.

Design:
The Conservation Assets Program will be executed in two phases. Firstly, all customers who have demands above 150 kW will be retrofitted with interval meter. The second phase of the project will be the introduction of and access to web based load profiling service for all customers with interval metering.

Intent:
The integration of interval metering and data warehousing while providing the customer with timely access to this data is improves customer understanding of consumption patterns as they occur. Customers once provided with the knowledge of how electricity is consumed then have the ability to manage it accordingly.

Delivery:
This program was launched during the first quarter of 2006. The delivery of this program is carried out using a contractor and it has been designed as a turnkey project. The contractor in conjunction with HOB staff visited the client to explain the program, coordinate the installation of both the phone line and interval meter and provide training for the web service.

Evaluation:
There are no results to report at this time. During 2006 there were 258 interval meters installed along with phone lines. All customers were set up and trained how to use the web service.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
Conservation Assets Program	1,285	818.9	N/A	N/A

Commercial / Industrial: C/I Load Control Pilot Project

Description:
The program consisted of the commercial and industrial energy efficient lighting program. The installation of energy efficient lighting will provide both permanent load reduction and energy savings. The lighting incentive program was introduced in June of 2006, where customers would receive an incentive of $150.00 per kW of load reduced.

In conjunction with the energy efficient lighting program, an energy efficient lighting demonstration program was undertaken by Hydro One Brampton to illustrate the various types of energy efficient lighting solutions available to commercial and industrial customers.

Both of these programs were designed and launched in 2006 with results being expected in 2007.

Design:
The program was designed and launched in 2006, providing a financial incentive for commercial and industrial customers to overcome the financial barrier to installing energy efficient lighting systems in their facilities.

Intent:
The intent of this program is to provide complete load reduction for both summer and winter.

Delivery:
Hydro One Brampton introduced this program to all C&I customers through various workshops and direct marketing with the customer class.

Evaluation:
In total 6 lighting incentive applications had been received with work to be completed in the first quarter of 2007.

The lighting demonstration project at Hydro One Brampton was also started in December 2006 with a completion expected by the end of the first quarter of 2007.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Life to Date Savings KW	Lifecycle kWh
C/I Load Control Pilot	500	12.6	N/A	N/A	N/A

Commercial / Industrial: Technology Demonstration Project

Description:
This program will provide an incentive to HOB commercial and industrial customers to install emerging energy technologies. Such initiatives would serve as a new technology showcase, which could then be promoted to other HOB customers. HOB partnered with Peel Region to demonstrate a solar/wind hybrid generation system along with a near net zero townhouse project.

Design:
As with other components of its CDM program, HOB's approach to energy efficiency has been to seek out beneficial partners wherever possible to deliver the appropriate technology to the customer. The Region of Peel proposed two projects which demonstrate the use of emerging technologies that can be applied by various builders and developers.

Intent:
The objective of the Technology Demonstration Project is to bring new and innovative technologies to customers, and where necessary, provide an incentive to encourage the installation of the new technologies. The energy savings will result in cost savings along with promoting the technologies.

The two projects that were selected clearly demonstrate new technologies and approaches to energy management.

Delivery:
Co-operative efforts with partners will be required to identify customers who would benefit from new emerging energy efficient technologies. The economic merits of the technologies would be determined and where the results are favourable incentives would be made available to encourage the purchase and installation of the technologies.

The work will be undertaken by the Region of Peel's Corporate Energy Group and commenced in 2006 with completion expected in 2007.

Evaluation:
This program was launched in 2006 and will be completed in the third quarter of 2007, presently there are no results to report.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Life to Date Savings KW	Lifecycle kWh
Technology Demonstration Project	135	102.1	N/A	N/A	N/A

Common: Distribution System Loss Reduction

Description:
The Distribution System Loss Reduction Program involves the optimization of HOB's distribution system. The specific focus was on power system load balancing along with system optimization, voltage conversion, and power factor correction.

Design:
Software was sourced externally that could be used by internal resources. The distribution grid was modeled into the software in 2006.

The distribution grid was modelled and then reconfigured to the most optimal configuration.

Intent:
The intent of the program is optimize the distribution system in an effort to reduce line losses.

Lowering distribution system delivery losses will reduce overall system demand and it will also provide additional network capacity for growth. System delivery losses are currently passed on to all customers therefore, improvements in this area will benefit all customers.

Delivery:
The modelling of the system commenced in 2005 and completed in 2006. After reviewing the optimization models the configuration with the greatest potential was determined and the steps to change the distribution system to this configuration were undertaken.

Evaluation:
The optimal configuration results in anenergy savings of 1,743,678 kWh with a demand reduction of 199kW. This has been an excellent initiative.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
Distribution System Loss Reduction	100	64.5	**1,743,678**	**17,436,780**

Common: Research Planning and Development

Description:
HOB partnered with Hydro One Networks Inc. for various customer research projects. One of these projects consisted of a detailed residential appliance survey. This research has provide valuable data for design of other CDM programs and initiatives.

Design:
The program was designed to establish baseline data using participant surveys which would then be used for developing specific CDM programs.

Intent:
The intent is to develop a typical residential customer appliance load make up for Brampton customers.

Delivery:
External consultants and service providers were employed to supplement available HOB resources. This program was supported by bill messaging and bill inserts.

Evaluation:
This program was started in 2005 and the final report was issued in 2006. The results can now be used for developing residential customer specific programs going forward.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
Research Planning and Development	36	11.2	N/A	N/A

Common: Customer Communication and Education Program

HOB has undertaken various initiatives intended to educate customers regarding the importance of conservation, as well as offer ideas on how to improve the electrical efficiency of their homes. HOB's education initiatives are divided into four categories listed below. HOB also appeared at several forums, trade shows and community events to discuss conservation and demand management and our programs.

HOB has developed various initiatives to help cultivate a conservation climate. All programs and initiatives are part of our "With A Little Energy You Can Save A Lot" theme.

Energy Management Focused Web Site:
During 2006, HOB was in the process of redesigning the utility's web site to provide a comprehensive energy awareness component for our customers to use. The web site provides information on energy usage along with tips for reducing energy usage. This was launched in the first quarter of 2006.

Event Activity Team (Civic Functions and Tradeshows)
HOB has attended numerous workshops and community events with a display that is solely focused on energy efficiency and tips on how to reduce usage. HOB has also appeared at commercial and industrial customer facilities to assist them in their energy awareness campaigns that they run for their employees.

Literature Program
HOB has developed an energy conservation awareness series of billing inserts. These inserts cover off various topics of energy conservation and are targeted to be delivered in 2007.

School Programs
HOB has also made presentation to various schools to educate students on how to conserve the use less electricity.

Evaluation:

These programs are designed to be educational and contribute towards a culture of conservation.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
Communication and Education	165	159.0	N/A	N/A

Common : Internal Building Efficiency

Description:
This program is designed for HOB's own facility and is aligned with the government's goal of reducing energy consumption by 5% in all government buildings. This program will identify opportunities of reducing energy consumption in our facility. The most significant savings will be realized through a lighting retrofit to more energy efficient lighting, which will be undertaken as part of the load reduction program.

The internal efficiency program was limited to the identification for areas of conservation to reach the provincial goal and the implementation of the conservation actions identified will be part of specific programs.

Design:
A lighting audit was completed of our facility and the resulting efficiency measures became the basis for the lighting retrofit that was undertaken. An increased maintenance program of the internal heat pump system was undertaken to increase the efficiency of the units. The building energy usage was profiled to identify other conservation and reduction opportunities.

Intent:
The intent of the program is to reduce overall peak demand and energy consumption in the Hydro One Brampton facility.

Delivery:
The program is designed in house and identified various areas of opportunity. The actual work will be undertaken by competent contractors.

Evaluation:
This program will be completed in 2007.

Program	3 Year Budget ($000)	Spending Life to Date ($000)	Life to Date Savings kWh	Lifecycle kWh
Internal Building Efficiency	5	3.6	N/A	N/A

Lessons Learned

Our efforts in Conservation and Demand Management over the last two years have identified a number of key findings, which will be utilized or emphasized as we move forward.

Some of these findings are on a macro level, based on broader policy, structures and inter-relationships, while others are more program specific. Some of these findings are listed below

- As electricity prices continue to increase, conservation and demand management is becoming a higher priority for customers in all sectors.
- Customers want to be able to control their electricity bill, but do not want to sacrifice comfort.
- Government and Ontario Power Authority should address those areas that utilities can not – codes, standards, and broader policies.
- Doing things fast is easy. Doing things right takes time and is not so easy i.e. launching two C&I programs (power factor and energy efficient lighting) there is a long lead time from introduction of the program to uptake by customers. There are barriers that need to be overcome when introducing new programs such as financing of projects, recognizing the customers budgeting process and the natural evaluation process.
- For new and emerging technologies, or for new or high risk applications in the marketplace, pilots or staged rollouts are very valuable in:
    - establishing the effectiveness of the device in either reducing energy consumption or shifting peak demand
    - refining logistics, incentive levels, and product selection,
    - assessing delivery channels, marketing and delivery costs,
    - determining customer acceptance and overcoming barriers to customer participation.
- CDM programs can provide a powerful incentive for encouraging use of innovative (pre-commercial) technologies and enabling "start-up" companies to compete in the electricity sector.
- Using expertise available in Ontario universities can help to develop specific initiatives and assessment tools that provide a basis for sound decisions.
- Partnering with organizations that have experience with targeted technologies and/or targeted customers brings existing skills and knowledge to bear.
- Clearer direction and consistent communication on smart metering will lead to a more efficient and effective implementation.

Conclusions

In 2006 a number of programs had been completed and more were underway with completion dates in 2007.
Programs had been launched, and a number had been completed with results received.

- The provincial EKC program produced sales of over 104,109 energy efficient products and savings of over 113 million lifecycle kWh.
- The Real-Time Monitoring pilot determined that 7-10% energy savings were possible through provision on a real-time energy and dollar monitor in the home.
- The power factor program has realized 2730 KVAR of capacitance being added to the grid while a total 7310 KVAR has been committed.
- The energy efficient lighting program was starting to deliver results with completion of various projects in 2007.
- The system optimization has resulted in a demand reduction of 199 kW with an annual savings potential of 1,743,678 kWh

Other programs were still underway and customers are still being engaged.

Still other efforts were underway through demonstration projects to illustrate the potential of new and emerging technologies.

In other areas, work was underway to quantify benefits of various technologies, to better understand specific customer needs, to identify and develop relationships with organizations with strengths in areas important to our programs' successes, to optimize incentive levels required for customer participation, and to ensure any program concepts meet required thresholds.

In 2007 we will be completing the ongoing programs migrating to the provincially based programs. We will continue to identify and seek partnerships with organizations where we can derive synergies and economies of scale.

Programs that are expected to continue into 2007 include:

- Technology Demonstration program to promote new and emerging alternate energy alternatives.
- Every Kilo Watt Counts Program
- Commercial / Industrial Energy Efficient Lighting Program
- Energy Efficient Technology Demonstrations
- Power factor correction
- Smart metering pilot implementation will be completed with the expectation that the main program will follow
- Line loss reduction work will continue
- Various educational initiatives

A number of other program concepts are being developed and assessed to determine whether they are appropriate for our customers and our service territory, and which may lead to their introduction during the year.

Appendix A

Evaluation of CDM Plan

Appendix A - Evaluation of the CDM Plan

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

	[5] Cumulative Totals Life-to-date	Total for 2006	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Agricultural	LDC System	[4] Smart Meters	Other #1	Other #2
Net TRC value ($):	*$ 6,470,682.88*	$ 6,155,122	$ 5,487,499	$ (514)	$ -	$ (339,105)	$ -	$ 1,007,242	NA	$ -	$ -
Benefit to cost ratio:	*4.37*	4.90	6.88	0.00	0.00	0.41	0.00	15.80	NA	0.00	0.00
Number of units delivered:	*257,680*	*245,661*	245,396	0	0	264	0	1	NA	0	0
Lifecycle (kWh) Savings:	*142,865,562*	134,020,855	116,584,075	0	0	0	0	17,436,780	NA	0	0
Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh):	*24,221,124*	23,542,284	21,798,606	0	0	0	0	1,743,678	NA	0	0
Total peak demand saved (kW):	*383*	332	133	0	0	0	0	199	NA	0	0
Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):	*0.49%*	0.61%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):	*0.042%*	0.042%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
[1] *Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures ($):*	*$ 1,820,118*	$ 1,240,378	$ 493,673	$ 102,072	$ -	$ 622,843	$ -	$ 21,790	$ -	$ -	$ -
[2] *Expenditures per KWh saved ($/kWh):*	$ 0.013	$ 0.009	$ 0.0042	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 0.0012	$ -	$ -	$ -
[3] *Expenditures per KW saved ($/kW):*	$ 4,748.18	$ 3,737.77	$ 3,717.42	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 109.47	$ -	$ -	$ -

Utility discount rate (%):	7.87

[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.

Appendices B

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** SPRING EVERY KILOWATT COUNTS PROGRAM

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

The Spring Every Kilowatt Counts program (Offered and devilvered by the OPA) offered rebates on variousenergy efficient products.This was a mass marketing program including a direct mail campaingn and instore promotions . Hydro One attended a series of civic activities to promote this program

Measure(s):

	Compact Fluorescent Lights	Timers	Fans
Base case technology:	139 KWh/yr	Without Timer	Without Fans
Efficient technology:	35 KWh/yr	With Timer	With Fans
Number of units:	41248	889	511
Measure life (years):	4	30	10
Number of Partipants life to date	41248	1089	562

	Prog Thermostat(Heating & Cooling)
Base case technology:	H-18,103; C-1,964
Efficient technology:	H-16,637;C-1,805
Number of units	383
Measure life (years):	18
Number of Partipants life to date	383

B. **TRC Results:**

		Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		$ 1,130,832.00	$ 1,130,832.00
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*			
	Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 158,408.00	$ 158,408.00
	Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ 127,432.00	$ 127,432.00
	Total TRC costs:	$ 285,840.00	$ 285,840.00
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		$ 844,992.00	$ 844,992.00
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		$ 3.96	3.96

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):

Summer	23.8	
Winter		

	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*21,017,220*	4,148,570	21,017,220	4,148,570
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

Dispatchable load (kW):
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):		
	lifecycle	*in year*
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	**Cumlative Life to Date**
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*	*	
	Incremental O&M:	$ -	$ -
	Incentive:		$ -
	Total:	$ -	$ -
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

* Program Cost showing above is the share from the total cost incurred by OPA. The cost incurred by Hydro One, for promotion at various civic events in Brampton , is embedded in the our Program i.e." CFL distributed by HOB"

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** FALL EVERY KILOWATT COUNTS PROGRAM

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

The Fall Every Kilowatt Counts program (Offered and devilvered by the OPA) offered rebates on variousenergy efficient products.This was a mass marketing program including a direct mail campaingn and instore promotions . Hydro One attended a series of civic activities to promote this program

Measure(s):

	Compact Fluorescent Lights	Seasonal LED-5W / Minis	Dimmers
Base case technology:	139 KWh/yr	19.4 / 7.8 KWh/yr	464 kWh / Yr
Efficient technology:	35 KWh/yr	0.5 / 0.6 KWh/yr	325 kWh / Yr
Number of units:	39843	19426	556
Measure life (years):	4	30	10
Number of Partipants life to date	43572	21132	225

	Motion Sensors	Prog Thermostat(Heating & Cooling	Base Board Prog. Thermostat
Base case technology:	696 kWh / Yr	H-18,103; C-1,964	Non Prog. Thermostat
Efficient technology:	487 kWh / Yr	H-16,637;C-1,805	Prog. Thermostat
Number of units:	179	1028	46
Measure life (years):	20	18	18
Number of Partipants life to date	179	1281	9

B. **TRC Results:**

		Reporting Year		**Life-to-date TRC Results:**
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$	*2,032,249.00*	$	2,340,014.00
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*				
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$	164,940.99	$	189,055.97
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$	170,597.00	$	200,131.00
Total TRC costs:	$	335,537.99	$	389,186.97
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$	1,696,711.01	$	1,950,827.03
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$	6.06		6.01

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

Conservation Programs:

			Cumulative Results:
Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*	109	142.36
	Winter	1218	1361.19

	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*42,264,812*	4,928,509	48,468,927	5,505,950
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

Dispatchable load (kW):	
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):	

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):		
	lifecycle	*in year*
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*	*	
	Incremental O&M:	$ -	$ 24,114.98
	Incentive:	$ -	$ 21,268.49
	Total:	$ -	$ 45,383.47
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

* Program Cost showing above is the share from the total cost incurred by OPA. The cost incurred by Hydro One, for promotion at various civic events within Brampton, is embedded in the our Program i.e." CFL distributed by HOB"

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** CFL DISTRIBUTED BY HYDRO ONE BRAMPTON

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

An events activity team was created to attend various civic event throughout 2006. CFL's were distrubuted to customers during these events. A direct home delivery program was delivered in 2006 whereby each residence in Brampton received a CFL. A partnership with the Brampton Public Library was developed and the Kill A Watt Save A Lot Proram was developed that saw customers borrow energy meters form library branches and receive CFLs.

Measure(s):

	Compact Fluorescent Lights	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	139 KWh/yr		
Efficient technology:	35 KWh/yr		
Number of units:	134921		
Measure life (years):	4		
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date	134921		

B. **TRC Results:**

		Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$	*3,151,335.00*	$ 3,151,335.00
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*			
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$	45,286.40	$ 45,286.40
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$	242,858.00	$ 242,858.00
Total TRC costs:	$	288,144.40	$ 288,144.40
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$	2,863,190.60	$ 2,863,190.60
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$	10.94	

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):

	Summer	Winter

	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*50,514,422*	12,628,606	50,514,422	12,628,606
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

Dispatchable load (kW):
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 45,286.40	$ 45,286.40
	Incentive:	$ 260,033.16	$ 260,033.16
	Total:	$ 305,319.56	$ 305,319.56
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

The Program cost is the combination of the expenditure for Spring and Fall EKC promotion, at various civic events in Brampton, and CFL distributed by Hydro One Brampton. The primary focus of these events was the promotion of energy conservation and the use of CFL's. the EKC programs were promoted as a method for customers to purchase products at discounted prices.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Commercial & Industrial Power Factor Correction Program

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

This program has been launched since April, 2006 and targetted the customers having load equal and above 200 kW with an average power factor of 83% or low. Fourteen Customers has applied for this program in 2006 and six projects completed during the year with the addition of 2730 kVAR.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	No Correction in Place		
Efficient technology:	Power Factor Correction Program		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	6		
Measure life (years):	15		
Number of Partipants or unites delievered life to date	6		

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$ *236,095.89*	$ 236,095.89
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 18,527.57	$ 18,527.57
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ 142,060.50	$ 142,060.50
Total TRC costs:	$ 160,588.07	$ 160,588.07
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$ 75,507.82	$ 75,507.82
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$ 1.47	$ 1.47

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

		lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*				
	Winter				
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):	2730
Distribution system power factor at begining of year (%):	91.0298
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):	91.1627

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 18,527.57	$ 20,967.97
	Incentive:	$ 39,461.25	$ 39,461.25
	Total:	$ 57,988.82	$ 60,429.22
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Holiday Light Exchange

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

There were three events held in 2006 for the Holiday Light Exchange. The first event was held at City Hall Brampton where lights exchanged on one for one basis maximum of two. The LED lights were subsequently recalled and at the two later events gift cards were distributed in exchange for the older inefficient lights. Customers who received the LED lights at the first event were encouraged to return them in exchange for gift cards.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	19.4 / 7.8 KWh/yr		
Efficient technology:	0.5 / 0.6 KWh/yr		
Number of units delivered for reporting year:	6366		
Measure life (years):	30		
Number of Partipants or units delievered life to date	12319		

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$ 105,686.00	$ 202,754.00
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 10,985.21	$ 45,434.21
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ 12,095.00	$ 23,405.00
Total TRC costs:	$ 23,080.21	$ 68,839.21
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$ 82,605.79	$ 133,914.79
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	4.58	2.95

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):

Summer	
Winter	41

	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*2,787,621*	92,921	5,347,938	178,265
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

Dispatchable load (kW):
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):

	lifecycle	*in year*
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 10,985.21	$ 45,434.27
	Incentive:	$ 35,165.50	$ 81,332.76
	Total:	$ 46,150.71	$ 126,767.03
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Conservation Assets Program

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

This program consists of installation of interval (smart) meters for C&I customers down to demand 150 KW and providing customers with the e-Meter Data Presentment program. This involves educating our clients to understand their energy consumption usage pattern and to identify possible areas for energy reduction.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Conventional Meter	Interval Meter	
Efficient technology:	Interval meter	Interval Meter with Telephone Line	
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	252	258	
Measure life (years):	15	15	
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 411,825.49	$ 445,123.12
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ -	$ -
Total TRC costs:	$ 411,825.49	$ 445,123.12
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

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

Conservation Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 411,825.49	$ 445,123.12
	Incentive:	$ 150,241.88	$ 373,820.45
	Total:	$ 562,067.37	$ 818,943.57
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Hydro One Brampton Internal Efficiency

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

Program has designed to identify areas of potential savings within Hydro One Brampton. The three areas that were specifically targetted were the lighting for the facility, increased maintenance for the internal heatpumps and load profiling of the facility using the e-Meter service. The lighting retrofit was undertaken as part of the C&I load control program. The increased and modified heat pump maintenance was identified as part of this program but the cost to perform the maintenance was attributed to Hydro One Brampton's normal maintenance program.

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 Partipants or unites delievered life to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 3,582.38	$ 3,582.38
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ -	$ -
Total TRC costs:	$ 3,582.38	$ 3,582.38
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):

		Cumulative Results:
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 begining of year (%):

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):

	lifecycle	*in year*
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	**Cumlative Life to Date**
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 3,582.38	$ 3,582.38
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 3,582.38	$ 3,582.38
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Hydro One Brampton Distribution Efficiency Program

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

This program involved the modelling of the Hydro One Brampton distribution grid on a modelling software that would allow the system to be modelled in various configurations to identify the most effective and effecient configuration. The original base modelling was done in 2005 and the most optimum configuration was determined in 2006. The system was reconfigured in 2006 to provide peak operating efficiency through optimized switching.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:	Optimizing Switching Configurations		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	1		
Measure life (years):	10		
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$ 1,075,289.00	$ 1,075,289.00
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 18,207.36	$ 64,465.11
*Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)**	$ 46,257.75	0
Total TRC costs:	$ 64,465.11	$ 64,465.11
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$ 1,010,823.89	$ 1,010,823.89
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$ 16.68	$ 16.68

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):		199.05
	lifecycle	*in year*
Energy savngs (kWh):	17,436,780	1,743,678

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 18,207.36	$ 64,465.11
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 18,207.36	$ 64,465.11
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

* The Incremental Measure Cost $ 46257.75 was a 2005 expense. The actual optimization of the system was performed in 2006. The 2005 costs were used to calculate actual B/C ratio only

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Residential Load Control Program

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

The pilot program, which was introduced from July 2004 and completed in Dec 2005.

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 Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ -	$ 66,302.00
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ -	0.00
Total TRC costs:		$ 66,302.00
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*	-	16.2	
	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 begining of year (%):	
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):	

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ -	$ 66,302.02
	Incentive:	$ 162.72	$ 3,539.72
	Total:	$ 162.72	$ 69,841.74
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** C / I Load Control Program

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

The Lighting Incentive Program was launched in the last quarter of 2006. Four application were received in 2006 with completion dates of 2007. Hydro One Brampton undertook a internal energy efficient lighting retrofit of its facility that was started in 2006 with completion by Q1 of 2007.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	T12 and MH Lights		
Efficient technology:	Energy Efficient Lights		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 2,787.29	$ 12,548.69
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		0
Total TRC costs:	$ 2,787.29	$ 12,548.69
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 2,787.29	$ 12,548.69
	Incentive:		$ 25.00
	Total:	$ 2,787.29	$ 12,573.69
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Common Communication & Education Program

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

This program is the primary support program of CDM portfolio. It was designed to provide promotional support for all programs as they are launched and during each program life. An events activity team and vehicle were put in place in 2006. This team attended various civic functions to promote energy conservation.A complete conservation theme based series of billing inserts were designed in 2006 for delivery in 2007

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3
Base case technology:	Standard Website		
Efficient technology:	Enhanced Website	Participation in all Community Events and Energy Forums	Literature
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 133,677.46	$ 159,047.03
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		
Total TRC costs:	$ 133,677.46	$ 159,047.03
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

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

Conservation Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 133,677.46	$ 159,047.03
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 133,677.46	$ 159,047.03
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Smart Metering Program

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

The HOB Smart Metering Pilot Project was started in December of 2006 with completion scheduled by the end of Q1 2007. There are no results to report

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	Conventional Meter		
Efficient technology:	Smart Meter		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):		
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		
Total TRC costs:		
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

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

Conservation Programs:

			Cumulative Results:	
	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*			
	Winter			
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 begining of year (%):	
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):	

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Incentive:		
	Total:		
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Technology Demonstration Project

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

HOB working in partnership with Peel Region will undertake two specific projects. The first is a solar wind hybrid generation system and the second is a near net zero town house retrofit

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:	Solar wind hybrid generation	Near net zero housing	
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 513.60	$ 513.60
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ -	$ -
Total TRC costs:	$ 513.60	$ 513.60
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 begining of year (%):	
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):	

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 513.60	$ 513.60
	Incentive:	$ 101,557.91	$ 101,557.91
	Total:	$ 102,071.51	$ 102,071.51
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** Common Research & Planning

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

The study and survey for residential appliance has been done in year 2005 therefore this program was not continued in year 2006

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 Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*		
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 4,483.08	$ 11,211.58
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ -	$ -
Total TRC costs:	$ 4,483.08	$ 11,211.58
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		

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

			Cumulative Results:	
		lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Conservation Programs:					
Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*				
	Winter				
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 begining of year (%):					
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):					

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 4,483.08	$ 11,211.58
	Incentive:	$ -	$ -
	Total:	$ 4,483.08	$ 11,211.58
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

A. **Name of the Program:** RT Monitoring Pilot

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

This was a Pilot Program, which was initiated in year 2005. It was not continued in 2006

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 Partipants or unites delievered lfe to date			

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$ -	$ *5,029.00*
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ 3,879.00	$ 40,312.00
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		
Total TRC costs:	$ 3,879.00	$ 40,312.00
Net TRC (in year CDN $):		-$ 35,283.00
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	-	0.12

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

		lifecycle	in year	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*				
	Winter				
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 begining of year (%):	
Distribution system power factor at end of year (%):	

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

	lifecycle	in year
Peak load savings (kW):		
Energy savngs (kWh):		

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):	

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumlative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 3,879.60	$ 40,312.60
	Incentive:		$ 170.00
	Total:	$ 3,879.60	$ 40,482.60
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. **Assumptions & Comments:**

Appendix C
Program and Portfolio Totals

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year:

1. Residential Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.
Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures ($)
Spring EKC	$ 1,130,832	$ 285,840	$ 844,992	3.96	4,148,570	21,017,220	23.8	$0.00
Fall EKC	$ 2,032,249	$ 335,538	$ 1,696,711	6.06	4,928,509	42,264,812	109	$0.00
CFL Distributed by Hydro One Brampton	$ 3,151,335	$ 288,144	$ 2,863,191	10.94	12,628,606	50,514,422	0	$305,319.56
Holiday LightExchange	$ 105,686	$ 23,080	$ 82,606	4.58	92,921	2,787,621	0	$46,150.71
Residential Load Control Program	$ -		$ -	0.00				$162.72
Communication & Education	$ -		$ -	0.00				$ 133,677.46
Residential Real Time Monitoring			$ -	0.00				$ 3,879.60
Research & Planning			$ -	0.00				$ 4,483.08
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Residential	$ 6,420,102	$ 932,603	$ 5,487,499	6.88	21,798,606	116,584,075	133	$ 493,673
Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total Residential TRC Costs		$ 932,603						
**Totals TRC - Residential	$ 6,420,102	$ 932,603	$ 5,487,499	6.88		21,705,685	113,796,454	

2. Commercial Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.
Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures ($)
Tecnology DemonstrationProject		$ 514	-$ 514	0.00				$ 102,072
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Commercial	$ -	$ 514	-$ 514	0.00	0	0	0	$ 102,072
Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ 514						
**Totals TRC - Commercial	$ -	$ 514	-$ 514	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.

	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	$ -
Institutional Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****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.

	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 ($)
Power fFctor Program	$ 236,096	$ 160,588	$ 75,508	1.47				$ 57,989
Conservation Assets Program	$ -	$ 411,825	-$ 411,825	0.00				$ 562,067
C - I Load Control Program	$ -	$ 2,787	-$ 2,787	0.00				$ 2,787
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
Totals App. B - Industrial	$ 236,096	$ 575,201	-$ 339,105	0.41	0	0	0	$ 622,843
Industrial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ 575,201						
****Totals TRC - Industrial**	**$ 236,096**	**$ 575,201**	**-$ 339,105**	**0.41**				

5. Agricultural Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.
Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures ($)
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 the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures ($)
Hydro One Brampton Internal efficiency		$ 3,582	-$ 3,582	0.00				$ 3,582
Hydro One Brampton Distribution efficiency	$ 1,075,289	$ 64,465	$ 1,010,824	16.68	1,743,678	17,436,780	199	$ 18,207
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
			$ -	0.00				
Totals App. B - LDC System	$ 1,075,289	$ 68,047	$ 1,007,242	15.80	1,743,678	17,436,780	199	$ 21,790
LDC System Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ 68,047						
****Totals TRC - LDC System**	**$ 1,075,289**	**$ 68,047**	**$ 1,007,242**	**15.80**				

7. Smart Meters Program

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

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

8. Other #1 Programs

List each Appendix B in the cells below; Insert additional rows as required.
Note: To ensure the integrity of the formulas, please insert the additional rows in the middle of the list below.

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures ($)
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 - Other #1	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	0	0	0	$ -
Other #1 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****Totals TRC - Other #1**	$ -	$ -	$ -	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.

	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 - Other #2	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	0	0	0	$ -
Other #2 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****Totals TRC - Other #2**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**0.00**				

LDC's CDM PORTFOLIO TOTALS

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures ($)
TOTALS FOR ALL APPENDIX B	$ 7,731,487	$ 1,576,365	$ 6,155,122	4.90	$ 23,542,284	$ 134,020,855	$ 332	$ 1,240,378
*Any **other** Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program*	→							
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS		$ 1,576,365						
****LDC' PORTFOLIO TRC**	$ 7,731,487	$ 1,576,365	$ 6,155,122	4.90				

* 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.