April 2, 2007

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

Dear Sir:

Re: Milton Hydro Distribution Inc RP-2004-0203\ ED 2005-0391
2006 Conservation and Demand Annual Report

Further to your Guideline for Annual Reporting of CDM Initiatives, Milton Hydro Distribution Inc. has enclosed three (3) hard copies and two (2) electronic copies of our annual report with the Board Secretary for the period ending December 31, 2006.

If you have any questions, please direct them to myself or Mary-Jo Corkum, VP, Finance.

Yours truly,

D.R. Thorne, P.Eng.
President/CEO

Re: Milton Hydro Distribution Inc RP-2004-0203\ ED 2005-0391
2006 Conservation and Demand Annual Report

Introduction

Milton Hydro Distribution Inc. ("Milton Hydro") fundamentally believes that a significant change is required in the conservation ethic of consumers if we are to achieve a long-term supply-demand balance. Enabling technologies and programs in our plan and those that we have implemented over the last several years have that single goal in mind. The initiatives contained in our plan are intended to achieve behavioral change by directly engaging consumers in our community in making their energy use decisions.

Evaluation of the CDM Plan

Please refer to Appendix A and C as attached.

Discussion of the Programs

Please refer to Appendix B as attached outlining the various programs in Milton Hydro's CDM Plan.

Lessons Learned and Conclusion

Regarding insights and barriers from our experiences to-date with CDM, we offer the following comments. Milton Hydro is concerned that the focus on TRC undervalues many of our programs, which are targeted at helping to realize 'the Conservation Culture'. Many of Milton Hydro's programs are focused on demand response and we don't consider it reasonable that the TRC Guide (p. ix, Appendix C) assigns a value of 0 $/kW in 2006 and 2007 for demand avoided generation, avoided transmission capacity and avoided distribution capacity costs and demand response.

The recent shift toward demand response initiatives in Ontario and throughout North America would seem to support this conclusion. Significant effort should be placed in reducing the customer transaction costs associated with demand response initiatives.

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 ($):	*$ 385,687*	**$ 385,687**	**$ 385,687**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**		**$ -**	**$ -**
Benefit to cost ratio:	*0.59*	13.86	13.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Number of participants or units delivered:	*34193*	*17,000*	16,500	500							
Lifecycle (kWh) Savings:	*7,425,892*	7,096,563	6,767,234	329,329	0	0	0	0		0	0
Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh):	*853,775*	811,005	768,235	42,770	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total peak demand saved (kW):	*439*	413	218	26	0	169	0	0		0	0
Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):											
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):											
[1] *Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures ($):*	*654721.27*	$ 86,132	$ 20,000	$ 66,132	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
[2] *Expenditures per KWh saved ($/kWh):*	*0.766854581*	$ 0.11	$ 0.03	$ 1.55	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -
[3] *Expenditures per KW saved ($/kW):*	*1490.747216*	$ 208.46	$ 91.80	$ 2,512.60	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -

Utility discount rate (%):	

[1] Expenditures are reported on accrual basis.
[2] Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate energy savings
[3] Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate capacity savings
[4] Please report spending related to 3rd tranche of MARR funding only. TRC calculations are not required for Smart Meters. Only actual expenditures for the year need to be reported
[5] Includes total for the reporting year, plus prior year, if any (for example, 2006 CDM Annual report for third tranche will include 2005 and 2004 numbers, if any

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Demand Response Program (General Service >50kW)

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

Intent: To achieve behavioural change by directly engaging large volume consumers in our community in making their energy use decisions

Design: 1) The design of a meter retrofit program which includes ongoing evaluation of technologies and development of an implementation plan using MHDI's existing resources. 2) A customer information program that consists of an Internet-based customer tracking of consumption and analysis tool ("Powerview"), customer help-line, customer notification system (TVD system), and customer education to use these tools.

Delivery: In 2006 an additional 16 large volume customers had signed up for on-line customer inquiry including access to their load data through the Powerview tool. The total number of customers signed up as of December 31 2006 was 86.

Partnerships: None

Evaluation : No incremental costs were incurred for this program in 2006. This completes the Pilot project phase of the Demand Response Program.

Measure(s):

	# of registered PowerView users	# of seminar attendees	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	16	0	
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or units delivered life to date	86	40	

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:

		Reporting Year	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 beginning of year (%):

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

Peak load savings (kW):

	lifecycle	*in year*	
Energy savngs (kWh):			

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

Amount of DG installed (kW):

Energy generated (kWh):

Peak energy generated (kWh):

Fuel type:

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	**Cumlative Life to Date**
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*	$ -	$ 25,000.00
	Incremental O&M:	$ -	$ 9,706.25
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ -	$ 34,706.25
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

none.

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Aggregator Development Program (TDRP) (General Service >50kW)

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

Intent: Program participants will reduce their electricity costs when electricity is the most expensive, potentially impact the market price, as a whole, and help to increase the stability of the electricity grid.Small reductions of this type yield big benefits, because of the exponential increase in market prices under tight supply conditions. Participants will also contribute to the avoidance or improvement in smog conditions.

Design: Addition of incremental settlement software for the existing settlement system (Settlement One), in addition to program maintenance costs.

Delivery: No incremental costs were incurred for this program in 2006.In 2006 15 additional participants regstered for the TDRP pilot program bringing the total to 21. This completes the Pilot project phase of the TDRP.

Partnerships : IESO

Evaluation: Milton Hydro met all of the technical and non-technical requirements for the IESO's transitional demand-response program; Although the program was developed for the TDRP program, its applicability is not limited to this program exclusively and can be readily adapted to other demand response programs such as the EDRP and the OPA's DR programs. Although Ontario's electricity system conditions and the weather in 2005 resulted in a significantly greater number of demand response events (1020 in 2005 vs 96 in 2006), the average demand response per event increased from 232kW in 2005 to 401 kW in 2006.

Measure(s):

	# of customers contacted	# of registered participants	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:		15	
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or units delievered lfe to date	6	21	

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	*$ 241,692.32*	*$ 573,482.96*
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	$ -	
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ -	
Total TRC costs:	$ -	*$ 21,091.60*
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$ 241,692.32	$ 552,391.36
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	infinite	27.19

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):	169	401
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):	96	1,115

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:*		$ 7,071.60
	Incremental O&M:		$ 14,020.00
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ -	$ 21,091.60
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

The 2006 max single event occurred in January at 2022 kW. The average demand reduction per demand response event was 401 kW.

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** The Energy Drill Program (General Service >50kW

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

Intent: An innovative program developed by Milton Hydro to enable customers to respond to market events by reducing their electricity demand, typically requiring little or no capital expenditures.

Design: The principle indicator of the need to reduce demand used in this pilot is the 3-hour ahead predispatch price exceeding $120/MW. A building assessment is undertaken to develop the building's Energy Drill Action Plan, and identify on-going savings that may be cost-effectively implemented to reduce overall energy use at the premise. The Energy Drill Program, modeled after fire drills, will designate and train building "Energy Marshals" who will be responsible for taking actions to reduce electricity demand during periods when it will be particularly important to reduce demand, e.g. periods of anticipated constrained supply, elevated prices, smog alerts. It is anticipated that the development of the protocols and procedures for the Energy Drill Program will lead to the identification and implementation of both technological and behavioral actions to reduce energy use.

Delivery: In 2006 the Milton Public Library and Halton Region Conservation Authority were added to the pilot program.

Partnerships: Clean Air Foundation Cool Shops Program

Evaluation: This completes the Pilot project phase of the Energy Drill Program.

Measure(s):

		# of participating buildings	total kW demand reductions achieved relative to the hour before the energy Drill
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:		14	
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or units delievered lfe to date		16	

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:

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:*	$ 4,498.33	$ 4,498.33
	Incremental O&M:	$ 40,588.50	$ 126,760.06
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 45,086.83	$ 131,258.39
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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Retrofit of Small Commercial/Industrial Customers less than 50kW

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

Intent: To provide low volume commercial/industrial consumers with access and the opportunity to benefit from the time-varying rates, potentially more options for retailers and participation in demand-response programs.

Design: Install interval/smart meters only on low volume commercial/industrial customers whose meters are subject to Measurement Canada re-verification requirements in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

Delivery: In 2005 Milton Hydro worked with the Clean Air Foundation and its "Cool Shops" program aimed at small commercial (< 50 kW) customers. Cool Shops is a program that identifies and helps implement in-store energy management practices to save on utility costs and improve environmental health. The program commenced the week of September 26th with a "street team" visiting those small commercial customers who have been retrofitted with an interval meter. The "street team" educated the customer about the TOU price structure, about Milton Hydro's Energy Drill program and "Powerview" product, its on-line account inquiry service and conduct the Cool Shop energy audit. One Compact Fluorescent Light (CFL) was distributed to each customer visited.

Partnerships: Clean Air Foundation

Evaluation: This project is now complete. The original budget for the project was $338,000 for capital expenditures. The costs of this project were $414,224 consisting of final capital costs of $376,971 and operating costs of $37,253. The operating costs were related to the CoolShops program which was not part of the original plan.

Measure(s):

	# of customers contacted	# of palm pilot assisted audits	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:		0	
Measure life (years):			
	2005		
Number of Partipants or units delievered lfe to date	448	268	

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$ -	$ 7,812.64
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):		
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)		
Total TRC costs:	$ 21,044.79	$ 414,224.13
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	-$ 21,044.79	-$ 406,411.49
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	-	0.02

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*	13.16		13.16
	Winter	13.16		13.16
	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*329329*	42770	329329	85540
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):	Greenhouse Gases	12.92 tonnes GH	25.84 tonnes GH	

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:*	$ 12,857.29	$ 376,970.94
	Incremental O&M:	$ 8,187.50	$ 37,253.19
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 21,044.79	$ 414,224.13
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Energy and demand and greenhouse gas emissions results are attributed to the substitution of one incandescent 60 watt lightbulb with a 13 watt CFL

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Partnership Building - Social Housing (Residential)

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

Intent: Identify energy savings opportunities, expected cost savings, and other energy efficiency improvements including resident comfort, operations and maintenance cost savings, renewal of plant & equipment, and reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases and other pollutants to social housing providers.

Design:MHDI to participate in the province-wide SHSC Energy Management Program Pilot.

Delivery: In 2005 Milton Hydro participated in a pilot program sponsored by the Social Housing Services Corporation (SHSC), to implement a viable and measurable Conservation and Demand Management plan for social housing. No further action was taken in 2006.

Partnerships: Social Housing Services Corporation ; Milton Community Homes

Evaluation : No incremental costs were incurred in 2006. This pilot project is now complete.

Measure(s):

	# of audits completed	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 units delievered lfe to date	26		

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)

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:

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:		$ 1,300.00
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ -	$ 1,300.00
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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Partnership Building - EER Air Conditioner Pilot (Residential)

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

Intent: Milton Hydro has been supportive of Natural Resources Canada's (EnerCan) efforts to get manufacturers to report EER as well as SEER ratings, to assist consumers in making their energy-efficiency decisions

Design: In 2005 EnerCan approached Milton Hydro regarding our interest in a pilot program and demonstration the value of high EER-rated equipment

Delivery: EnerCan completed the pilot design in Q1 2006.

Partnerships: Natural Resources Canada, OZZ Corporation

Evaluation:This project has been cancelled as a result of the federal election and changes in direction at EnerCan.

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 units 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:

		Reporting Year	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:

	Reporting Year	Cumulative Results:
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:

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Partnership Building - Energuide Program (Residential)

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

Intent: To promote existing CDM programs and inform consumers in our community in making their energy efficiency decisions as they apply to homeowners.

Design: In 2005 Milton Hydro worked with Halton REEP to deliver the Natural Resources Canada EnerGuide for Houses program. No further action was taken in 2006.

Delivery: No further action was taken in 2006.

Partnerships: Halton Residential Energy Efficiency Program (REEP); Natural Resources Canada

Evaluation : No incremental costs were incurred in 2006. This pilot project is now complete.

Measure(s):

	# of initial evaluations	# of follow -up evaluations	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 units delievered lfe to date	51	16	

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:	
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:

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:

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Partnership Building - 20/20 Clean Air Partnership 20/20 (Residential)

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

Intent: To promote existing Clean Air Foundation CDM programs and inform consumers in our community in making their energy efficiency decisions.

Design: In 2005 Milton Hydro worked with 20/20 The Clean Air Partnership; the program is funded by Environment Canada and in partnership with Toronto Public Health, Durham Region, Halton Region, Region of Peel, and York Region. The program is primarily directed at residential customers and provides a free planner to help reduce energy use by 20% at home and on the road.

Delivery: No further action was taken in 2006.

Partnerships: The Clean Air Partnership; Environment Canada working in partnership with Toronto Public Health, Durham Region, Halton Region, Region of Peel, and York Region.

Evaluation : No incremental costs were incurred in 2006. This pilot project is now complete.

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 units 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:	
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:

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:		$ 1,410.09
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ -	$ 1,410.09
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 numebr 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:** Rural Smart-Metering Pilot (Residential)

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

Intent: To identify and pilot one or more technologies in Milton's rural areas.Rural residential customers have more expensive manual meter reading costs and tend to have the highest electricity consumption within the residential class. The early adoption of smart metering for this customer group will provide the greatest benefit to the system and to participating customers through access to time-varying rates and other programs.

Design:

Delivery:

Partnerships

Evaluation: Continued to evaluate technology for this low-density application of smart metering implementation plan for 2007.

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 units 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:	
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:

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:

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Partnership Building - Net Zero Energy (Residential)

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

Intent: MH is a member of the Net Zero Energy Home Coalition and has had preliminary discussions with innovative technology manufacturers who are designing technologies that would allow homes to be net zero electricity consumers. MH will pursue these opportunities along with discussing with potential subdivision developers the possibility of developing a net zero energy home pilot program in Milton.

Design: Milton Hydro confirmed with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) Green Municipal Funds, its intent to participate as a Contributing Partner in the Integrated Energy – Smart Home Project. In 2006 Milton Hydro contributed $20,000 to build at least one of the resulting homes. The Clean Energy Developments (CED) is partnering with the Town of Milton, Milton Hydro and OZZ Corporation to study and plan for a new energy efficient residential community.

Delivery: In March 2006, the CED recently notified Milton Hydro that a signed grant agreement was in place with the FCM's Green Municipal Funds. In 2006 Mattamy installed the systems in two of their model homes. CED submitted an Intent to Apply together with Mattamy to the Green Municipal Funds to roll out the Integrated Energy Smart Home and EcoTech Village concepts into a 500 home development in Milton.

Partnerships: Net Zero Energy Home Coalition; Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM); Mattamy Homes Development Ltd.; Town of Milton, Clean Energy Developments; OZZ Corporation

Evaluation: In progress

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 units 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)

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:

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:	$ 20,000.00	$ 20,000.00
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 20,000.00	$ 20,000.00
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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Partnership Building - Union Gas Fuel Substitution (Residential)

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

Intent: To develop a new program to encourage fuel-switching from electricity to natural gas.

Design: No further action was taken in 2006 for this pilot program.
Delivery: No further action was taken in 2006.
Partnerships: Union Gas Ltd
Evaluation : No incremental costs were incurred in 2006. This pilot project is now complete.

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 units 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:	
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:

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:

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** 2006 Every Kilowat Counts Fall Program

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

Intent: To provide every Ontario household with information on easy-to-do conservation activities within their house, condominium or apartment. To achieve energy and demand savings by providing meaningful incentives to households to undertake one or more easy-to-do energy saving actions.

Design: A continuation of the spring 2006 EKC Education and Incentive program for the mass market (residential sector) launched by the Conservation Bureau.

Delivery: as per the Conservation Bureau's provincial EKC Campaign. Milton Hydro did not participate in any incremental advertising or promotions specific to Milton.

Partnerships: Conservation Bureau/Ontario Power Authority

Evaluation: A total of 673 EKC direct mail coupons and 4,745 in-store coupons were redeemed in the Milton area. EKC Program results indicate there were 9,098 units purchased.

Measure(s):

	Direct mail coupons redeemed	In -Store coupons redeemed	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	673	4745	
Measure life (years):			
Number of Partipants or units delievered lfe to date	673	4745	

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:	
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	$ 415,669.00	$ 415,669.00	
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*			
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):			
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	$ 29,982.00	$ 29,982.00	
Total TRC costs:	$ 385,687.00	$ 385,687.00	
Net TRC (in year CDN $):			
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$ 13.86	13.8639517	

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

			Cumulative Results:	
Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*	19.61		19.61
	Winter	198.26		198.26
	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	6767234	768235		
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:

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Program Administration (All classes)

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

Intent: To capture the incremental cost of the program planning, coordination and administration of the CDM program
Design:
Delivery
Partnerships
Evaluation:

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 units 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:	$ -	0
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*	19.61		
	Winter	198.26		
	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	6767234	768235		
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:		$ 30,730.71
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ -	$ 30,730.71
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 numebr of units times the net present value per unit b

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				$ -
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				$ -
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				$ -
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				$ -
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				$ 20,000
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				$ -
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program	$ 415,669	$ 29,982	$ 385,687	13.86	768,235	6,767,234	218	$ -
Program Administration			$ -	0.00				
***Totals App. B - Residential**	$ 415,669	$ 29,982	$ 385,687	13.86	768,235	6,767,234	218	$ 20,000
Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total Residential TRC Costs		$ 29,982						
****Totals TRC - Residential**	**$ 415,669**	**$ 29,982**	**$ 385,687**	**13.86**				

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: **2006**

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				$ 45,087
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00	42,770	329,329	26	$ 21,045
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	0.00				
***Totals App. B - Commercial**	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	42,770	329,329	26	$ 66,132
Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****Totals TRC - Commercial**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**0.00**				

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	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**				

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: **2006**

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				$ -
TDRP			$ -	0.00	0	0	169	$ -
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	0.00				
***Totals App. B - Industrial**	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	0	0	169	$ -
Industrial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→							
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****Totals TRC - Industrial**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**0.00**				

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	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**				

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	0.00				
***Totals App. B - LDC System**	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	0	0	0	$ -
LDC System Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program →								
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****Totals TRC - LDC System**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**0.00**				

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 ($) →	-

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	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**				

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: 2006

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 ($)
Demand Response			$ -	0.00				
TDRP			$ -	0.00				
Energy Drill Program			$ -	0.00				
Social Housing			$ -	0.00				
EER Pilot			$ -	0.00				
Energuide Program			$ -	0.00				
20 20 Clean Air Program			$ -	0.00				
Retrofit Small Commercial			$ -	0.00				
Rural Smart Metering			$ -	0.00				
Net Zero Energy			$ -	0.00				
Union Gas Fuel Substitution			$ -	0.00				
Integrated Smart Energy Home			$ -	0.00				
EKC Fall Program			$ -	0.00				
Program Administration			$ -	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**	$ 415,669	$ 29,982	$ 385,687	13.86	$ 811,005	$ 7,096,563	$ 413	$ 86,132
*Any **other** Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program* →								
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS		$ 29,982						
****LDC' PORTFOLIO TRC**	$ 415,669	$ 29,982	$ 385,687	13.86				

* 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.