2006 OEB Annual

Conservation and Demand Management Report

Submitted By:

Canadian Niagara Power Inc. Port Colborne

RP- 2004-0203/EB- 2004-0523

April 2, 2007

May 8, 2007

Board Secretary at Ontario Energy Board
P.O. Box 2319
2300 Yonge Street
Suite 2700
Toronto, ON
M4P lE4

2006 Annual Conservation and Demand Management Report
RP-2004-0203 *I* EB 2004-0523

CNPI Port Colborne is pleased to submit its 2006 Conservation and Demand Management Report, but with regrets that we did not meet the April 2, 2007 guideline for filing.

This does not reflect the value our LDC places in conservation and demand management, which remains high. Rather, it is a matter of resourcing that required us to delay the completion of our annual report.

As the accompanying report demonstrates, CNPI Port Colborne took a more focused approach in its conservation and demand management in 2006 compared to 2005, due in part because of learning in the previous year, and because time was allocated to plan for 2007 initiatives.

Building on the foundation established in 2005, it is our intention to increase activities with our Niagara Erie Power Alliance (NEPA) partners in 2007, and complete our Third Tranche expenditures as planned.

The details of our activities are set out in the accompanying 2006 Conservation and Demand Management Annual Report. Please do not hesitate to call at your convenience if you have any questions, or require additional information.

Regards,

Douglas Bradbury
Director, Regulatory Affairs
Canadian Niagara Power Inc. Port Colborne

1.0 Introduction

Serving approximately 9,400 customers, Canadian Niagara Power Inc. Port Colborne (CNPI Port Colborne) delivered 196,628,567 kWh in 2006, and saw a summer peak 44,252 kWh. The LDC continued its efforts to promote a sustainable conservation culture with customers in 2006, and supported a regional effort with its NEPA partners to raise awareness and commitment across the Niagara region.

CNPI Port Colborne's approved funding for CDM is $159,214 from its Third Tranche rate increase. Since its CDM Plan was approved in 2004, the LDC has been active in the Co-Branded Mass Market, Smart Metering, Distribution Loss Reduction, and Social Housing programming segments. In the two years since programming commenced in 2005, CDM expenditures have surpassed $48,000, saving an estimated 260,128 kWh.

This document reports on CDM activities, expenditures and TRC values for the period from January 1, 2006 to December 31, 2006.

2.0 Evaluation of the CDM Plan

Overall, conservation and demand management activities remained on plan in 2006 for CNPI Port Colborne, with a focus on improving residential and small business energy usage. A net TRC value of $35,637 was achieved in 2006 on spending of $6,785 for an estimated savings of 260,128 kWh.

Expenditures were lower in 2006 than the previous year largely due to spending for program development in the first year. In 2006, spending was directed toward technologies that directly impacted energy efficiency such as compact fluorescent lights and thermostats.

CNPI Port Colborne was also aided in its efforts by its NEPA partners. The established working relationship of NEPA partners helped create a mutual CDM foundation in 2005, which was built upon in 2006.

This important CDM partnership convened monthly meetings to plan and direct joint CDM programming, and to find more efficient resourcing, and developed a strategy to derive the fullest value possible for emerging OPA CDM programs. One important joint initiative updated and maintained a website to provide public education about conservation.

CFL bulbs were targeted at residential, small commercial and social housing through incentives and distributions to achieve peak and non-peak energy savings, but also to help shift market attitudes, and to help reduce customer electricity costs – particularly for social housing. Similarly, programmable thermostats were distributed to social housing units to further reduce energy use and costs.

The accompanying table sets out the technologies, energy savings and costs of 2006 CDM expenditures by CNPI Port Colborne.

Program	Target Customers	Total KWh / kW Savings	Actual Expenditure to Dec 31, 2006
Co-Branded Mass Market – Website and CFL Bulbs	Residential and small commercial	75,168	$ 2961
Nonprofit & Social Housing – Thermostats and CFL Bulbs	Residential	182,949	3786
TOTALS		**258,117**	**$ 6747**

3.0 Discussion of the Programs

Co-Branded Mass Market

Public Website (www.conserverjoe.com) This website, launched in 2005 by the NEPA group, was updated in 2006, with the addition of an energy usage calculator to help customers better understand and use energy. Featuring Conserver Joe of the Conservation family, the website is popular with both children and adults.

Compact Fluorescent Lights. To support the shift of consumer behavior toward the purchase of CFLs to replace incandescent lighting, 720 13-watt CFLs were distributed to residents of Port Colborne when they visited the LDC office to pay an electricity bill. For residents who had not yet purchased a CFL for their homes, the free CFL would enable them to experience this technology without a financial commitment, and as a prelude to replacing other incandescent lighting.

Social Housing

Programmable Thermostats. To help residents understand and better manage energy use and costs, 16 programmable thermostats were installed in Non Profit/Social Housing units in Port Colborne. The value of this technology is magnified in units that depend on electric heat, which is frequently the case for social housing units. The net effect beyond load and energy savings is that it also provides a measure of economic empowerment to families who typically have low incomes.

Compact Fluorescent Lights. Approximately 800 CFLs (13 watt and 23 watt) units were distributed to Non Profit/Social Housing units to help lower energy and costs in housing where it potentially will make both an energy and economic difference.

4.0 Lessons Learned

If 2005 was a foundation year to establish programming with NEPA partners, 2006 was a year to build momentum in terms of shifting customer behavior toward energy use, and attitudes toward new technologies. For this reason, CNPI Port Colborne chose to focus its spending on proven technologies (CFLs, thermostats), and on public education

(website). However, it is apparent from TRC valuations, that spending levels should have been higher than they were in 2006.

As mentioned in its 2005 CDM Annual Report, CNPI Port Colborne's limited CDM budget of approximately $160,000 required a very prudent approach to return value. Under these circumstances, it is important that smaller LDCs leverage as much added value for programming by partnering wherever possible.

To that end, the advent of programs such as Every Kilowatt Counts and other initiatives by the OPA are important. These programs can be administrated and communicated more effectively from a centralized agency, while the LDC is able to do what it does best, by being the local conduit for these programs.

Based on its experience in 2006, CNPI Port Colborne plans to redouble its efforts in 2007 to complete its Third Tranche spending across and expanded CDM program offering:

- Present a CDM program to grade five students (from NEPA)
- Work with Chamber of Commerce to introduce distributed generation to the business community
- Expand interval metering technology
- Introduce the kilowatt measurement device to local libraries for resident to borrow and measure appliance consumption (from NEPA)
- A kit for homeowners with conservation message, CFL and a refrigerator thermometer
- An energy audit of major installations for the City of Port Colborne
- Working with low income housing for a possible energy audit

5.0 Conclusion

In 2006, CNPI Port Colborne CDM activities reduced peak demand by 3 kW to bring the total peak reduction since 2005 to 26 kW. CDM programs also helped save 258,117 kWh in energy in 2006 on expenditures of $6747, returning a net TRC value of $35,637. Since programming commenced in 2005, the anticipated lifetime energy savings that are estimated to accumulate from the programs implemented thus far is 938,013 kWh.

The LDC continued to promote conservation, particularly among residential, small business and low-income customers, and laid plans for a much expanded CDM programming in 2007. The details of energy savings, expenditures and TRC valuations accompany this document as OEB Appendices A, B and C.

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 ($):	*$21,734.79*	**$ 35,637**	**$ 35,637**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**		**$ -**	**$ -**
Benefit to cost ratio:	*2.09*	10.18	10.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00
Number of participants or units delivered:	*1529*	*1528*	1528								
Lifecycle (kWh) Savings:	*938,013*	887,738	887,738	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh):	*260,128*	258,117	258,117	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total peak demand saved (kW):	*26*	3	3	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):	*0.07%*	0.13%	0.13%								
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):		0.01%	0.01%								
[1] *Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures ($):*	*$ 22,785*	$ 6,785	$ 6,785	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
[2] *Expenditures per KWh saved ($/kWh):*	$ 0.02	$ 0.01	$ 0.01	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -
[3] *Expenditures per KW saved ($/kW):*	$ 889.77	$ 2,601.71	$ 2,601.71	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -		$ -	$ -

Utility discount rate (%):	8.05

[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.

2006 Total kWh delivered	196,628,567
2006 Peak kW	44,252
2005 Total kWh delivered	189,633,718
2005 Peak kW	40,792

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Co-Branded Mass Market

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

To support the shift of consumer behaviour toward the purchase of CFLs for replacing incandescent lighting, 720 13-watt CFL's where purchased and distributed to residents of Port Colborne when they visited the LDC office to pay an electricity bill. For residents who had not yet purchased a CFL for their homes, the free CFL would enable them to experience this technology without a financial commitment, and as a prelude to replacing other incandescent lighting.

Measure(s):

	Indoor Lighting CFL-13 watts	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	60W Incandescent		
Efficient technology:	CFL Screw-In 15W		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	720		
Measure life (years):	4		
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	720		

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	*$ 16,255.58*	$ 16,255.58
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):		$ -
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	-$ 1,296.00	-$ 1,296.00
Total TRC costs:	-$ 1,296.00	-$ 1,296.00
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$ 14,959.58	$ 14,959.58
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$ 12.54	

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*	0	0
	Winter	16	16

	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*375,840*	75,168	375,840	75,168
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

Controlled load (kW)		
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:

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

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):		

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 2,961.00	$ 12,263.00
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 2,961.00	$ 12,263.00
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

OEB published assumptions and measures tables applied for all TRC Calculations; 15W CFL measure assumed as a reasonable proxy for 13W CFL's

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Social Housing

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

To help residents understand and better manage energy use and costs, 16 programmable thermostats were installed in Non Profit/Social Housing units in Port Colborne. The value of this technology is magnified in units that depend on electric heat, which is frequently the case for social housing units. The net effect beyond load and energy savings, is that it also provides a measure of economic empowerment to families who typically have low incomes. In addition, CNPI Port Colborne will work directly with operating staff to identify opportunities to replace existing incandescent lighting with more energy efficient compact florescent lighting.

Measure(s):

	Prog Thermostats	Indoor Lighting CFL - 13 watts	Indoor Lighting CFL - 23 watts
Base case technology:	Average existing stock	60W Incandescent	100W Incandescent
Efficient technology:	Programmable Thermostat	CFL Screw-In 15W	CFL Screw-In 25W
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	16	648	144
Measure life (years):	18	4	4
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	16	648	144

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:	
[1] *TRC Benefits ($):*	*$ 23,264.01*	$ 23,264.01	
[2] *TRC Costs ($):*			
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):			
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	*-$ 2,548.80*	-$ 2,548.80	
Total TRC costs:	-$ 2,548.80	-$ 2,548.80	
Net TRC (in year CDN $):	$ 20,715.21		$ 20,715.21
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	$ 9.13		

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	*Summer*	3	3	
	Winter	20	20	
	lifecycle	*in year*	*Cumulative Lifecycle*	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	*511,898*	182,949	511,898	182,949
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

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

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

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

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):		

D. **Actual Program Costs:**

		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:	$ 3,786.08	$ 3,786.08
	Incentive:		
	Total:	$ 3,786.08	$ 3,786.08
Utility indirect costs ($):	*Incremental capital:*		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

OEB published assumptions and measures tables applied for all TRC Calculations; 15W CFL measure assumed as a reasonable proxy for 13W CFL's; 25W CFL measure assumed as a reasonable proxy for 23W CFL's

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

[2] For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.

Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: **2006**

1. Residential Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (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 ($)
Co-Branded Mass Market	$ 16,256	$ 1,296	$ 14,960	12.54	75,168	375,840	0	$ 2,961
Social Housing	$ 23,264	$ 2,549	$ 20,715	9.13	182,949	511,898	3	$ 3,786
Name of Program C			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			$ -	0.00				
***Totals App. B - Residential**	$ 39,520	$ 3,845	$ 35,675	10.28	258,117	887,738	3	$ 6,785
Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program	→	$ 38						
Total Residential TRC Costs		$ 3,883						
****Totals TRC - Residential**	**$ 39,520**	**$ 3,883**	**$ 35,637**	**10.18**				

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 ($)
Name of Program A			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program B			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			$ -	0.00				
***Totals App. B - Commercial**	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	0	0	0	$ -

Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program →				
Total TRC Costs		$ -		
****Totals TRC - Commercial**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**0.00**

3. Institutional Programs

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

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

	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 ($)
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 - Industrial**	$ -	$ -	$ -	0.00	0	0	0	$ -
Industrial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program →								
Total TRC Costs		$ -						
****Totals TRC - Industrial**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**$ -**	**0.00**				

5. Agricultural Programs

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

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

	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 ($)
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 C			$ -	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 ($) →

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**	$ 39,520	$ 3,883	$ 35,637	10.18	$ 258,117	$ 887,738	$ 3	$ 6,785
*Any **other** Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program* →								
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS		$ 3,883						
****LDC' PORTFOLIO TRC**	$ 39,520	$ 3,883	$ 35,637	10.18				

* 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.