BRANTFORD POWER INC. RP-2004-0203/EB-2004-0478 CONSERVATION AND DEMAND MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

In developing its 2004-05 Conservation and Demand Management Plan, Brantford Power was guided by the following principles:

- Avoid lost opportunities and keep options open
- The portfolio should include a mix of conservation assets and programs
- The program should address all customer classes
- The program should build on existing programs and leverage other sources of funding, where possible, and
- The portfolio should provide experience that will be helpful in the design and delivery of future conservation and demand management programs.

Brantford Power's 2004-05 conservation and demand management portfolio comprised the following core program elements:

- 1. Distribution System Improvements
- 2. Smart meters for commercial and industrial customers
- 3. Key accounts seminar series targeted at commercial and industrial customers
- 4. Residential water heater load management
- 5. "Conserving Homes", a low-income consumer retrofit program
- 6. Customer outreach
- 7. Technology and program outreach, and
- 8. Program administration and planning.

Each of these programs is discussed in greater detail in Section 2, 3 and 4 along with Appendices A and B, below

To provide for flexibility in its program offering, the portfolio also included the following supplemental programs:

- ➤ LED Christmas lighting
- ➤ LED Christmas light conversion incentive program
- > LED traffic light conversion
- ➤ Room air conditioner [RAC] program
- ➤ Cool Shops Brantford, energy audits targeting small commercial customers
- Accelerated smart meters for commercial / industrial customers, and
- Memberships and sponsorships.

2. EVALUATION OF THE CONSERVATION AND DEMAND MANAGEMENT PLAN

With gross expenditures in the amount of \$1,340,000 for 2004/05 conservation and demand management programming, the net TRC value of the portfolio is \$179,185.00 with a benefit to cost ratio of 1.18. The Evaluation of the Conservation and Demand Management Plan is set out in Appendix A to this report.

3. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAMS

3.1 DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

The Distribution System Improvements program involved the upgrade of one of the oldest and least electrically efficient subdivisions in the Brantford Power distribution service territory, the Mayfair Subdivision, from 4.16 kV to 27.6 kV. Only those costs pertaining to voltage conversion through replacement of transformers and primary cables, were attributed to conservation and demand management. The net TRC value of the Distribution System Improvements program is \$190,289.00 with a benefit to cost ratio of 1.21.

3.2 SMART METERS FOR COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS

As part of the 2004/05 conservation and demand management program, meters at commercial or industrial customer premises (>50kW) that were coming up for their six-year calibration in 2005 were replaced with interval meters. As a result of replacing meters when they were being pulled for recalibration, only capital costs were incurred and subsequent installation costs were avoided.

With expenditures of \$50,000 for the smart meter program, there were no kWh or kW savings. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

3.3 KEY ACCOUNTS SEMINAR SERIES TARGETED AT COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL CUSTOMERS

In collaboration with existing business associations, Brantford Power hosted a key accounts seminar series comprising three breakfast seminars, geared to commercial and industrial customers.

The inaugural seminar, at which the IESO's Vice President of Market Series was guest speaker, addressed wholesale electricity market requirements as they pertained to larger customers billed for electricity on hourly market prices; 76 participants attended the seminar.

The second seminar with 76 participants was entitled "Seven Steps to Good Energy Management" and featured representatives from Natural Resources Canada.

The third seminar in the series featured a panel discussion among representatives from local industries and institutions with expertise in commercial and industrial energy management

who explored various energy conservation strategies in industrial, commercial and institutional settings. There were 54 participants at the third seminar in the series.

With expenditures of \$9,457.07 for the Key Accounts Seminar Series, there were no kWh or kW savings identified. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

3.4 RESIDENTIAL WATER HEATER LOAD MANAGEMENT

Prior to market opening, Brantford Power operated a load management system that could shed load from Brantford Power owned load control units on 3000 electric water heaters with a connected load of approximately 9 MW and a demand load of approximately 4 MW.

The load control program was idled with market opening. As a result, current staff did not have experience with the program and system testing. As well, upgrades to software and hardware were required to reactivate the system.

Conservation and demand management expenditures in 2005 in the amount of \$86,096.92 including hardware and software upgrades, staff training and an incentive of \$1.50 per month per participant to retain existing participants, were costs towards reactivating the system to control loads in 2006. Because the load control management system was not operated in 2005 beyond some limited system tests, there were no kW savings and, as a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

3.5 "CONSERVING HOMES" LOW INCOME CONSUMER RETROFIT PROGRAM

In collaboration with Share the Warmth, Brantford Power developed and implemented a pilot program specifically targeted to low income households in Brantford including homeowners and tenant-occupied premises where occupants directly pay their electricity bills.

Participants with incomes, which are at or below Statistics Canada's pre-tax, post-transfer Low-income Cut-off (LICO) qualified for the program. The program comprised initial inhome energy assessments with energy conservation education, installation of appropriate basic energy conservation measures such as compact fluorescent bulbs, clothes line kits, pipe insulation and hot water heater tank wraps.

As a pilot program, the expenditures of \$120,523.71 included program design and start-up costs resulting in a net TRC value of (37,368.08).

3.6 CUSTOMER OUTREACH

In partnership with the Niagara Erie Public Power Association [NEPPA], customer outreach comprised the development and delivery of the Conserver Joe information campaign geared to residential customers.

With expenditures of \$9,207.24 for Customer Outreach, there were no quantifiable kWh or kW savings. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

3.7 TECHNOLOGY AND PROGRAM RESEARCH

Additional research into technology to capture landfill gas for use to generate electricity was undertaken.

With expenditures of \$29,388.57 for Technology and Program Research, there were no kWh or kW savings. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

3.8 PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING

Program administration and planning comprised \$35,814.81 for external assistance to design and implement the 2004/05 Conservation and Demand Management Plan. As there were no kWh or kW savings, TRC benefits do not apply to the program.

From the supplementary programs, the following two programs were delivered:

3.9 LED TRAFFIC LIGHT CONVERSION

The LED Traffic Light Conversion program involved replacement of traffic signals at seven intersections and two flashing beacon installations with LED lamps on the Wayne Gretzky Parkway.

With expenditures of \$25,331.40 in 2004/05 for this program, there was a net TRC benefit of \$26,264.34 and a benefit to cost ratio of 2.04.

3.10 ACCELERATED SMART METERS

The Accelerated Smart Meters Program was an extension of the Smart Meters program for commercial and industrial customers discussed above.

With expenditures of \$70,880.28 for the accelerated smart meter program, there were no impacts in kWh or kW. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

3.11 MEMBERSHIPS AND SPONSORSHIPS

In order to remain informed and share information about current developments in conservation and demand management, Brantford Power joined the Canadian Energy Efficiency Alliance in 2004 and 2005.

With expenditures of \$3,300.00 for the memberships and sponsorships program, there were no kWh or kW savings. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program.

4. LESSONS LEARNED

The 2004/05 Conservation and Demand Management program provided the opportunity for staff to gain experience in the design and delivery of conservation and demand management programs, as well as develop methodologies for tracking, monitoring and evaluating those programs within the Total Resources Cost test framework.

With respect to specific programs in the 2004/05 Conservation and Demand Management portfolio, the following lessons were learned:

- 4.1 **Distribution System Improvements** converting voltages from 4.16 kV to 27.6 kV resulted in a net TRC value of \$190,289.00 and a benefit to cost ratio of 1.21 confirmed the benefits of voltage conversion as a sustained conservation and demand management program.
- 4.2 The **Key Accounts Seminar Series** with 3 seminars attended by a total of 206 participants demonstrated the interest in the commercial and industrial sector in conservation and demand management. Many of the participants in the seminars were actively involved in in-house conservation and demand activities indicating a capacity within the commercial and industrial sectors to undertake conservation and demand initiatives with appropriate price signals in place. Some participants, however, indicated an expectation or requirements for short payback periods of one year or less, when making Conservation and Demand Management investments.
- 4.3 The **Residential Water Heater Load Control Program**, which was an existing Brantford Power program idled at market opening, focused on system upgrades and staff training in order to reactivate the system. The 2004/05 provided staff the opportunity to update their skills to operate the load control system.
- 4.4 "Conserving Homes", the low income consumer retrofit pilot program, while challenging in terms of program design and customer outreach, was an important component of the 2004/05 Conservation and Demand Management portfolio providing needed services to the particular group of low income consumers. Through partnership, Share the Warmth brought its expertise in the area of low-income energy consumers to the design and delivery of the program. Because

reductions in energy consumption as a result of home assessments and parallel customer education about electricity conservation could not be quantified, those two elements of the program, critical to changing consumer behaviours, did not yield TRC benefits. While the prescribed 10% free ridership rate was used for purposes of TRC calculations, Brantford Power suggests, given the target participants limited financial resources to acquire basic conservation measures like compact flourescent bulbs, that the free ridership for this particular group of customers may be much lower.

- 4.5 Although **Customer Outreach** through communications and bill stuffers did not yield quantifiable electricity reductions, Brantford Power suggests that customer communications are critical to changing consumer electricity consumption behaviours and are a vital part of a Conservation and Demand Management program.
- 4.6 The **LED Traffic Signal Conversion Program** proved to be an easily implemented Conservation and Demand Management program with a net TRC value of \$36,264.34 and a benefit to cost ratio of 2.04.

5. CONCLUSION

Brantford Power is pleased to report that the programs outlined in our 2004-2005 Conservation and Demand Management Plan have been delivered. Our total CDM expenditures of \$1.34 million, representing our entire third tranche rate increase, resulted in a positive net TRC benefit. The programs we delivered, notably the groundbreaking low income conservation program "Conserving Homes," were very well received by customers. We learned from our 2004-2005 programs, and Brantford Power remains committed to delivering Conservation and Demand Management to our customers.

Appendix A - Evaluation of the CDM Plan

	Total	Distribution System Improvement	Smart Meters (C&I)	Key Account Seminar Series	Residential Water Heating Load Control	Low Income Consumer Retrofit	Customer Outreach	Technology & Program Research	Program Admin. & Plng.	LED Traffic Light Conversion	Accelerated Smart Meters (C&I)	Memberships & Sponsorship s
Net TRC value (\$):	\$179,185	\$190,289	n/a	n/a	\$ -	-\$ 37,368.08	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 26,264.34	n/a	n/a
Benefit to cost ratio:	1.18	1.21	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.48	n/a	n/a	n/a	2.04	n/a	n/a
Number of participants or units delivered:	1,179	n/a	0	0	0	1,178	n/a	n/a	0	1	0	0
Total KWh to be saved over the lifecycle of the plan (kWh):	33,746,161	32,243,390	n/a	0	n/a	583,187	n/a	n/a	n/a	919,584	n/a	n/a
Total in year kWh saved (kWh):	1,158,760	921,240	n/a	0	n/a	122,573	n/a	n/a	n/a	114,948	n/a	n/a
Total peak demand saved (kW):	160	145	n/a	0	n/a	2	n/a	n/a	n/a	13	n/a	n/a
Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):	0.114%	0.090%	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.012%	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.011%	n/a	n/a
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):	0.083%	0.076%	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.001%	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.007%	n/a	n/a
Gross in year C&DM expenditures (\$):	\$1,340,000	\$ 900,000.00	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 9,457.07	\$ 86,096.92	\$ 120,523.71	\$ 9,207.24	\$ 29,388.57	\$ 35,814.81	\$ 25,331.40	\$ 70,880.28	\$ 3,300.00
Expenditures per KWh saved (\$/kWh)*:	0.04	\$0.03	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.21	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$0.03	n/a	n/a
Expenditures per KW saved (\$/kW)**:	\$8,390	\$6,207	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$75,564	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Utility discount rate (%): 7.7933

^{*}Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate energy savings.

**Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate capacity savings.

Total kWh delivered 1,019,297,494

(complete this section for each program)

A.	Name of the Program:	Distribution System Improvemen	ts		
	Description of the program (include	ding intent, design, delivery, pa	rtnerships	s and evaluation):	
	The Distribution System Improvements prograservice territory, the Mayfair Subdivision, from cables, were attributed to conservation and decost ratio of 1.21.	4.16 kV to 27.6 kV. Only those costs pert	aining to volt	age conversion through replac	ement of transformers and primary
	Measure(s):	System Losses	Meas	ure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	4 kV System	Mode	aro z (ii applicabio)	meacure o (ii applicable)
	Efficient technology:	27.6 kV System			
	Number of participants or units deliv				
	Measure life (years):	35			
B.	TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$): TRC Costs (\$):			1,090,289	
		Itility program cost (less incentives):	\$	900,000.00	
		Participant cost:			
		Total TRC costs:	\$	900,000.00	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):			\$190,288.79	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		1.21	
C.	Results: (one or more category may	/ apply)			
	Conservation Programs:				
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer	145		
		Winter	125		
		lifecycle		in year	
	Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved:	32,243,390	921,240		
	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 (%):	

<u>Line Loss Reduction Programs:</u>			
Peak load savings (kW):			
	lifecycle		in year
Energy savngs (kWh):			
Distributed Generation and Load D	Displacement Programs:		
Amount of DG installed (kW):			
Energy generated (kWh):			
Peak energy generated (kWh):			
Fuel type:			
Other Programs (specify):			
Metric (specify):			
Program Costs*:			
Program Costs*: Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	900,000.00
Ounty direct costs (\$\phi\$).	Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	Φ	900,000.00
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$	900,000.00
	i Olai.	Ψ	900,000.00
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
, ,,,	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		
Comments:			

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	Accelerated Smart Meters (C&I)		
	Description of the program (include	ling intent, design, delivery, pa	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	The Accelerated Smart Meters Program was a	n extension of the Smart Meters program	for commercial and industrial customers di	scussed above.
	With expenditures of \$70,880.28 for the accele	prated smart meter program, there were no	impacte in NWh or NW As a result TPC	hanafite do not apply to this program
	With experialtures of \$70,000.20 for the access	rated smart meter program, there were no	Jimpacis iii kwii oi kw. As a lesuit, TKC	benefits do not apply to this program.
	Measure(s):	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	weasure i	ivieasure 2 (ii applicable)	Measure 3 (II applicable)
	Efficient technology: Number of participants or units deliv			
		ered:		
	Measure life (years):			
B.	TRC Results:			
	TRC Benefits (\$):			
	TRC Costs (\$):	Itilita a programa anno (logo importivos).		
	<i>O</i>	tility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost:		
		Total TRC costs:	\$ -	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	rotal TNO costs.	\$ -	
	Panelit to Cost Potio (TDC Panelits)	TDC Coataly	#DIV/01	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):	#DIV/0!	
C.	Results: (one or more category may	apply)		
	Conservation Programs:			
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
	3 ()	Winter		
		lifecycle	in year	
	Energy saved (kWh):			
	Other resources saved :			
	Natural Gas (m3):			
	Other (specify):			
	<u>Demand Management Programs:</u>			
	Controlled load (kW)	(114/1.)		
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak			
	Litergy stillled wild-peak to Oil-peak	(VANII).		

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 (%):	

	Line Loss Reduction Programs:				
	Peak load savings (kW):	lifecycle		in year	
	Energy savngs (kWh):	шесусте		ııı yeai	
		Displacement Programs:			
	Distributed Generation and Load I Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type:	Displacement Programs:			
	Other Programs (specify): Metric (specify):				
D.	Program Costs*:				
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	70,880.28	
		Incremental O&M: Incentive:			
		Total:	\$	70,880.28	
			Ť	,	
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:			
		Incremental O&M:			
		Total:			
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:			
	, and pain occio (4).	Incremental O&M:			
		Total:			
E.	Comments:				

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation): In adder in small informed and share information about current developments in conservation and demand management. Brantford Power joined the Canadian Energy Efficiency Allamos in 2004 and 2005. With expenditures of \$3,300.00 for the memberships and sponsorships program, there were no kWh or kW savings. As a result, TRC benefits do not apply to this program. Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Rumber of participants or units delivered: Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Base case technology: Rumber of participants or units delivered: Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Measure 5 (if applicable) Measure 6 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 9 (i	A.	Name of the Program:	Memberships & Sponsorships		
Measure(s): Measure(s): Measure 3 (if applicable) Base case technology: Elficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure 3 (if applicable) B. TRC Results: TRC Denefits (3): TRC Costs (3): Unitry program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Net TRC (in year CDN \$): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Penerly saved (kWh): Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kWh): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kWh): Cenery shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Description of the program (includ	ing intent, design, delivery, par	tnerships and evaluation):	
Measure(s): Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Measure 5 (if applicable) Measure 6 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 9 (if applicable) Measure 1			ion about current developments in conser	vation and demand management, Brantfor	d Power joined the Canadian Energy
Measure (s): Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Measure 3 (if applicable) Measure 6 (if applicable) Measure 7 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 9 (if applicable) Measure 9 (if applicable) Measure 8 (if applicable) Measure 9 (if applicable			rships and sponsorships program, there w	ere no kWh or kW savings. As a result, T	RC benefits do not apply to this
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		p. 09. a			
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Measure 1 Measure 2 (if applicable) Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$S): TRC Costs (\$S): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Measure(s):			
Efficient technology.* Number of participants or units delivered: Measure life (years): B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$): TRC Costs (\$): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Net TRC (in year CDN \$): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):			Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$): TRC Costs (\$): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter Iffecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Efficient technology:			
B. TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$): TRC Costs (\$): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Net TRC (in year CDN \$): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Total TRC costs: Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! Conservation Programs: Winter Iffecycle			ered:		
TRC Benefits (\$): TRC Costs (\$): Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Net TRC (in year CDN \$): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Total TRC costs: #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):	В.				
Utility program cost (less incentives): Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Net TRC (in year CDN \$): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Uinter Uinter Uinter Uinter Uinter Uinter Uinter Uinter (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		TRC Benefits (\$):			
Participant cost: Total TRC costs: Net TRC (in year CDN \$):			tility program cost (less incentives):		
Net TRC (in year CDN \$): Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):			Participant cost:		
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs): #DIV/0! C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC costs:		
C. Results: (one or more category may apply) Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):			TRC Costs):	Ť	
Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		·	·	#DIV/0:	_
Demand savings (kW): Summer Winter lifecycle in year Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved: Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):	C.		арріу)		
Winter lifecycle in year			Summer		
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):			Winter		
Other resources saved : Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Energy sayod (kM/h):	lifecycle	in year	
Other (specify): Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Demand Management Programs: Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Other (specify):			
Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):		Demand Management Programs:			
Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):					
Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak (kWh):		Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak			
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 (%):	

	Line Loss Reduction Programs:			
	Peak load savings (kW):	lifecycle	in year	
	Energy savngs (kWh):	mecycle	III year	
	<u>Distributed Generation and Load</u> Amount of DG installed (kW):	Displacement Programs:		
	Energy generated (kWh):			
	Peak energy generated (kWh):			
	Fuel type:			
	Other Programs (specify):			
	Metric (specify):			
D.	Program Costs*:			
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	• •	Incremental O&M:	\$	3,300.00
		Incentive:		
		Total:	\$	3,300.00
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	σ	Incremental O&M:		
		Total:		
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		
		Incremental O&M:		
		Total:		
Ξ.	Comments:			

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

(complete this section for each program)

A.	Name of the Program:	Smart Meters (C&I)		
	Description of the program (include	ding intent, design, delivery, pa	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	As part of the 2004/05 conservation and dema year calibration in 2005 were replaced with int and subsequent installation costs were avoided	erval meters. As a result of replacing meter		
	With expenditures of \$50,000 for the smart me	eter program, there were no kWh or kW sa	vings. As a result, TRC benefits do not a	pply to this program.
	Measure(s):			
	Base case technology: Efficient technology:			
	Number of participants or units delive Measure life (years):	ered:		
D	,			
B.	TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$):			
	TRC Costs (\$):			
	L	Itility program cost (less incentives):		
		Participant cost:		
	Net TDO (in the ODA)	Total TRC costs:		
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):	#DIV/0!	
C.	Results: (one or more category may	apply)		
	Conservation Programs:	-		
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
		Winter	*********	
	Energy saved (kWh):	lifecycle	in year	
	Other resources saved :			
	Natural Gas (m3):			
	Other (specify):			
	Demand Management Programs:			
	Controlled load (kW)			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak	• •		
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	: (KVVh):		
	Demand Response Programs:			
	Dispatchable load (kW):	l.		
	Peak hours dispatched in year (hour	rs):		

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):		
١.	Program Costs*:		
	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 50,000.00
		Incremental O&M:	
		Incentive:	\$ -
		Total:	\$ 50,000.00
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	
	Double in and a cate (C):	la ava ma antal a avvin ma arti	
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
		Incremental O&M: Total:	
		rotar.	
	Comments:		

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	Key Account Seminar Series		
	Description of the program (include	ding intent, design, delivery, pa	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	In collaboration with existing business associa and industrial customers. The inaugural semir requirements as they pertained to larger custo participants was entitled "Seven Steps to Good featured a panel discussion among representa various energy conservation strategies in indu-	nar, at which the IESO's Vice President of mers billed for electricity on hourly market d Energy Management" and featured repre atives from local industries and institutions	Market Series was guest speaker, address prices; 76 participants attended the semin esentatives from Natural Resources Canad with expertise in commercial and industrial	sed wholesale electricity market ar. The second seminar with 76 a. The third seminar in the series energy management who explored
	With expenditures of \$9,457.07 for the Key Ac program.	counts Seminar Series, there were no qua	nitifiable kWh or kW savings. As a result,	TRC benefits do not apply to this
	Measure(s):	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:			
	Efficient technology:			
	Number of participants or units delivenessure life (years):	ered:		
	Measure life (years).			
B.	TRC Results:			
	TRC Benefits (\$):			
	TRC Costs (\$):			
	ι	Itility program cost (less incentives):		
		Participant cost:		
	Not TDO (in the ODN ft)	Total TRC costs:		
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		

D. Program Costs*:			
Utility direct costs ((\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	\$ 9,457.07
		Incentive:	
		Total:	\$ 9,457.07
Utility indirect costs	s (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	
Participant costs (\$	S):	Incremental equipment:	
		Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	

E. Comments:

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	Residential Water Heating Load	Management	
	Description of the program (includ	ling intent, design, delivery, pa	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	Prior to market opening, Brantford Power opera heaters with a connected load of approximately			oad control units on 3000 electric water
	The load control program was idled with marke software and hardware were required to reactive		ot have experience with the program and sy	ystem testing. As well, upgrades to
	Conservation and demand management exper \$1.50 per month per participant to retain existir system was not operated in 2005 other than so	ng participants, were costs towards reactive	vating the system to control loads in 2006.	Because the load control management
	Measure(s):			
	Base case technology: Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delive Measure life (years):	ered:		
B.	TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$): TRC Costs (\$):	itility program cost (less incentives):		
	C	Participant cost:		
		Total TRC costs:	\$ -	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$ -	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):	#DIV/0!	
C.	Results: (one or more category may	apply)		
	Conservation Programs: Demand savings (kW):	Summer Winter		
	Energy saved (kWh):	lifecycle	in year	
	Other resources saved :			
	Natural Gas (m3):			
	Other (specify):			
	Damand Managament Browns			
	<u>Demand Management Programs:</u> Controlled load (kW)			
	Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	(kWh):		
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak ((kWh):		
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak	(kWh):		
	Demand Response Programs:			
	Dispatchable load (kW):			
	Peak hours dispatched in year (hours	s):		
	Power Factor Correction Programs	s:		

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

Line Loss Reduction Prograi	ns:	
Peak load savings (kW):		
	lifecycle	in year
Energy savngs (kWh):		
Distributed Generation and L	oad Displacement Programs:	
Amount of DG installed (kW):		
Energy generated (kWh):		
Peak energy generated (kWh).		
Fuel type:		
Other Programs (specify):		
Metric (specify):		
Program Costs*:		
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 86,096.92
	Incremental O&M:	
	Incentive:	
	Total:	\$ 86,096.92
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
	rotai.	
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
Comments		
Comments:		

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

(complete this section for each program)

A.	Name of the Program:	Low Income Consumer Retrofit		
	Description of the program (include	ling intent, design, delivery, par	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	In collaboration with Share the Warmth, Brantf	ord Power developed and implemented a	pilot program specifically targeted to low in	come households in Brantford including
	homeowners and tenant-occupied premises w			oomo nodoonoldo in Brandord inoldding
	Participants with incomes, which are at or belo initial in-home energy assessments with energ bulbs, clothes line kits, pipe insulation and hot	y conservation education, installation of ap		
	As a pilot program, the expenditures of \$120,5	23.71 included program design and start-u	up costs and resulted in a net TRC value of	f (37,368.08).
	Measure(s):	la de en l'inhtin e	la de en l'inhtin e	Missallanasus
	Paga agas taghnalagur	Indoor Lighting 60W Incandescent	Indoor Lighting 100W Incandescent	Miscellaneous Average existing stock
	Base case technology: Efficient technology:	CFL Screw-In 15W	CFL Screw-In 23W	Clothes Line Kit
	Number of participants or units delive		53	65
	Measure life (years):	4	4	10
		•	Water Heating - Avg. Res. Home	10
		Average existing stock	Average existing stock	
		Pipe Insulation (6-10')	Tank Wrap	
		39	14	
		6	6	
В.	TRC Results:			
Ь.	TRC Benefits (\$):		34,237.0	
	TRC Costs (\$):		34,237.0	
		Itility program cost (less incentives):	¢ 65.440.43	
	O	Participant cost:	\$ 65,449.13	
		Total TRC costs:	\$ 6,155.95	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC costs.	\$ 71,605.08 -\$ 37,368.08	
	Net The (iii year σείν φ).		-ψ 37,500.00	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):	\$ 0.48	
C.	Results: (one or more category may	(apply)		
О.	results. (one of more category may	арріу)		
	Conservation Programs:			
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer	1.6	
		Winter	23.3	
		lifecycle	in year	
	Energy saved (kWh):	583,187	122,573	
	Other resources saved :			
	Natural Gas (m3):			
	Other (specify):			
	() 2)			

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:	
Power Factor Correction Programs: Amount of KVar installed (KVar):	

Line Loss Reduction Program	ns:	
Peak load savings (kW):		
	lifecycle	in year
Energy savngs (kWh):		
Distributed Generation and L	oad Displacement Programs:	
Amount of DG installed (kW):		
Energy generated (kWh):		
Peak energy generated (kWh):		
Fuel type:		
Other Programs (specify):		
Metric (specify):		
D. Program Costs*:		
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 114,367.76
	Incentive:	\$ 6,155.95
	Total:	\$ 120,523.71
I Hility indirect costs (\$):	Ingramental conital:	
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
E. <u>Comments:</u>		

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	Customer Outreach		
	Description of the program (include	ling intent, design, delivery, pa	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	In partnership with the Niagara Erie Public Powcampaign geared to residential customers.	wer Association [NEPPA], customer outrea	ach comprised the development and delive	ry of the Conserver Joe information
	With expenditures of \$9,207.24 for Customer 0	Outreach, there were no quantifiable kWh	or kW savings. As a result, TRC benefits	do not apply to this program.
	Measure(s):			
	Base case technology:			
	Efficient technology: Number of participants or units delive	ered:		
	Measure life (years):			
B.	TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$):			
	TRC Costs (\$):	Itility program cost (less incentives):		
	O	Participant cost:		
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC costs:	\$ - \$ -	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):	#DIV/0!	
C.	Results: (one or more category may	•	11011170.	
0.	Conservation Programs:	арріу)		
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer		
		Winter	in year	
	Energy saved (kWh):	lifecycle	iii yeai	
	Other resources saved:			
	Natural Gas (m3): Other (specify):			
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
	<u>Demand Management Programs:</u>			
	Controlled load (kW) Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak	(kWh)·		
	Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak			
	Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak			

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 (%):	

Line	Loss Reduction Programs:		
Peal	k load savings (kW):		
		lifecycle	in year
Enei	rgy savngs (kWh):		
Dist	ributed Generation and Load D	Displacement Programs:	
	ount of DG installed (kW):		
	rgy generated (kWh):		
	k energy generated (kWh):		
Fuel	type:		
Othe	er Programs (specify):		
	ric (specify):		
	(၁၉၁೮).		
	gram Costs*:		
Utilit	y direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
		Incremental O&M:	\$ 9,207.24
		Incentive:	
		Total:	\$ 9,207.24
1 14:1:4	in direct costs (C)	la susua sutal sa sitali	
Otilit		Incremental capital: Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	
Part	icipant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
	(,,	Incremental O&M:	
		Total:	
E. Com	<u>iments:</u>		

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	Technology & Program Research	ı	
	Baraniadian at the annual control	Para latant da alam da Parama man	december of a section (local)	
	Description of the program (include	ling intent, design, delivery, pai	rtnerships and evaluation):	
	Additional research into technology to capture	landfill gas for use to generate electricity v	vas undertaken.	
	With expenditures of \$29,388.57 for Technolog	gy and Program Research, there were no	kWh or kW savings. As a result, TRC ber	nefits do not apply to this program.
	Measure(s):	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:		, , ,	(11
	Efficient technology:	e u e els		
	Number of participants or units delivenessure life (years):	erea:		
	,			
B.	TRC Results:			
	TRC Benefits (\$):			
	TRC Costs (\$):	Hilita na aram anat /lana inanatiran).		
	C	Itility program cost (less incentives):		
		Participant cost:		
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC costs:	\$ -	
	Net TNO (III year CDN φ).		Ф -	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/	TRC Costs):		

D. Program Costs*:		
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 29,388.57
	Incentive:	
	Total:	\$ 29,388.57
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	

E. Comments:

 $^{^{\}star}$ Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	f the Program: Program Administration & Plng.					
	Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):						
	Program administration and planning comprised \$35,814.81 for external assistance to design and implement the 2004/05 Conservation and Demand Management Plan. As there were no kWh or kW savings, TRC benefits do not apply to the program.						
	Measure(s):	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)			
	Base case technology: Efficient technology:						
	Number of participants or units delive	ered:					
	Measure life (years):						
B.	TRC Results:						
	TRC Benefits (\$):						
	TRC Costs (\$):						
	U	Itility program cost (less incentives):					
		Participant cost:					
	Not TPC (in year CDN \$):	Total TRC costs:	\$ -				
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		-				
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):						

. Program Costs*:		
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 35,814.81
	Incentive:	
	Total:	\$ 35,814.81
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	

E. Comments:

1. There were no results for this program in 2005

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

A.	Name of the Program:	LED Traffic Light Conversion			
	Description of the program (including intent, design, delivery, partnerships and evaluation):				
	The LED Traffic Light Conversion program involved replacement of traffic signals at seven intersections and two flashing beacon installations with LED lamps on the Wayne Gretzky Parkway.				
	With expenditures of \$25,331.40 in 2004/05 for this program, there was a net TRC benefit of \$26,264.34 and a benefit to cost ratio of 2.04.				
	Measure(s):				
	. ,	LED Traffic Signals	Measu	re 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
	Base case technology:	Avg. Existing Stock			
	Efficient technology:	LED Traffic Signals			
	Number of participants or units delive Measure life (years):	e 9 8			
B.					
Б.	TRC Results: TRC Benefits (\$):		\$	51,595.74	
	TRC Costs (\$):		φ	01,090.74	
		Itility program cost (less incentives):	\$	25,331.40	
	Ş	Participant cost:	Ψ	25,551.40	
		Total TRC costs:	\$	25,331.40	
	Net TRC (in year CDN \$):		\$	26,264.34	
	Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):		\$	2.04	
C.	Results: (one or more category may apply)				
	Conservation Programs:				
	Demand savings (kW):	Summer	13.1		
		Winter	13.1		
	Formula and AMAN	lifecycle	444040	in year	
	Energy saved (kWh): Other resources saved:	919,584	114,948		
	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 (%):					

	Line Loss Reduction Programs:				
	Peak load savings (kW):	lifecycle		in year	
	Energy savngs (kWh):	mecycle		iii yeai	
	Distributed Generation and Load E Amount of DG installed (kW): Energy generated (kWh): Peak energy generated (kWh): Fuel type:	Displacement Programs:			
	Other Programs (specify):				
	Metric (specify):				
D.	Program Costs*:				
υ.	Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:			
	Ounty unect costs (φ).	Incremental O&M:	\$	25,331.40	
		Incentive:	Ψ	20,001.40	
		Total:	\$	25,331.40	
	Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:			
		Incremental O&M:			
		Total:			
	Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:			
	r articipant costs (φ).	Incremental O&M:			
		Total:			
		rota.			
	_				
E.	Comments:				

^{*}Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.