

March 31, 2006

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  
Conservation and Demand Annual Report**

Further to your Guideline for Annual Reporting of CDM Initiatives, Milton Hydro Distribution Inc. has enclosed five (5) hard copies and two (2) electronic copies of our annual report with the Board Secretary for the period ending December 31, 2005.

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  
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 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**

Regarding insights and barriers from our experiences to-date with CDM, we offer the following comments. Although we believe that Milton Hydro has demonstrated a certain amount of innovativeness in developing and implementing CDM programs in our community, we do not support what we believe has been a fragmented and for the most part an inefficient, ineffective and unsustainable approach to CDM in Ontario. With more than eighty distribution utilities developing, seeking regulatory approval and delivering CDM, it is our opinion that this is not what we want to be doing on a going forward basis in this province.

Identifying the most effective programs is complex. The selection, measurement and assessment of the success of CDM programs is multi-faceted and outcomes not necessarily predictable in advance and therefore can involve significant risk. The decision to move forward with what turns out to be a highly successful initiative may rely on judgment without the security found in quantitative rationalization. This is particularly relevant where the objective is behaviour change, which is a primary goal of the government (to create a “conservation culture” in Ontario). It is our view that the two instruments, the total resource cost test and its companion, the shared savings mechanism as currently applied are limiting, potentially discouraging programs that result in the highest value over time to consumers and can lead to perverse results. For example, “if giving away one compact fluorescent bulb is good, two is better”.

**Conclusion**

With the OPA now in place it is time to centralize the development and testing and selection of CDM programs for delivery province wide. We continue to believe that LDCs can play a vital

but not necessarily exclusive role as delivery agents in their communities. Regulatory oversight of distributors would focus on the effectiveness in which the LDCs delivered these programs, eliminating the TRC test regime and the SSM, freeing up resources throughout the industry for higher valued uses to consumers.

We believe that Milton Hydro's "Energy Drill Program" and the development of the "Aggregator" function are of broader interest. Although we plan on expanding these programs to more customers within Milton and possibly throughout Halton Region in 2006, we believe that province wide consideration should be given. Our pilots of the Energy Drill Program primarily undertaken to develop procedures and protocols also have provided convincing results that this behaviour change program not only can result in significant conservation but that there is a tremendous amount of Demand Response capacity that can be readily mobilized. From our experience, we have concluded that on an individual participant basis this response is typically limited to one or two hours, however coordinating the response of multiple participants can result in significant demand reductions over several consecutive hours as was required last summer. Given Bill 21, we see the broader public sector as prime candidates for this program not only because of the requirements placed on this sector and the relatively significant demand response opportunity that they represent but also because demand response is highly visible and if results are publicized in a timely fashion, can effectively support locally and provincially, the leadership and responsibility goals of the act.

The role of the Aggregator is a fundamental requirement in mobilizing the demand response capacity in the retail market. This is not optimally a local function but one that should span the province. The meter data management/ repository component of the smart metering initiative is necessary to facilitate this role. The development of one or multiple Aggregators should be supported and institutionalized in Ontario's Electricity Market.

## Appendix A - Evaluation of the CDM Plan

	Total	Residential	GS <50kW	GS >50kW	Administration						
<i>Net TRC value (\$):</i>	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0							
<i>Benefit to cost ratio:</i>	#DIV/0!	0.00	0.00	0.00							
<i>Number of participants or units delivered:</i>	17,193	16,500	448	245							
<i>Total kWh to be saved over the lifecycle of the plan (kWh):</i>	329,329	0	329,329	0							
<i>Total in year kWh saved (kWh):</i>	42,770	0	42,770	0							
<i>Total peak demand saved (kW):</i>	26	0	26	0							
<i>Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):</i>	0.01%	0.00%	0.01%	0.00%							
<i>Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):</i>	0.02%	0.00%	0.02%	0.00%							
<i>Gross in year C&amp;DM expenditures (\$):</i>	\$568,591	\$2,710	\$393,179	\$141,970	\$30,731						
<i>Expenditures per kWh saved (\$/kWh)*:</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
<i>Expenditures per kW saved (\$/kW)**:</i>	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -							
<i>Utility discount rate (%):</i>	7.2557%										

\*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.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

**(complete this section 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 MHDl'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:** MHDl purchased "PowerView", an Internet-based customer tracking and analysis tool. MHDl also purchased a customer notification system (TVD) that notifies customers who sign up of market-price alarms based on their sensitivity, special price-triggers, IESO public appeals, warnings and power emergencies, and general public appeals. Once notified, customers are able to take steps to reduce energy consumption, increase savings, and provide system benefits to the electricity grid. Two breakfast seminars were held in November 2004 for large volume consumers to introduce software tools and new CDM programs they could participate in.

**Partnerships:** None

**Evaluation:** 40 large volume consumers attended the breakfast workshops; the majority of those attending expressed interest in signing up for notification, the Energy Drill program, and the TDRP program. As at December 31, 2005, 71 Large Volume consumers have signed up for on-line customer inquiry including access to their load data through the Powerview tool.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/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):	
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):  0

lifecycle in year

Energy savngs (kWh):  0  0

**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. **Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	<input type="text"/> 25,000.00
	Incremental O&M:	\$	<input type="text"/> 9,706.25
	Incentive:		<input type="text"/>
	Total:	\$	<input type="text"/> 34,706.25
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:		<input type="text"/>
	Total:		<input type="text"/>
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:		<input type="text"/>
	Total:		<input type="text"/>

---

E. **Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

**(complete this section 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:** To run this program effectively there is a need for incremental settlement software for the existing settlement system (Settlement One), in addition to program maintenance costs.

**Delivery:** This program was piloted in 2005 with 6 industrial/commercial/institutional customers ; the plan is to significantly expand the program to a minimum of 30 participants in 2006.

**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.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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):	

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

**Demand Response Programs:**

Dispatchable load (kW):	236540 Total
Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):	1020 June-Dec 05

**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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$	7,071.60
	<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	\$	14,021.00
	<i>Incentive:</i>		
	<i>Total:</i>	\$	21,092.60

Utility indirect costs (\$):	<i>Incremental capital:</i>		<input type="text"/>
	<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>		<input type="text"/>
	<i>Total:</i>		<input type="text"/>

Participant costs (\$):	<i>Incremental equipment:</i>		<input type="text"/>
	<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>		<input type="text"/>
	<i>Total:</i>		<input type="text"/>

**E. Comments:**

Average hourly event max single event occurred in August of 2308 kW.

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.



# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section 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 predispach 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. It is envisioned that the Energy Drill Program will ultimately be implemented in all municipal government and school buildings

**Delivery:** In 2005 the program pilot began in several buildings of different types including Milton Hydro headquarters, the Milton Leisure Centre and Robert Baldwin Public School.

**Partnerships:** Clean Air Foundation Cool Shops Program

**Evaluation:** Results indicate the program can yield substantial short-term savings and identify non-trivial opportunities for longer-term savings, while promoting a sense of individual responsibility and enthusiasm for efficient energy-use and the conservation of resources. Milton Hydro results: overall energy savings of about 10% since start of Energy Drill Program in Feb 2005, 25% reduction in peak demand and 49% reduction in demand during energy drill (as observed June 27, 2005). Milton Leisure Centre results: 23% short-term drop in demand (43kW) during energy drill on July 27, 2005. Robert Baldwin P.S. results: 40% drop in short term demand (38kW) during energy drill on June 15 2005. Estimated short term savings of as much as 70% possible on days when use is highest. During the Cool Shops Program (see "APP B Retrofit Small Comm" tab) directed at low volume commercial customers, 106 customers indicated their interest in participating in The Energy Drill Program. In late 2005, Conservation Halton and Milton Hydro executed a partnership agreement to implement the Energy Drill program across all of its facilities. The agreement is contingent upon participation by all the LDCs distributing power to Conservation Halton; the other LDCs have agreed in principle to

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/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):	

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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ <input type="text" value="-"/>
	Incremental O&M:	\$ <input type="text" value="86,171.56"/>
	Incentive:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	\$ <input type="text" value="86,171.56"/>
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>

**E. Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

**(complete this section 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:** MHDH to participate in the province-wide SHSC Energy Management Program Pilot.

**Delivery:** Milton Hydro is participating 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. Milton Hydro paid \$1,300 (\$50 per unit) to help fund the pilot including the energy audit process and resident awareness programs for 26 pilot units.

**Partnerships:** Social Housing Services Corporation ; Milton Community Homes

**Evaluation:** SHSC reported in late fall 2005 that they had completed the first phase of the Energy Management Program Pilot with audits complete and reports in the hands of over 40 social housing providers. SHSC has audited more than 6000 social housing units across the province, including the 26 units in Milton Hydro's service area. The Milton Community Homes Inc. audit identified measures for appliance replacements, lighting retrofits, window replacements, weather stripping and insulation measures. Initial discussions with Milton Community Homes indicates a willingness to incorporate energy savings measures identified in their audit with capital renewal retrofits. SHSC proposes to build on the pilot and implement a province-wide Energy Management Program for the social housing sector across Ontario.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/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 (water m3):		

**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):  0  lifecycle  in year

Energy savngs (kWh):  0   0

**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. **Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	\$ <input type="text"/> 1,300.00
	Incentive:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	\$ <input type="text"/> 1,300.00
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>

---

E. **Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section 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:** EnerCan has 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; the partners are currently investigating delivery options.

**Partnership:** Natural Resources Canada, OZZ Corporation

**Evaluation:** inactive as of December 31 2005.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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):

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):

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):		
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	-
	Incremental O&M:	\$	-
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$	-
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

---

**E. Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section 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:** Milton Hydro worked with Halton REEP, a licensed agent to deliver the Natural Resources Canada EnerGuide for Houses program. The program is directed at residential customers and provides homeowners an independent expert advice about energy efficiency in their homes.

**Delivery:** • In May 2005, Milton Hydro included a bill insert outlining the Energuide program available to residential customers. MH was responsible for distributing the inserts; customers were directed to contact REEP to participate in the program.

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

**Evaluation:** REEP completed 51 initial evaluations and 16 follow evaluations in the Milton area as a result of the insert by the end of 2005.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<u>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</u>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	

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

**Conservation Programs:**

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	
	Winter	
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
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):		
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
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. **Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	-
	Incremental O&M:	\$	-
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$	-
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

---

E. **Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.



# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section 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:** • Milton Hydro worked with 20/20 The Clean Air Partnership; the program is funded by Environment Canada and works 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:** In May 2005, Milton Hydro included a bill insert outlining the program available to residential customers. MH responsible for the printing costs of the insert; the Clean Air Partnership responsible for follow up for customers.

**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:** Inserts were successfully distributed. MH has not received a final report from Clean Air Partnership at the time of this reporting.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	

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

**Conservation Programs:**

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	
	Winter	
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):

<i>Incremental capital:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	\$ <input type="text"/> 1,410.09
<i>Incentive:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Total:</i>	\$ <input type="text"/> 1,410.09

Utility indirect costs (\$):

<i>Incremental capital:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Total:</i>	<input type="text"/>

Participant costs (\$):

<i>Incremental equipment:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Total:</i>	<input type="text"/>

**E. Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section 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:** As of December 31, 2005 448 meter-installations were retrofitted. 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. In 2006, the plan is to follow up with this original group of customers to reinforce the 2005 efforts delivered by the Cool Shops program and to facilitate participation in demand response initiatives (TDRP and The Energy Drill Program).

**Partnerships:** Clean Air Foundation

**Evaluation:** MH implemented the Regulated Price Plan -Time of Use pricing in October 2005 to this group of low volume commercial/industrial consumers. Approximately \$40,000 in costs will be avoided from this program. The "Cool Shop" team contacted all 448 targeted customers, performed Palm Pilot assisted-audits on 268 sites, providing 280 CFLs at no cost to the customer.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	

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

**Conservation Programs:**

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	13.16
	Winter	13.16
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
Energy saved (kWh):	329329	42770
Other resources saved :		
Natural Gas (m3):		
Other (specify):	Greenhouse Gases	12.92 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 beginning of year (%):

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

**Line Loss Reduction Programs:**

Peak load savings (kW):

	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
Energy savngs (kWh):	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 364,113.65
	Incremental O&M:	\$ 29,065.69
	Incentive:	
	Total:	\$ 393,179.34
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	
Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	
	Incremental O&M:	
	Total:	

**E. 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 .

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section 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:** inactive as of December 31, 2005.

**Partnerships:**

**Evaluation:** Continuing to evaluate most suitable technology for deployment of smart metering in low density areas. Expect to make a decision by Q2 2006.

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/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):	
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. **Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	-
	Incremental O&M:	\$	-
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$	-

Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>

Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>

---

E. **Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

**(complete this section 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 manufactureres 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. Milton Hydro is expected to contribute \$20,000 subject to approval of the Application by the Green Municipal Funds and commitment of a home builder in the Milton area 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. It was noted that Mattamy will begin by installing the systems in two of their model homes. In addition, 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:			
Measure life (years):			

B. **TRC Results:**

TRC Benefits (\$):	
TRC Costs (\$):	
Utility program cost (less incentives):	
Participant cost:	
Total TRC costs:	
<b>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</b>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	

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 (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):

	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>
Energy savngs (kWh):	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

**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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$	-
	Incremental O&M:	\$	-
	Incentive:		
	Total:	\$	-

Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>

Participant costs (\$):	Incremental equipment:	<input type="text"/>
	Incremental O&M:	<input type="text"/>
	Total:	<input type="text"/>

---

**E. Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.



# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

**(complete this section 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:** Deliver a clear and consistent message to consumers regarding the highest value uses of each energy resource. As part of this fuel-switching program, MH hoped to target low-income consumers living in social housing, low-income homeowners, and tenants responsible for paying their electricity bills.

**Delivery:** • Milton Hydro worked with Union Gas regarding a communication package relating to the “right fuel choice for the right job”, specifically with respect to the replacement of electric water heaters to gas. An insert was included with August gas and electricity bills to all customers; an article appeared in Union Gas’ quarterly magazine “Bestthings” distributed in September 2005. In September 2005, an insert was sent to a targeted group of customers who would be expected to have an electric water heater; the insert offered a nominal financial incentive and a conservation kit provided by Union Gas to convert to a gas water heater.

**Partnerships:** Union Gas Ltd

**Evaluation:** Incentives proved to be ineffective in the consumers’ decision to switch to a gas water heater. Union Gas and MH are considering redesigning and delivery of the program.

**Measure's):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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):

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):

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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):

<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$	-
<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	\$	-
<i>Incentive:</i>		
<i>Total:</i>	\$	-

Utility indirect costs (\$):

<i>Incremental capital:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Total:</i>	<input type="text"/>

Participant costs (\$):

<i>Incremental equipment:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Incremental O&amp;M:</i>	<input type="text"/>
<i>Total:</i>	<input type="text"/>

**E. Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this section for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** University of Waterloo/Centre for Excellence Program (Residential and Large Volume GS customers)

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

**Intent:** Develop electricity response systems to promote conservation and demand management.

**Design:** Commencing in 2006, Milton Hydro will be working with the University of Waterloo and the Ontario Centre for Excellence on a project to develop electricity response systems to promote conservation and demand management to answer the question, "How are consumption behaviour and conservation attitudes influenced by electricity-use feedback information?" This research proposal centres on the assessment of whether various forms of feedback are effective in achieving peak level electricity consumption reductions (i.e. consumption reductions during the peak hours of the day); total electricity consumption reductions; and a raised awareness regarding the importance of increased electricity conservation.

**Delivery:** inactive as at December 31, 2005

**Partnerships:** University of Waterloo; Centre for Excellence

**Evaluation:** inactive as at December 31, 2005

**Measure(s):**

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
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:	
<u>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</u>	
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/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):	
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. Program Costs\*:**

*Utility direct costs (\$):*

*Incremental capital:*

*Incremental O&M:*

*Incentive:*

*Total:*

*Utility indirect costs (\$):*

*Incremental capital:*

*Incremental O&M:*

*Total:*

*Participant costs (\$):*

*Incremental equipment:*

*Incremental O&M:*

*Total:*

---

**E. Comments:**

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.

# Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

**(complete this section 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:			
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):

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):

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):		

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. Program Costs\*:**

Utility direct costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Incentive:

Total:

\$ 30,730.81
\$ 30,730.81

Utility indirect costs (\$):

Incremental capital:

Incremental O&M:

Total:


Participant costs (\$):

Incremental equipment:

Incremental O&M:

Total:


---

**E. Comments:**

--

\*Please refer to the TRC Guide for the treatment of equipment cost in the TRC Test.