



ERIE THAMES POWERLINES

"Your Home Town Utility"

2007 Annual Report, CDM Third Tranche Funding, Erie Thames Powerlines Corporation

Ontario Energy Board File No. RP-2004-0203/ED-1999-0287

March 31, 2008

Erie Thames Powerlines Corporation
280 Elm Street, Aylmer, Ontario, N5H 3G3
Tel (519) 773-2931, Fax (519) 773-2978
www.eriethamespower.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
EVALUATION OF CDM PLAN.....	5
DISCUSSION OF PROGRAMS.....	6
LED Traffic Light Retrofit Program	7
Street Light Conversion Program	8
LESSONS LEARNED	15
Measuring Success	15
Partnering for Success	15
Deliver Results	16
Review Programs and Re-Evaluate the CDM Plan	16
CONCLUSION.....	17
APPENDIX A – Evaluation of the CDM Plan	
APPENDIX B – Discussion of the Program	
APPENDIX C – Program and Portfolio Totals	



INTRODUCTION

On March 22nd, 2005, Erie Thames Powerlines Corporation ("Erie Thames") was granted final approval for its Conservation and Demand Management ("CDM") Plan, as filed with the Ontario Energy Board ("Board") under docket number RP-2004-0203 / EB-2004-0519. The Board's decision indicated that annual reporting "should be done on a calendar year and should be filed with the Board no later than March 31st of the following year" and would be subject to public review. On March 1st, 2007 the Board issued Amended Requirements for Annual Reporting of Conservation and Demand Management ("CDM") Initiatives that explained more fully the requirements. This report has been prepared in accordance with those guidelines.

Erie Thames is "Your Home Town Utility" to approximately 14,000 customers, in 11 communities, across 7 municipalities, which in itself presents a challenging task of delivering initiatives to all communities equally and fairly. From the outset, Erie Thames CDM strategy has been to *Educate, Encourage, Equip* and *Empower* customers through various CDM initiatives. The 2007 objective was to continue to Educate, Encourage, Equip and Empower all customers in all communities as well as pilot new technologies that will further develop the conservation culture.

The Erie Thames CDM Strategy – *Educate, Encourage, Equip and Empower*

Educate

It all begins with education, and with the basic of the electricity market and conservation, with a focus on developing two key relationships, the relationship between a customer's energy consumption and the energy industry and the relationship between a customer's energy consumption and the cost of the energy they consume, both of which are crucial for meaningful growth and development of the 'conservation culture' in Ontario.

Once the relationships are understood, additional education about behaviours, technologies, etc. can be added to the communications strategy, thereby providing customers with the needed knowledge to make educated and informed decisions about products they purchase, upgrades they make and processes they implement.

Encourage

Education alone is not enough to create a conservation culture as customers need more than a brochure, they need something real that they can install and



observe makes a difference. Giveaways, exchanges and incentives are all mechanisms to *encourage* customers to evaluate energy efficient technologies and/or process with the underlying objective that customers use the technology/implement the process; observe the results first hand; and then adopt the technology and/or the process and install additional technologies or further implement the process.

Equip

Education and *encouragement* together still do not provide the complete package required for a successful CDM program. Customers need tools that communicate and demonstrate energy consumption and cost information in a meaningful and useful format; a tool to build the relationship and make the connection between consumption and cost. This is crucial, especially to residential customers, as they generally do not understand what a kilowatt hour represents, but certainly understand what a dollar spent represents. The tools therefore, provide customers with the means to easily and effectively measure changes to their life styles and/or implement energy efficient technologies.

Empower

Through ***Education***, ***Encouragement*** and ***Equipment***, Erie Thames is ***Empowering*** customers with the information, the incentives and the tools to make educated decisions, purchase and evaluate energy efficient products, and evaluate energy efficient actions for effectiveness. This empowerment will in turn drive the conservation culture movement.



EVALUATION OF CDM PLAN

The following programs continued in 2007:

- LED Traffic Light Retrofit Incentive Program (3 completed in 2005, 5 Completed in 2006, 3 Completed in 2007)
- Street Light Conversions (3 Completed 2006, 1 Completed in 2007)
- Smart Meter Pilot - Commercial and Industrial (Completed)
- Smart Meter Pilot - Residential (In Progress)
- Medium and Large User CDM Energy Management Tool (Completed)

Please refer to Appendix A for the complete evaluation of Erie Thames CDM plan as outlined in the in the Amended Requirements for Annual Reporting of Conservation and Demand Management ("CDM") Initiatives.

Given the funding granted to Erie Thames under the Third Tranche of Market Adjusted Revenue Requirement the results achieved are significant. A summary of Erie Thames CDM plan performance is illustrated in Table 1 below.

Year	Annual Savings (kWh)	Life Cycle Savings (kWh)	Cost Per kWh (\$)	Peak Demand Savings (kW)	Cost Per kW (\$)
2005	62,900	724,000	0.047	0.04	790,641.40
2006	299,050	2,342,946	0.054	42.01	3,821,73
2007	60,749	507,293	0.21	1.00	109,439.75
Total	422,699	3,574,219	0.074	43.05	6,167.44

The accumulated annual savings of 422,699 kWh's is equivalent to powering 29 homes for one year, and over the lifetime of the technology deployed, the savings of 3,574,219 kWh's is equivalent to powering 248 homes for one year.



DISCUSSION OF PROGRAMS

The following programs continued and were completed in 2007.

- LED Traffic Light Retrofit Incentive Program (3 completed in 2005, 5 Completed in 2006, 3 Completed in 2007)
- Street Light Conversions (3 Completed 2006, 1 Completed in 2007)
- Smart Meter Pilot - Commercial and Industrial (Completed)
- Smart Meter Pilot - Residential (In Progress)
- Medium and Large User CDM Energy Management Tool (Completed)

Please refer to Appendix B, Discussion of Programs for a complete description of the programs as outlined in the Amended Requirements for Annual Reporting of Conservation and Demand Management ("CDM") Initiatives.



LED Traffic Light Retrofit Program

Description:

Incentive based program focused on *encouraging* the replacement of incandescent based traffic light systems with Light Emitting Diode (LED) technologies. Incentives range from \$500 for a partial conversion to \$1,500 for a full conversion.

Target:

Municipalities, Townships, Counties

Benefits:

LED traffic lighting uses approximately 80% less energy as compared to its dated counterpart the incandescent. In addition to reduced energy consumption LED's last approximately 10 times longer, thereby decreasing maintenance costs. When considering energy savings alone, the payback period for LED Traffic Retrofit Program is 6 years, but when the maintenance savings is incorporated the payback period is a mere 2.4 years.

2007 Results:

In 2007, Erie Thames provided \$ 3,827.65 in incentives which equates to two complete intersection conversions and one conversion of a four way flashing intersection beacon, providing a savings of 37,390 kWh's annually.

Program Results:

Since 2005, Erie Thames has provided a total of \$14,827.65 for 11 projects amounting to an annual savings of 148,830 kWh's and over the lifecycle of the technology accumulate savings of 1,488,300 kWh's, equivalent to powering 100 homes for one year. Table 2, summarizes the cumulative annual savings and the program lifecycle savings.

Table 2 – LED Traffic Retrofit Savings Summary		
	kWh Savings	KW Savings
Cumulative Annual Savings	148,830	0.12
Program Lifecycle Savings	1,488,300	0.12



Street Light Conversion Program

Description:

Incentive based program designed to *encourage* the replacement of inefficient and maintenance prone technologies with more efficient technologies with increased life spans. Incentives for the program range from \$5,000 to \$10,000, with incentives based on the size of the conversion project.

Target:

Municipalities, Townships, Counties

Benefits:

High Pressure Sodium street lights not only reduce the energy consumption while providing the same amount of light, but they have an increased life span. Mercury Vapor lamps last 2 years or approximately 7,000 hours, where as the High Pressure Sodium lamps last 5 years or approximately 20,000 hours. Finally, the replacement costs for High Pressure Sodium are less than Mercury Vapour. The increased cost of the Mercury Vapour is attributed to the decrease in the demand for the lamp given the new technologies available.

2007 Results:

One street light conversion was completed in 2007 in Otterville, where a total of 56 street lights were converted from 175 Mercury Vapor lamps to 100 watt High Pressure Sodium lamps. The conversions resulted in an annual reduction of 18,396 kWh's and a lifecycle savings of 91,980 kWh's.

Program Results:

Since 2005, Erie Thames has provided a total of \$25,000 for 4 projects resulting in an annual savings of 40,733 kWh's and over the lifecycle of the technology savings of 203,666 kWh's, equivalent to powering 14 homes for one year. Table 3, summarizes the cumulative annual savings and the program lifecycle savings.

Table 3 – Street Light Conversion Savings Summary		
	kWh Savings	KW Savings
Cumulative Annual Savings	40,733	2
Program Lifecycle Savings	203,666	2



Smart Meter Pilot Program – Commercial and Industrial

Description:

The Ontario Government has established targets for the installation of 800,000 residential smart meters by December 31st, 2007 and for all of Ontario for 2010. These meters will assist in establishing a 'conservation culture' in Ontario. In conjunction with appropriate rate structures, they will encourage customers to conserve energy or shift energy use.

A pilot program for commercial and industrial smart meters was completed to assess the metering and communications of systems where conventional tower or mesh network communication technologies are not practical.

Initially, several smart metering technologies were researched and the SmartSynch wireless cellular system was selected for the pilot. Erie Thames partnered with the Utilismart Corporation who has purchased the requisite software to read the meters and present the corresponding data

Erie Thames also partnered with the Thames Valley District School Board (TVDSB) as part of the commercial smart meter project. The project was beneficial to both parties as TVDSB facilities in ETPL territory were moved to interval meters, thereby providing TVDSB with much needed interval data to supplement their aggressive energy management strategy, while ETPL gained invaluable experience dealing with challenging locations for cellular based smart meters.

Target:

Commercial and Industrial Customers

Benefits:

The smart meter program supports the Minister of Energy's commitment to the installation of 800,000 smart meters by December 31st, 2007. In addition, the program provides Erie Thames with the much needed experience and knowledge required to efficiently and effectively expand the deployment of smart meters.

Program Results:

In total, 16 SmartSynch smart meters were deployed across Erie Thames territory in a variety of unique and challenging locations. Several, important issues were identified and will be addressed to ensure future deployments are efficient and trouble free. A summary of the issues encountered and the corrective action has been included below.



Planning and Testing

- *Poor or no Signal Strength* - Ensure signal strength testing is performed in the exact location to simulate the precise conditions the meter will experience in trying to obtain a wireless signal. This will ensure that the proper meter is ordered (internal antenna versus external antenna) and the associated installation work planned out accordingly.
- *Antennas Cables Undersized* - Order external antennas, if required, with more than adequate cabling.
- *Poor or No Signal* - Coverage in rural areas, where a technology of this nature would be useful may not be adequate for the application.

Installation

- *Meter Initialization Time Consuming* - Initialization of the meter to the wireless network is not instantaneous and depending on signal strength, meter / antenna location may take considerable time, therefore ensure installation scheduling includes buffers to accommodate for the initialization. In addition, ensure the customer is aware of the total time required to complete and commission the installation.

Overall

- Wireless signals vary even if the signal strength was tested and verified in precisely the exact location and the simulated environment.
- Cellular meter communication technology has an application in the Ontario Smart Meter market place for locations that will be difficult to reach by way of a phone line / ethernet connection, a wireless mesh network or tower technology.



SMART Meter Pilot Program – Residential

Description:

The Ontario Government has established targets for the installation of 800,000 residential smart meters by December 31st, 2007 and for all of Ontario for 2010. These meters will assist in establishing a 'conservation culture' in Ontario. In conjunction with appropriate rate structures, they will encourage customers to conserve energy or shift energy use.

Pilot programs for residential smart meters were completed to assess the metering, communications, associated installation processes and procedures, settlement, load control, and other technologies that could be used in conjunction with smart meters in the future.

Erie Thames researched a multitude of smart meter technology providers and settled on piloting the Elster Energy Smart Metering technology. In addition, Erie Thames partnered with Utilismart for meter data acquisition services.

Target:

Residential Customers

Benefits:

The smart meter program supports the Minister of Energy's commitment to the installation of 800,000 smart meters by December 31st, 2007. In addition, the program provides Erie Thames with the much needed experience and knowledge required to efficiently and effectively expand the deployment of smart meters.

Program Results:

500 meters were initially deployed but due to a defective electronic component, a substantial quantity of the meters had to be removed from the field and returned to the factory for rework. Currently 300 meters have been redeployed in the field with the remaining 200 scheduled to be redeployed in early 2008. A summary of the issues encountered has been included below.

Collector Configuration

- Several "Collectors" (i.e. meters designed to wirelessly collect the data from individual meters to be downloaded by way of a phone line) have arrived incorrectly programmed. As a result numerous hours were spent troubleshooting to resolve the issue. The problem was rectified by way of a remote software update performed by the factory.



Inoperative Displays

- A number of meter displays have become inoperative which presents issues to meters readers currently reading the meters as well as meter technicians working in the field studying communication paths and troubleshooting communication issues.

Installation Processes and Procedures

- A number of installation processes were carried out to determine the most efficient manner to deploy the meters and ensure the meter changes were accurately captured in the customer information system, in a timely manner. Handheld tablet computers equipped with wireless and / or cellular communication capabilities to streamline the processes and ensure accurate and up to date information updates will be fully utilized for full deployment.



Commercial and Industrial Energy Management Tool

Description:

In March of 2006 a seminar was held for Erie Thames commercial and industrial customers with the objective to *educate, encourage and equip* commercial and industrial customers with energy awareness and conservation information. As part of the program Erie Thames partnered with Utilismart to provide their Energy Management and Reporting tool as well as training on how to use the tool free of charge until September of 2007. The Utilismart Energy Management and Reporting tool completes the conservation loop by equipping commercial and industrial customers with the tools necessary to understand and manage their energy usage as well validate conservation initiatives implemented.

Target:

Commercial and Industrial Customers

Benefits:

The Utilismart Energy Management Tool provides customers with a suite of useful reports and tools for energy management, cost analysis and cost prediction. The major benefit of the software is that it is web based and can be accessed from any computer with access to the internet, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Some of the more useful reports and tools include:

- Monthly Calendar - Illustrates a quick snapshot of the usage on a daily basis, such as peak demand, time of peak, consumption and load factor.
- Demand Profile – Graphically displays the demand profile and power factor in both a monthly and daily format. Data is also available in an excel download.
- Consumption Profile – Monthly view (by day) or daily view (by hour) of the kWh consumption. Data also available for download in excel format.
- Cost Report – Breakdown of cost by day in competitive and non-competitive fees.
- Invoice Report – Month to date invoice of energy costs.
- Cost Prediction – The tool uses day ahead pricing and actual customer historical data to predict the energy costs for the following day. Inputs allow users to customize the tool by way of inputs for the historical data and the market data utilized in the modeling process. Therefore the tool



allows customers to predict the cost of power and take action to avoid high priced periods. The tool can also be used the following day to validate, if actions taken, delivered the desired or expected results.

Program Results:

Several customers made use of the software tool for many functions such as:

- To gain an understanding of when and where their energy is used and the associated costs.
- Evaluate process changes and quantify the impact of the changes, such as reducing lighting, cooling temperatures, staggering startup processes and procedures, etc.
- Assemble improved business cases for technology retrofits, upgrades, etc. by utilizing operating cost savings, increased life span, and decreased maintenance costs as elements of the business case.
- Evaluate and predict pricing and manually shift or curtail load and evaluate the impact.



LESSONS LEARNED

Erie Thames learned many lessons while investigating, delivering and comparing CDM initiatives including:

- Measuring Success
- Partnering for Success
- Deliver Results
- Review Programs and Re-Evaluate the CDM Plan

Measuring Success

As stated in the 2005 and 2006 annual reports, from Erie Thames experiences, it is apparent that success can be measured quantitatively and qualitatively, and that determining whether a program is successful based solely on quantitative results is flawed. Mission critical marketing and communication programs which are primarily qualitatively based are essential to customer education and the development of the 'conservation culture' in Ontario.

Partnering for Success

Partnering with LDC's, Channel Delivery Agents and stakeholders increases the success of programs.

- LDC's – Provides the opportunity for increased program exposure and consistent marketing.
- LDC's – Provides economies of scale for the procurement of marketing services, technologies, etc.
- Channel Delivery Agents – Increased program exposure at low cost or no cost as the promotion of the program is a benefit for the channel delivery agent.
- Customers – LDC's have a vast pool of CDM resources to work with, pull ideas from; evaluate new technologies on and test initiatives with; that pool being their customers. Developing working relationships with customers on all levels empowers customers by giving them a sense that they are important and that their needs are important to the LDC, thereby further engaging their interest and participation. In addition, the relationships provide the LDC with valuable feedback on programs that can then be utilized in the development and deployment of future programs.



Deliver Results

CDM programs need to deliver realizable, quantitative results to customers, while at the same time the implementation process to achieve the results must remain simple and relatively low in cost. This equation of delivering results through programs that are easily implemented and low in cost is essential to engaging customers. Once these easy to implement, low cost initiatives pay dividends for customers, their level of trust in future programs increases, while at the same time their resistance to increasing their financial investment in additional conservation programs decreases.

Review Programs and Re-Evaluate the CDM Plan

Although going forward, programs are evaluated prior to being funded, program results need to be evaluated upon completion to ensure that the programs were successful quantitatively and/or qualitatively. In addition, identifying the key success factors as well as those factors where the program missed the mark is essential to delivering subsequent successful programs.



CONCLUSION

Given the funding granted under the Third Tranche of Market Adjusted Revenue Requirement, Erie Thames maximized the funding in delivering a portfolio of CDM programs that *educated, encouraged, equipped* and *empowered* customers to be conservation champions.

Erie Thames strategy of *educating, encouraging, equipping* and *empowering* customers was extremely successful. In 2005, with the programs deployed addressing the educating and encouraging components, while in 2006, Erie Thames focused not only on *educating* and *encouraging* customers, but rolled out the most crucial component, *equipping* customers with tools to measure energy savings with the deployment of a residential and commercial and industrial web based energy management programs, successfully completing the conservation loop. Finally in 2007, Erie Thames piloted new technologies for smart metering and continued to promote the highly effective traffic and street light conversion programs.

Overall, customers have received *education* about energy conservation; they have been *encouraged* to implement energy saving technologies through exchanges and incentives; and have the necessary *equipment* for measurement and evaluation, thereby *empowering* customers to take action and implement processes and purchase energy saving products.

Erie Thames looks forward to playing a significant role in the development and delivery of future conservation programs that will continue to develop the 'conservation culture' in Ontario and abroad and inspire customers to be energy managers and conservation ambassadors.



Appendix A

Evaluation of CDM Plan



Appendix A - Evaluation of the CDM Plan

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

	⁵ Cumulative Totals Life-to-date	Total for 2007	Residential	Commercial	Institutional	Industrial	Agricultural	LDC System	⁴ Smart Meters	Other #1	Other #2
Net TRC value (\$):	\$ 143,689.56	\$ 25,066	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 33,939	\$ -
Benefit to cost ratio:	2.71	2.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		4.76	0.00
Number of participants or units delivered:	866	17	0	0	0	15	0	0		2	0
Lifecycle (kWh) Savings:	3,574,218.50	507,293	0	0	0	0	0	0		507,293	0
Report Year Total kWh saved (kWh):	422,698.50	60,749	0	0	0	0	0	0		60,749	0
Total peak demand saved (kW):	43.01	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		1	0
Total kWh saved as a percentage of total kWh delivered (%):	0.03%	0.01%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.01%	0.00%
Peak kW saved as a percentage of LDC peak kW load (%):		0.00123%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%		0.00123%	0.00%
¹ Report Year Gross C&DM expenditures (\$):	\$ 265,230.96	\$ 104,515	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,450	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 78,364	\$ 13,828	\$ -
² Expenditures per kWh saved (\$/kWh):	\$ 0.074	\$ 0.21	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 0.03	\$ -
³ Expenditures per kW saved (\$/kW):	\$ 6,167.44	\$ 109,439.75	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		\$ 14,479.21	\$ -
Utility discount rate (%):	8.13										

¹ Expenditures are reported on accrual basis.

² Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate energy savings.

³ Expenditures include all utility program costs (direct and indirect) for all programs which primarily generate capacity savings.

⁴ Please report spending related to 3rd tranche of MARR funding only. TRC calculations are not required for Smart Meters. Only actual expenditures for the year need to be reported.

⁵ Includes total for the reporting year, plus prior year, if any (for example, 2007 CDM Annual report for third tranche will include 2006, 2005 and 2004 numbers, if any).



Appendix B

Discussion of Programs



Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** LED Traffic Light Retrofit Incentive Program (In Progress)

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

The intent of the program was to have municipalities, townships, etc. move towards using LED traffic and pedestrian signal lighting in place of the current, inefficient incandescent systems. The program was made available to all communities with traffic signals in Erie Thames Powerlines territory and was designed as an incentive program to stretch the allotted funds and reach as many customers as possible. With the approximate cost of an LED Traffic Light retrofit falling between \$3,000 and \$5,000 (depending on the number of signals) Erie Thames Powerlines (Erie Thames) incentive of \$1,500 per intersection provided enough incentive for the retrofits given the energy savings. To undertake the traffic and pedestrian signal retrofits Erie Thames partnered with Erie Thames Services, a utility service provider.

Payback period for and LED retrofit project given energy cost savings and the savings resulting from the decreased maintenance and re-lamping costs factored into the equation the pay back period on an LED Traffic Light Retrofit sits at a more than respectable level of 2.4 years.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
<i>Base case technology:</i>	135 watt incandescent bulb	135 watt incandescent bulb	
<i>Efficient technology:</i>	10 watt LED Bulb	6 watt LED Bulb	
<i>Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:</i>	52	32	
<i>Measure life (years):</i>	10	10	
 <i>Number of Participants or units delivered life to date</i>	 216	 120	

B. TRC Results:	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 37,804.63	\$ 146,616.61
² TRC Costs (\$):		
<i>Utility program cost (excluding incentives):</i>	\$ -	\$ -
<i>Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)</i>	\$ 6,216.00	\$ 24,528.00
<i>Total TRC costs:</i>	\$ 6,216.00	\$ 24,528.00
<i>Net TRC (in year CDN \$):</i>	\$ 31,588.63	\$ 122,088.61
 <i>Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):</i>	 \$ 6.08	 \$ 5.98

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

Conservation Programs:

	Summer	Winter
<i>Demand savings (kW):</i>	0	0.12
	0.04	

	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>	<i>Cumulative Lifecycle</i>	<i>Cumulative Annual Savings</i>
<i>Energy saved (kWh):</i>	407,100	40,710	1,488,300	148,830
<i>Other resources saved :</i>				
<i>Natural Gas (m3):</i>				
<i>Other (specify):</i>				

Demand Management Programs:

<i>Controlled load (kW)</i>		
<i>Energy shifted On-peak to Mid-peak (kWh):</i>		
<i>Energy shifted On-peak to Off-peak (kWh):</i>		
<i>Energy shifted Mid-peak to Off-peak (kWh):</i>		

Demand Response Programs:

<i>Dispatchable load (kW):</i>		
<i>Peak hours dispatched in year (hours):</i>		

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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



Line Loss Reduction Programs:

<i>Peak load savings (kW):</i>			
	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>	
<i>Energy savings (kWh):</i>			

Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

<i>Amount of DG installed (kW):</i>		
<i>Energy generated (kWh):</i>		
<i>Peak energy generated (kWh):</i>		
<i>Fuel type:</i>		

Other Programs (specify):

<i>Metric (specify):</i>		
--------------------------	--	--

D. <u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
<i>Utility direct costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Incentive:</i>	\$ 3,827.65	\$ 14,827.65
	<i>Total:</i>	\$ 3,827.65	\$ 14,827.65
 <i>Utility indirect costs (\$):</i>	 <i>Incremental capital:</i>	 \$ -	 \$ -
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Total:</i>	\$ -	\$ -

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Assumed the number of participants or units delivered to be the number of bulbs, i.e. 3 bulbs for every overhead signal and two bulbs for every pedestrian signal. NET TRC calculations corrected for 2005 and 2006 to reflect the number of bulbs replaced, rather than the number of signal heads.

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

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



Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Street Light Conversions

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

The intent of the program was to provide incentive to municipalities, townships, etc. to convert inefficient Mercury Vapour Street Lights to a more efficient High Pressure Sodium (HPS) lamp. Erie Thames provided an \$10,000 incentive to the Township of Norwich for a 56 street light conversion in the town of Otterville.

In addition to saving energy with the HPS streetlights, is the increased life span of 5 year from 2 years, thereby decreasing maintenance costs; additional lumens provided by the HPS bulbs as compared to the Mercury Vapour; and finally the HPS are a less expensive than the Mercury Vapour due to the decrease in demand of the Mercury Vapour bulbs.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:	175 Watt		
Efficient technology:	100 Watt		
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:	56		
Measure life (years):	5		
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date	56		

B. **TRC Results:**

	Reporting Year	Life-to-date TRC Results:
¹ TRC Benefits (\$):	\$ 5,150.30	\$ 11,355.41
² TRC Costs (\$):		
Utility program cost (excluding incentives):	\$ -	\$ -
Incremental Measure Costs (Equipment Costs)	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 6,800.00
Total TRC costs:	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 6,800.00
Net TRC (in year CDN \$):	\$ 2,350.30	\$ 4,555.41
Benefit to Cost Ratio (TRC Benefits/TRC Costs):	\$ 1.84	\$ 2.49

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

Cumulative Results:

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer	0.366	0.816
	Winter	0.549	1.224

	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):	100192.5	20038.5	100192.5	20038.5
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):		
Energy savings (kWh):	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>

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. <u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
<i>Utility direct costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$ -	\$ 2,250.00
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Incentive:</i>	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 25,000.00
	<i>Total:</i>	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 27,250.00
<i>Utility indirect costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Total:</i>	\$ -	\$ -

E. Assumptions & Comments:

Assumed that the street lights operate for 4,378 hours per year, and therefore used this figure to calculate energy savings, lifespan, etc.

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

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



Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Commercial and Industrial Smart Meter Program (In Progress)

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

The intent of the program was to evaluate smart meter technology for commercial and industrial applications for territorial areas inaccessible by other smart meter technologies. Initially several smart metering technologies were researched and the SmartSynch wireless cellular system was selected for the pilot. Erie Thames partnered with the Utilismart Corporation who has purchased the requisite software to read the meters and present the corresponding data.

Erie Thames also partnered with the Thames Valley District School Board (TVDSB) as part of the commercial smart meter project. The project was beneficial to both parties as TVDSB facilities in ETPL territory were moved to interval meters, thereby providing TVDSB with much needed interval data to supplement their aggressive energy management strategy, while ETPL experience dealing with challenging locations for cellular based smart meters.

In total 16 SmartSynch smart meters were successfully deployed. Several, important issues were identified and will be addressed to ensure future deployments are more efficient. A summary of the issues identified has been included in the "Assumptions & Comments" section below.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date			

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

C. Results: (one or more category may apply)	Cumulative Results:			
Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer			
	Winter			
Energy saved (kWh):	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
	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):		
Energy savings (kWh):	<i>lifecycle</i>	<i>in year</i>

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. <u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 5,875.34	\$ 5,875.34
	Incremental O&M:	\$ -	\$ -
	Incentive:	\$ -	\$ -
	Total:	\$ 5,875.34	\$ 5,875.34
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

The major issue encountered surrounded the location of the meter and the building materials surrounding the location and their effects on the cellular signal. This issue, which was unanticipated as signal strength testing did not identify the site as being problematic, was overcome by piloting several different types of external antennas. The primary lesson learned was with respect to signal testing and ensuring signal testing is performed from the exact meter location or location of the antenna to ensure minimal signal degradation.

¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.
² For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.



Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Residential Smart Meter Program (Ongoing)

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

Residential Smart Metering Pilot was undertaken to evaluate the technology, installation processes and procedures, meter change out processes and procedures and billing and settlement system deficiencies with regards to interval data. Erie Thames researched a multitude of smart meter technology providers and settled on piloting the Elster Energy Smart Metering technology. In addition, Erie Thames partnered with Utilismart for meter data acquisition services. Issues identified are summarized in Assumptions & Comments Section below.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date			

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

C. Results: (one or more category may apply)	Cumulative Results:			
Conservation Programs:				
Demand savings (kW):	Summer			
	Winter			
	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):				
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				



Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

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

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

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

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. <u>Actual Program Costs:</u>		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
Utility direct costs (\$):	Incremental capital:	\$ 72,488.60	\$ 72,488.60
	Incremental O&M:	\$ -	\$ -
	Incentive:	\$ -	\$ -
	Total:	\$ 72,488.60	\$ 72,488.60
Utility indirect costs (\$):	Incremental capital:		
	Incremental O&M:		
	Total:		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

The project has proved to be an extremely valuable for testing the technology, communication, processes and procedures with installation and processing the associated meter changes. 300 meters are currently in the field as a an issue with an electronic component in the meters required the meters to be sent back to the factory for rework. Additional issues encountered include meter displays becoming inoperative and collectors that required reprogramming / reconfiguring in the field.

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

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



Appendix B - Discussion of the Program

(complete this Appendix for each program)

A. **Name of the Program:** Commercial & Industrial Energy Management

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

As an extension of the commercial and industrial Energy Management Seminar held in 2006, Erie Thames continued its partnership with Utilismart to offer the commercial and industrial customers the Utilismart Energy Management and Reporting tool for until the end of 2007. Several customers utilize the tool and multiple training sessions have been undertaken at multiple customer facilities to ensure that the customer understands and uses the tool, while at the same time working with the customer to understand their energy requirements.

Measure(s):

	Measure 1	Measure 2 (if applicable)	Measure 3 (if applicable)
Base case technology:			
Efficient technology:			
Number of participants or units delivered for reporting year:			
Measure life (years):			
Number of Participants or units delivered life to date			

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

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

Conservation Programs:

Demand savings (kW):	Summer			
	Winter			
	lifecycle	in year	Cumulative Lifecycle	Cumulative Annual Savings
Energy saved (kWh):				
Other resources saved :				
Natural Gas (m3):				
Other (specify):				

Demand Management Programs:

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

Demand Response Programs:

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

Power Factor Correction Programs:

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

Line Loss Reduction Programs:

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



Distributed Generation and Load Displacement Programs:

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

Other Programs (specify):

Metric (specify):		
-------------------	--	--

D. Actual Program Costs:		Reporting Year	Cumulative Life to Date
<i>Utility direct costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>	\$ 7,847.00	\$ 7,847.00
	<i>Incentive:</i>	\$ -	\$ -
	<i>Total:</i>	\$ 7,847.00	\$ 7,847.00
<i>Utility indirect costs (\$):</i>	<i>Incremental capital:</i>		
	<i>Incremental O&M:</i>		
	<i>Total:</i>		

E. Assumptions & Comments:

- ¹ Benefits should be estimated if costs have been incurred and the technology has been deployed. Benefits reflect the present value of the measure for the number of units deployed in the year, i.e. the number of units times the net present value per unit benefit specified in the TRC Guide.
- ² For technologies which have not been deployed but for which the LDC has incurred costs, report only the TRC costs on a present value basis. Incentives (e.g. rebates) from the LDC to a customer are not a component of the TRC costs. However, payments made to a third party service provider to run an incentives program are program costs, and are to be included as TRC costs under the "Utility Program Costs" line.



Appendix C

Program and Portfolio Totals



Appendix C - Program and Portfolio Totals

Report Year: **2007**

1. Residential Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
Name of Program A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
Name of Program B			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Residential	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
Residential Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program		\$ -						
Total Residential TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Residential	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

2. Commercial Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
Name of Program A	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
Name of Program B			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Commercial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
Commercial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program		\$ -						
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Commercial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				



3. Institutional Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)		\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)						
Name of Program A			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program B			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Institutional	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
<i>Institutional Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Institutional	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

4. Industrial Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)		\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)						
C&I Energy Management Tool	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ 3,450
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Industrial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ 3,450
<i>Industrial Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Industrial	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				



5. Agricultural Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)		\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)						
Name of Program A			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Agricultural	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
<i>Agricultural Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Agricultural	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

6. LDC System Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)		\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)						
Name of Program A			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program B			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - LDC System	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
<i>LDC System Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - LDC System	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				



7. Smart Meters Program

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

Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$) 78,364

8. Other #1 Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits		\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
	(PV)	TRC Costs (PV)						
LED Traffic Light Retrofit Incentives	\$ 37,805	\$ 6,216	\$ 31,589	6.08	40,710	407,100	0.04	\$ 3,828
Street Light Upgrades	\$ 5,150	\$ 2,800	\$ 2,350	1.84	20,039	100,193	0.92	\$ 10,000
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program F			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Other #1	\$ 42,955	\$ 9,016	\$ 33,939	4.76	60,749	507,293	0.96	\$ 13,828
<i>Other #1 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ 9,016						
**Totals TRC - Other #1	\$ 42,955	\$ 9,016	\$ 33,939	4.76				



9. Other #2 Programs

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

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

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
Name of Program A			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program B			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program D			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program E			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program C			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program G			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program H			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program I			\$ -	0.00				
Name of Program J			\$ -	0.00				
*Totals App. B - Other #2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0	0	0	\$ -
<i>Other #2 Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>								
Total TRC Costs		\$ -						
**Totals TRC - Other #2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.00				

LDC's CDM PORTFOLIO TOTALS

	TRC Benefits (PV)	TRC Costs (PV)	\$ Net TRC Benefits	Benefit/Cost Ratio	Report Year Total kWh Saved	Lifecycle (kWh) Savings	Total Peak Demand (kW) Saved	Report Year Gross C&DM Expenditures (\$)
*TOTALS FOR ALL APPENDIX B	\$ 42,955	\$ 9,016	\$ 33,939	4.76	\$ 60,749	\$ 507,293	1	\$ 104,515
<i>Any other Indirect Costs not attributable to any specific program</i>		\$ 8,873						
TOTAL ALL LDC COSTS		\$ 17,889						
**LDC' PORTFOLIO TRC	\$ 42,955	\$ 17,889	\$ 25,066	2.40				

* The savings and spending information from this row is to be carried forward to Appendix A.

** The TRC information from this row is to be carried forward to Appendix A.