

AMPCO Table # 1

Comparison of THESL's OPA & Board Approved CDM Programs

		Peak															
		Savings	Consumption														
		MW	Savings GWh														
THESL Target		286.77	1,303.99														
Provincial Target		1,330.04	5,999.97														
% of Prov Target		21.6%	21.7%														
OPA CDM Programs																	
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															
		MW	%														
		MW/h	\$/MW														
		Budget	\$/MWh														
Consumer	MW	40	14%														
	MW/h	233,137	18%														
	Budget	\$13,989,180	28%														
Commercial	MW	123	43%														
	MW/h	765,871	59%														
	Budget	\$32,199,168	64%														
Industrial	MW	58	20%														
	MW/h	141,790	11%														
	Budget	\$4,006,373	8%														
TOTAL	MW	221	77%														
	MW/h	1,140,798	88%														
	Budget	\$50,194,721															

1 **BOARD-APPROVED CDM PROGRAM**

2 **COMMERCIAL PROGRAM**

3
4 **Initiative Number:** 6

5 **Initiative Name:** Double Return Plus ("DRP")

6 **Initiative Frequency:** Year round

7 **Target Customer Type(s):** Commercial and industrial interval metered customers with
8 average peak load of 200 kW or above.

9 **Years of Operation for the Initiative:** 2011 to 2014, subject to annual reviews and
10 approvals.

11
12 **1. Initiative Description**

13 The Double Return Plus Initiative ("DRP") targets approximately 900 interval-metered
14 commercial and industrial ("C/I") customers with an average monthly peak load in excess
15 of 200 kW. The objective of this Initiative is to reduce the customers' peak demand,
16 which, in turn, is expected to reduce the total system peak demand by up to 20 MW. This
17 Initiative has an expected program cost of \$4.1 million (\$200/kW) inclusive of
18 incentives.

19
20 The Double Return Plus Initiative has two components: a peak demand reduction and an
21 energy efficiency component. This Initiative encourages the customers to reduce their
22 summer peak demand relative to their summer demand in the previous year by at least
23 5%. The energy efficiency savings will be achieved through the installation of a load
24 management system. The proposed Initiative will fund [REDACTED] of the cost of a load
25 management system, up to a maximum of [REDACTED]. This Initiative will enable customers
26 to control and reduce their summer peak demand as well as achieve sustainable energy
27 savings.

1 The performance incentive payments will be set equal to double the amount of reduction
2 in delivery charges on the customer's bill resulting from achieving a reduction in their
3 peak load. While the participants are encouraged to optimize their reduction in their peak
4 demand, incentives are only applied to savings that range from a minimum of 5% to a
5 maximum of 10% reduction. For every dollar the customer saves in reduced delivery
6 charges, the program will provide two dollars in incentive payments.

7
8 In addition to performance incentives, this Initiative will offer a range of behind-the
9 meter services including online technical services, on-site visits, energy efficiency and
10 demand response workshops, and employee engagement kits.

11
12 The program will primarily be delivered directly by Hydro One with the help of a number
13 of third party vendors to assist with the promotion and delivery of the technical services
14 to the customers.

15
16 **2. Non-Duplicative Features of the Initiative**

17 The unique elements of the Initiative are:

- 18 • **Non-Dispatchable versus Dispatchable Demand Response:** The Double Return
19 Plus Initiative is not duplicative of the OPA Demand Response Programs because it is
20 based on non-dispatchable load control and it also aims at reducing energy
21 consumption. By contrast, the OPA Province-wide Demand Response programs are
22 based on dispatchable load control and, as a result, have minimal energy savings.
23 Non-dispatchable load control means that it is left to the customer's discretion
24 whether they wish to reduce their peak demand and the time at which they reduce
25 demand given the customers business needs and production cycles. Dispatchable
26 load control, on the other hand, means that the customer must respond to the IESO's
27 request that they curtail a contracted amount of their load or face penalties (e.g.,
28 under Demand Response 3) for not doing so. Further, the OPA had already approved
29 the Double Return program as a Custom Program distinct from the OPA's Demand

1 Response 1/Demand Response 3 programs, and all three programs coexisted in the
2 marketplace in 2008 and 2009.

- 3 • **Bring demand response and energy efficiency together:** The Initiative equips the
4 customer with the information and tools to meet demand reduction as well as energy
5 savings, all in one initiative. Hydro One will hire third party vendor(s) so that
6 participants will have access to a range of technical and information services that
7 would help them better understand their energy usage and assist them in identifying
8 areas where they can reduce their energy consumption and shift or shave their peak
9 load. Several tools including workshops, online assistance, and written information
10 material would be used to assist customers to reach this goal. The Initiative will also
11 offer free expert on-site visits to identify specific opportunities in customers' facilities
12 focusing on loads associated with industrial processes, motors, lighting, compressed
13 air, and electro-technologies. Bringing together demand response and energy
14 efficiency is a unique feature compared to OPA-contracted Demand Response
15 initiatives available in the market
- 16 • **No cost - low cost opportunities:** Double Return Plus helps identify savings
17 potential at limited and/or no cost to the customer. For example, a change in the
18 customer's behaviour will come at no cost, whereas an installation of a control device
19 would come at low cost. The focus on operational and behavioural changes brings
20 about a culture of conservation in the business markets.

21 22 **3. Background**

23 The initial Double Return Initiative was designed by Hydro One and offered under
24 Market Adjusted Rate of Return (MARR) funding in 2006/2007. This Initiative was very
25 successful and became popular among Hydro One customers as well as other
26 stakeholders. Further, the OPA approved the Double Return program as a Custom
27 Initiative in 2008/2009 where the program coexisted with the OPA's Demand Response
28 1/Demand Response 3 programs. The proposed Double Return Plus is a new generation
29 of the original Initiative with enhanced features for the 2011-2014 period.

1
2 **4. Initiative Elements**

3 While the key success factor in the original Double Return program has been the
4 simplicity of its design, the new Double Return Plus initiative includes three additional
5 components:

6 • **Reply Card:** A requirement to submit a "Reply Card" by participating customers.
7 The Reply Card ensures that the customer is interested and committed to the
8 Initiative.

9 • **Action Plan:** A requirement to complete a multiple choice two-paged "Action Plan"
10 The Action Plan identifies the steps which the customer plans to take to meet the
11 minimum peak load reduction (of at least 5% of the average summer June-August
12 peak load as compared to the previous year) to qualify for the financial incentive.

13 • **Load Management System:** The availability of financial incentives to enable
14 participants to purchase a Load Management System to perform load balancing
15 through energy management programming to achieve savings. The financial
16 incentives will cover [REDACTED] of the cost of the system, up to a maximum of [REDACTED]
17

18 Other Initiative offerings include:

19 • **Incentives:** Double Return Plus incentives will be set to equal double the amount of
20 reduction in delivery charges on the customer's bill resulting from achieving 5% -
21 10% reduction in the summer peak load as compared to the previous year. Double
22 Return Plus incentives will also provide funds up to [REDACTED] of the cost of the Load
23 Balancing/Management System up to [REDACTED] per system.

24 • **Behind-the-meter services:** this Initiative will offer on-going technical services
25 including:

- 26 ○ customized online information
27 ○ expert site visits/assistance
28 ○ Double Return Plus energy workshops
29 ○ employee engagement kits

5. Purpose of the Initiative

The Double Return Plus Initiative will offer the key elements required to assist the medium to large C&I sectors in the successful pursuit of continuous and deeper energy savings beyond the traditional C/I CDM programs that focus only on technology or equipment replacement.

6. Projected reduction in Peak Electricity Demand (MW)

This Initiative is projected to achieve 21 MW peak reduction by the end of 2014. For Double Return Plus a portion of the peak reduction will have one year persistence attributable to behavioural changes, and the remaining peak reduction will have multi-year persistency attributable to the application of the load management system.

Total Peak Reduction (MW) 2011-2014					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Coincident Peak Demand Reduction by end of 2014 (MW)
Double Return Plus (MW)	7.9	12.5	16.5	21.0	21

7. Total Projected Reduction in Electricity Consumption (MWh)

This Initiative is projected to achieve 52 GWh cumulative energy reduction by 2014. Energy reduction attributable to the portion of Double Return Plus for peak shaving will have one-year persistence, while the load balancing component will enhance persistency of results achieved in the Initiative.

Total Energy Reduction (MWh) 2011-2014					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total Energy Reduction Cumulative (2011-2014)
Double Return Plus (MWh)	9,250	12,200	14,450	16,100	52,000

8. Projected Budget

The total cost estimate for the Initiative is approximately \$4.1million (inclusive of incentives), and the incentives include a financial contribution towards a load management system (covering [REDACTED] of the cost of the system up to a maximum of [REDACTED] as well as performance incentives for achieved results for a total of approximately [REDACTED] (roughly [REDACTED] per summer season).

Double Return Plus - Initiative Budget (\$) 2011-2014					
	2011	2012	2013	2014	Total 2011-2014
Marginal costs					
Fixed costs					
Administrative costs	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Marketing	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Site visits / Verifications	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
EM&V	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Total Fixed Costs	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Variable Costs					
Turn-Key Vendor / Load Balancing	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Total Variable Costs	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Allocable costs					
Fixed Overhead	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Variable Overhead	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Total Program Costs	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Financial Incentives (Based on Load Reduction)	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Total Budget	\$ 1,021,300	\$ 1,021,300	\$ 1,021,300	\$ 1,020,700	\$ 4,100,000

1

2 Note: The total budget shown above is projected to be allocated between commercial and industrial
3 participants on a 40/60 basis, respectively.

4

5 **9. Cost Effectiveness Test Results**

6 • TRC ratio: 11.3

7 • PAC ratio: 7.4

8

9 **10. Draft Evaluation Plan**

10 Hydro One will ensure that the Double Return Plus Initiative will be evaluated in
11 accordance with the OPA's EM&V Protocol for any custom measures not included in the
12 OPA's Measures and Assumption List. A Draft Evaluation Plan is attached based on the
13 most current version available on the OPA's website as of Oct. 15, 2010. The Initiative
14 Final Evaluation plan will be prepared by an independent third party. The selection of
15 the evaluation criteria and detailed elements of the Evaluation Plan will be determined by
16 the independent third party. Measurement and verification of Initiative peak demand
17 savings (kW) and electricity savings (kWh) results will be conducted by a third party
18 review contractor selected through an RFP process from the OPA's "Third Party Vendor
19 of Record" list once the Initiative is approved.

20

21 The following is a DRAFT EVALUATION PLAN TEMPLATE:

Table 2: Summary of THESEL CDM Programs – EDR-funded and OPA-funded (\$000s)

Year	Program	Funding Source	OPEX		CAPEX	Total Cost	Program Annual Savings		TRC Net Benefits	TRC Benefit/Cost
			Labor	Other			kwh	kwh		
2008	Mass Market	OPA	42	1,833	0	1,875	530	26,633,000	6,150	3.89
	Social Housing	OPA	42	1,015	0	1,057	420	10,420,000	1,477	1.52
	Business Incentive Program	OPA	42	2,625	0	2,667	6,670	26,667,000	875	1.26
	Program Support	OPA	378	455	0	833	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	OPA Programs Total		504	5,928	0	6,432	7,610	63,719,000	8,502	N/A
	Residential Load Control	OEB	527	687	385	1,599	50,000	0	44,183	2.22
	CDM Program Governance	OEB	261	64	0	326	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009	Mass Market	OPA	42	1,833	0	1,875	530	26,633,000	6,150	3.89
	Social Housing	OPA	42	1,015	0	1,057	420	10,420,000	1,477	1.52
	Business Incentive Program	OPA	42	2,625	0	2,667	6,670	26,667,000	875	1.26
	Program Support	OPA	378	455	0	833	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	OPA Programs Total		504	5,928	0	6,432	7,610	63,719,000	8,502	N/A
	Residential Load Control	OEB	549	731	491	1,771	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	CDM Program Governance	OEB	272	66	0	338	0	0	0	N/A
2010	Mass Market	OPA	21	917	0	938	260	13,316,000	3,075	3.89
	Social Housing	OPA	21	508	0	529	210	5,210,000	739	1.52
	Business Incentive Program	OPA	21	1,312	0	1,333	3,330	13,333,000	437	1.26
	Program Support	OPA	189	228	0	417	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	OPA Programs Total		252	2,964	0	3,216	3,800	31,860,000	4,251	N/A
	Residential Load Control	OEB	573	811	246	1,631	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	CDM Program Governance	OEB	284	68	0	352	0	0	0	N/A
Grand Total			1,109	3,844	246	5,199	3,800	31,860,000	4,251	N/A

Note 1: TRC Test results reflect all the costs for the 2008-2010 Residential Load Control operation and the 50MW demand response capacity installed prior to 2008

Note 2: Residential Load Control program costs for 2008-2010 are reflected in the 2008 TRC Test results

