

2012 Electric and Natural Gas Conservation and Load Management Plan

Submitted by:

The Connecticut Light and Power Company
The United Illuminating Company
Yankee Gas Services Company
Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation and
Southern Connecticut Gas Company

Docket No. 11-10-03

September 30, 2011

This page intentionally blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW (Electric and Natural Gas)	1
Introduction.....	1
Historical Highlights.....	2
2012 Priorities	6
2012 Priorities	7
2012 Focus Areas	9
Current Funding Sources	10
Future and Potential Funding Sources and Challenges	14
PA 11-80 and the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund.....	16
Codes, Standards and Changes in the Market Process.....	17
Energy Efficiency Board	17
BUDGET TABLES (ELECTRIC COMPANIES)	19
BUDGET TABLES (CL&P)	25
BUDGET TABLES (UI).....	35
BUDGET TABLES (NATURAL GAS COMPANIES).....	45
CHAPTER TWO: RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS.....	63
Residential Overview (Electric and Natural Gas).....	63
Residential Retail Products (Electric)	69
Residential New Construction (Electric and Natural Gas)	89
Home Energy Solutions (Electric and Natural Gas).....	107
Residential Water Heating Program (Electric and Natural Gas).....	143
CHAPTER THREE: COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROGRAMS (Electric and Natural Gas).....	149
C & I Overview.....	149
C&I NEW CONSTRUCTION	161
Energy Conscious Blueprint (Electric and Natural Gas)	161
C&I RETROFIT.....	175
Energy Opportunities: (Electric and Natural Gas).....	175
Small Business Energy Advantage (Electric)	189
Business and Energy Sustainability (formerly Operations & Maintenance) Program	203
Process Reengineering for Increased Manufacturing Efficiency (“PRIME”) (Electric)	223
Appendix: C&I Incentive Tables	229
CHAPTER FOUR: EDUCATION and OUTREACH	235
Overview.....	235
Clean Energy Communities Program (Electric).....	239
SmartLiving Center & Museum Partnerships (Electric).....	251
eesmarts™ (Electric)	267
CHAPTER FIVE: FINANCING, LOAD MANAGEMENT, RD&D.....	281
Conservation & Load Management Financing Overview.....	281
C&LM Financing - Small Business/Municipal Loan Program (Electric & Gas).....	289
C&LM Financing - C&I Energy Efficiency Financing Program (Electric & Gas).....	293
Residential Energy Efficiency Financing (Electric and Natural Gas)	295
ISO-NE Load Response Program (Electric)	301
Research, Development and Demonstration (Electric).....	307

CHAPTER SIX: BENEFIT COST ANALYSIS (Electric and Natural Gas)	319
Overview.....	319
CHAPTER SEVEN: IT INITIATIVE (CL&P)	333
CHAPTER EIGHT: INCREASED SAVINGS SCENARIO	335
Overview.....	335
Expanded Plan Strategies, Outcomes and Caveats.....	338
INCREASED SAVING SCENARIO TABLES.....	345
EXHIBIT I: 2010 PUBLIC COMMENT MATRIX.....	381
EXHIBIT II: ENERGY EFFICIENCY BOARD RESOLUTIONS (Electric and Natural Gas)	383
EXHIBIT III: PURA COMPLIANCE ORDERS (Electric and Natural Gas).....	385
Orders - Docket No. 10-10-03	385
Orders - Docket No. 10-10-04	401
EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE MATRIX.....	407
EXHIBIT V: PROGRAM EVALUATIONS.....	415

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW (Electric and Natural Gas)

Introduction

In accordance with Connecticut General Statutes § 16-245m and § 16-32f, The Connecticut Light and Power Company (“CL&P”), The United Illuminating Company (“UI”) (collectively, the “Electric Companies”) and The Connecticut Natural Gas Corporation (“CNG”), The Southern Connecticut Gas Company (“SCG”), and Yankee Gas Services Company (“Yankee Gas”) (collectively the “Natural Gas Companies”) hereby submit this comprehensive Conservation & Load Management (“C&LM”) Plan (“2012 C&LM Plan”) for the implementation of cost-effective electric and natural gas energy efficiency programs and market transformation initiatives for the years 2012 and 2013.




The 2012 C&LM Plan represents a continuation of combining the C&LM plans for both the Electric Companies and Natural Gas Companies. The Electric Companies are also continuing to present a two-year budget cycle that will allow for program continuity over a multiple budget year period. This two year budget cycle will also provide latitude for adjustments due to over or under-spending of program budgets and thus minimize disruptive program actions that adversely impact customer and vendor participation. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies will continue to monitor overall market response and program effectiveness and will maintain the flexibility to reallocate unspent program dollars within program sectors to in-demand programs. This flexibility will allow the Electric and Natural Gas Companies to react to market conditions, enhance their capacity to achieve cost-effective savings and will minimize undue interruptions in program offerings in the marketplace.

This is the thirteenth C&LM Plan prepared by the Electric Companies since passage of the State’s restructuring legislation (Public Act 98-28) and the seventh plan filed by the Natural Gas Companies since passage of the State’s energy independence legislation (Public Act 05-01). In conjunction with the Energy Efficiency Board (“EEB”) (formerly the Energy Conservation Management Board) and the EEB consultants, the Companies have developed and deployed cost-effective, integrated electric and gas efficiency and conservation programs to all classes of energy consumers throughout the state.



Chapters 1-7 of this Plan reflect goals, strategies and tactics for program design and delivery based on a budget that relies on current funding mechanisms. Chapter 8 (Increased Savings Scenario) reflects an expanded goal and commensurate budget scenario that is in keeping with the new state emphasis on energy leadership.

Historical Highlights



Historical spending and savings achievements, as well as customer participation associated with the implemented C&LM Plans from 2006 to 2010 are highlighted in the following tables.



Historical Highlights (Continued)



Historical Highlights (Continued)



Historical Highlights (Continued)


Combined Electric Companies - Customer Program Participation

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Totals
Number of Home Energy Solutions Participants	13,827	9,190	13,825	16,046	29,642	82,530
Quantity of Retail Products	2,448,747	3,141,316	3,030,371	2,209,659	5,177,508	16,007,601
Number of Home Energy Solutions-Income Eligible Participants	16,597	14,904	11,213	15,132	15,347	73,193
Number of Large Commercial & Industrial Participants (including municipal)	1,668	1,652	1,707	1,601	1,841	8,469
Number of Small Businesses Energy Advantage Participants	1,265	1,754	1,628	1,344	2,021	8,012

Reduction in Pollutants and Carbon Dioxide (in Tons)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Totals
SO ₂	101	336	100	68	326	931
Nox	50	104	55	34	112	354
CO ₂	197,397	214,927	193,166	134,539	207,561	947,591

C&LM Highlights Timeline



2012 Priorities

As Connecticut labors to redefine its economic future, energy conservation and load management planning is more critical than ever. In 2007, Public Act 07-242, *An Act Concerning Electricity and Energy*, envisioned energy efficiency as the centerpiece of a statewide energy policy and directed the State to implement “all cost-effective energy efficiency.” That directive, and our commitment to it, has not changed. What has changed is the way we are meeting that commitment. The programs and initiatives detailed in this 2012 C&LM Plan build on the strengths of the past, but take advantage of new technologies, rely more heavily on relationships with communities (including the financial community), and acknowledge that the energy efficiency and conservation market is growing with more stakeholders, and, consequently, more at stake. More recently, Connecticut’s landmark energy reform bill, PA 11-80, makes significant changes to Connecticut’s energy conservation policy and structure, representing a fundamentally new approach to achieving energy efficiency which is addressed in more detail later in this chapter.

The following is a list of the key priorities for 2012, as reflected in this Plan.

Market Transformation

The long-term market transformation strategy for the Energy Efficiency Fund’s programs is to achieve fundamental market change in energy management and investment practices for residential, commercial, industrial and institutional markets, resulting in sustainable, continuously improving and highly cost-effective savings. Over the years, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies have worked closely with the EEB to successfully influence and effect change in building design, renovations, maintenance practices and equipment performance. Often these improvements come through changes to the State Building Code, or as a result of collaboration with trade and business associations.

The shift in the market towards more energy-efficient technologies and practices are accompanied by a shift towards more consumer investment in the benefits. In other words, market transformation should lead to more market-based implementation of energy efficiency services and products. Increasingly, the business community is embracing energy efficiency and strategic energy management as a standard business practice, and, in the residential sector, as a necessity. An objective of the C&LM programs is to help facilitate that shift. Efforts in 2012 will include an increased emphasis on programs and initiatives that promote sustainable energy management as a core consumer and business value. Ultimately, as the green market grows, programs should move from a primary dependency on public benefit charges to a more self-sustaining industry that can be supplemented, or leveraged, though Energy Efficiency Fund resources.

Comprehensive (Deep) Energy Savings

The 2012 C&LM Plan will continue to offer program designs, education and promotion that encourage comprehensive (deep) energy savings in homes, non-residential buildings and industrial processes through an up front, packaged, comprehensive approach. The intent is to shift from projects where only the “low-hanging-fruit” is addressed, necessitating repeat visits later on to evaluate the deeper, more expensive energy reduction projects like mechanical system and energy management system controls. A comprehensive approach minimizes the administrative costs associated with multiple visits and enables the customer to start benefiting from maximum savings sooner.

Innovative Financing

Customer financing has proven to be a key driver of energy investment in general and comprehensive project participation in particular. On June 1, 2011 the Companies introduced a new residential loan program by offering subsidized, low interest rate loans to residential customers who make qualified energy efficiency improvements to their homes. This program is one of the first in the nation to offer residential electric customers on-bill repayment for energy efficiency loans.

The 2012 C&LM Plan includes a continued emphasis on residential financing and the introduction of natural gas energy efficiency financing for small business customers. (Refer to Chapter 5 for details.)

Expanded Analytic Tools

In 2012, there will be a stronger emphasis on the additional use of customer analytic, benchmarking, and portfolio rating tools for use in residential, commercial/industrial, and municipal applications. (See Chapters 2 and 3 for details.)

Performance Contracting

In 2011 the Companies and the EEB started looking for ways to facilitate performance contracting in Connecticut as a strategy to leverage existing funds. Performance contracting continues to be a priority in 2012. (Refer to Chapter 3 Overview for details.)

Education and Outreach

Market transformation is impossible without an informed consumer. In 2012, the C&LM administrators will increase emphasis on the Clean Energy Communities program initiatives to leverage high-visibility opportunities and effect change on a broader scale, support continued collaboration with public and technical schools and universities and increase outreach to the contractor community.

2012 Focus Areas

In support of the priorities listed above, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies and the EEB and their consultants will focus on the following areas:

Residential Focus Areas:

- Support and participate in legislative and regulatory activities that promote updated energy codes and appliance standards, code enforcement training and support, and building labeling.
- Deeper savings and increased data gathering/analysis in HES in order to provide more comprehensive installations and accurate follow-up recommendations from the initial visit.
- Increased media attention on new federal lamp standards and Federal Trade Commission (“FTC”) lamp labeling requirements has led to significant consumer interest (and confusion) regarding light bulbs. Additionally, interest in LED lighting has increased and the Energy Efficiency Fund has incentives on several ENERGY STAR qualified LED products. In 2012, we will focus on consumer education and begin the transition from CFLs to LED lighting in the Retail Products, Home Energy Solutions and Residential New Construction programs.
- Continued support of new technologies and energy efficient strategic approaches such as advanced design and construction of new buildings, inverter driven ductless heat pumps, tankless whole house gas water heaters, and heat pump water heaters in appropriate applications.

Commercial & Industrial Focus Areas:

- Increased emphasis on strategic energy management - integrating technology, benchmarking, and training and behavior elements into all commercial and industrial program offerings.
- Green State Building Initiative - enhancements to commercial and industrial programs that will assist the State in meeting and exceeding PA 11-80 goals in Section 118.
- Continue the investigation and analysis of non-energy benefits (“NEBs”) of high performance buildings and processes to broaden the business case for energy efficiency. Other states like Massachusetts have been incorporating NEBs into their program evaluation and have already been reporting on this topic for a number of years.
- Increased promotion of natural gas technology and the addition of gas measures to the Small Business Energy Advantage program.

Current Funding Sources

The primary funding sources for the 2012 C&LM Plan continue to be the three-mill charge on customers' electric bills and the contributions from natural gas customers (on firm rates) through the monthly Conservation Adjustment Mechanism ("CAM").

Additional revenue from natural gas customers may also be available as a result of excess gross receipts tax ("GRT") collections.¹

The energy and demand savings that result from the programs outlined in the 2012 C&LM Plan are, to a substantial extent, generators of additional revenue. Energy savings allow us to participate and earn funding from a variety of sources. The 2012 C&LM Plan includes funding from the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative ("RGGI"), Class III Renewable Energy Credits ("Class III RECs") and Independent System Operator-New England's ("ISO-NE") Forward Capacity Market ("FCM"). In other words, the more these energy efficiency programs save, the more financially sustainable they can become.

CL&P/UI C&LM REVENUES (\$M)	2012 CL&P/UI Total	2012 CL&P/UI Percent
Collections (Mill Rate)	\$ 83.9	79%
ISO-NE Other Demand Resources (ODRs)	\$ 8.1	8%
ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market Demand Response Revenues	\$ 4.9	5%
Class III Renewable Energy Credits	\$ 4.5	4%
Carrying Charges	\$ 0.8	1%
RGGI	\$ 3.4	3%
Total - C&LM Revenues	\$ 105.6	100%

Forward Capacity Market (FCM)

Through the FCM, a reduction in usage from demand side resources such as energy efficiency and demand response programs is considered as electrical capacity equivalent to supply-side generation sources, which can then be bid into the ISO-NE capacity market similar to conventional generation. With the transition period of the FCM now well behind us, we enter into the second full year of the permanent FCM market.

¹ (Conn. Gen. Stat. § 16-32f(b) (2008 Supp.)). The potential amount of excess GRT funding available to support the 2012 C&LM Plan is unknown at this time since the annual excess GRT is not calculated until the end of the State's fiscal year, June 30, 2012. In the event funding from excess GRT becomes available, the Natural Gas Companies have developed a procedure with the EEB, per the Department's Order No. 4 in Docket 06-10-03, *DPUC Review of the Connecticut Gas Utilities Forecast of Demand and Supply 2007-2011 and Joint Conservation Plans*, Decision (Jan. 23, 2008), to receive such funds from the State Comptroller's Office. Funds will then be allocated to support energy efficiency programs as described in this 2012 C&LM Plan as an offset to the CAM.

Payments received by the Electric Companies from the FCM have already contributed more than \$37.1 million (CL&P, \$29.4 million; UI, \$7.7 million) in revenue to the Energy Efficiency Fund. However, this revenue is becoming less robust. The FCM is a forward-looking, competitive market and auctions have already been held for 2012, 2013, and 2014. As a result of this competitive auction process, the price of capacity has been driven down and in 2012 customers can expect to receive approximately \$35 per kW per year. For the foreseeable future, FCM revenues are not likely to be the most significant funding source for the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund. However, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) is currently deliberating on a package of changes to FCM rules that could potentially lead to higher capacity prices in the future.

Class III Renewable Energy Credits (“RECs”)

Class III Renewable Energy Credits are earned via commercial and industrial megawatt hour savings from Energy Efficiency Fund-supported projects. These Class III RECs are sold via a Request for Proposal (“RFP”) process to energy suppliers or marketers interested in meeting their renewable portfolio standard obligations. Revenue from Class III RECs in 2012 is expected to be approximately \$4.5 million.

Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (“RGGI”)

RGGI is the first mandatory, market-based effort in the United States to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. By 2018, Connecticut and ten Northeastern and Mid-Atlantic States will cap and reduce carbon dioxide (“CO₂”) emissions from the power sector by ten (10) percent. The participating states include Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont. There has been recent political activity in New Jersey and New Hampshire aimed at removing those states from RGGI, however, at this time, they remain in. The participating RGGI states sell emission allowances through auctions and invest the auction proceeds to Public Benefits Charge programs that fund energy efficiency, renewable energy and other clean energy programs and technologies.

Under the Department of Environmental Protection regulations (Section 22a-174-31), a minimum of seventy-seven (77) percent must be allocated to the Connecticut Auction Account. Of that the amount allocated to the Connecticut Auction Account, seventy-five (75) percent will be distributed to the CL&P account, eighteen and three-fourths (18.75) percent to the UI account, and six and one-fourth (6.25) percent to the Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative (“CMEEC”). These proceeds must be used to support the development of energy efficiency measures.

The following chart depicts the results of the RGGI auctions to date. The trend established in three of the last four auctions have indicated that not all allowances are being sold, which means that the proceeds from RGGI are lower than they have been in the past. Some analysts speculate that emitters are pulling back from banking RGGI credits for future compliance, and that has led to the recent auction

being undersubscribed. It is uncertain at this time if this trend will continue, but this pattern has led to a revenue decrease.

Summary of RGGI Auctions to Date

Auction Number	Control Period	Quantity Offered	Quantity Sold	Clearing Price	Total Proceeds
Auction 12 6/8/2011	Current	42,034,184	12,537,000	\$1.89	\$25,477,200.00
	Future	1,864,952	943,000	\$1.89	
Auction 11 3/9/2011	Current	41,995,813	41,995,813	\$1.89	\$83,425,588.47
	Future	2,144,710	2,144,710	\$1.89	
Auction 10 12/1/2010	Current	43,173,648	24,755,000	\$1.86	\$48,224,220.00
	Future	2,137,991	1,172,000	\$1.86	
Auction 9 9/10/2010	Current	45,595,968	34,407,000	\$1.86	\$66,437,340.00
	Future	2,137,992	1,312,000	\$1.86	
Auction 8 6/9/2010	Current	40,685,585	40,685,585	\$1.88	\$80,465,566.78
	Future	2,137,993	2,137,993	\$1.86	
Auction 7 3/10/2010	Current	40,612,408	40,612,408	\$2.07	\$87,956,944.56
	Future	2,137,992	2,091,000	\$1.86	
Auction 6 12/2/2009	Current	28,591,698	28,591,698	\$2.05	\$61,587,120.90
	Future	2,172,540	1,599,000	\$1.86	
Auction 5 9/9/2009	Current	28,408,945	28,408,945	\$2.19	\$66,278,239.35
	Future	2,172,540	2,172,540	\$1.87	
Auction 4 6/17/2009	Current	30,887,620	30,887,620	\$3.23	\$104,242,445.00
	Future	2,172,540	2,172,540	\$2.06	
Auction 3 3/18/2009	Current	31,513,765	31,513,765	\$3.51	\$117,248,629.80
	Future	2,175,513	2,175,513	\$3.05	
Auction 2 12/17/2008	Current	31,505,898	31,505,898	\$3.38	\$106,489,935.24
Auction 1 9/25/2008	Current	12,565,387	12,565,387	\$3.07	\$38,575,738.09

Connecticut Efficient Healthy Homes Initiative (“CTEHHI”)

In September 2010, The Companies, on behalf of the Energy Efficiency Fund, applied for and were awarded a two-year \$3 million Weatherization Innovation Pilot Program (“WIPP”) grant from the U.S. Department of Energy (“DOE”) to create a streamlined approach to providing energy efficient and healthy housing interventions for Connecticut’s income-eligible residents. CTEHHI was one of sixteen WIPP grantees chosen out of 71 national applications. CTEHHI is a statewide program, providing additional energy efficiency and health and safety services to customers with the greatest need, with a gross annual income at or below sixty (60) percent of state median income.

CTEHHI is based on community partnerships. Statewide CTEHHI partners include Bridgeport Neighborhood Trust, the City of New Haven, the City of Bridgeport, Connecticut Children’s Medical Center/LAMPP, Connecticut Department of Public Health, Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, L. Wagner & Associates, NauVEL, NeighborWorks New Horizons, and Yale-New Haven Children’s Hospital Regional Lead Treatment Center. Through CTEHHI, Connecticut is participating in a national movement to make housing healthy, safe, and environmentally sustainable, a movement supported by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Energy, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Office of Healthy Homes and Lead Hazard Control, and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

It is also important to note that in recent years the Companies have expanded their roles as grant proposal writers. The DOE CTEHHI grant is the most recent successful effort, but other proposals are in development as well. The *16 Green Challenge Grant Proposal* filed in partnership with UCONN for the Connecticut Proof of Concept Center, will focus exclusively on green technologies. The most recent grant application, *The Connecticut Efficient Buildings Report Card*, was filed in partnership with DEEP. This DOE grant focuses on developing the marketplace, infrastructure and mechanisms that are needed to attract private capital investment into commercial building energy efficiency and conservation retrofits.

Future and Potential Funding Sources and Challenges

Fuel Oil Funding

In a State where more than half, or approximately 700,000 households heat with fuel oil or propane, providing equitable energy-efficiency services to residential consumers under the current funding mechanisms remains a challenge. While fuel oil and propane-heating customers do pay into the Fund through their electric utility bill, they do so to a significantly lesser degree than do electric or natural gas-heating customers.

In 2010 and 2011, the Companies utilized temporary methods to meet the challenge through collaboration with the Office of Policy & Management (“OPM”), American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (“ARRA”) monies and RGGI revenues. These non-traditional solutions allowed residential

customers to participate in core weatherization and energy efficiency services at the same low co-pay as electric and gas-heating customers, or at no charge if they meet income eligibility guidelines. These funding methods are not long-term solutions and by late 2011/early 2012 will be exhausted.

Under Public Act 11-80² a statewide limit of \$500,000 from the 3-mill base Energy Efficiency Fund budget can be used to support fuel oil heating energy efficiency measures. Yet the bill requires that each electric, gas or fuel oil customer, regardless of heating source, be assessed the same co-payment for the Home Energy Solutions program. Under this restriction, only 1,600 fuel oil and propane-heating households can be served, leaving hundreds of thousands of oil and propane customers out in the cold.

Electric Conservation Adjustment Mechanism (“CAM”)

While the Conservation Adjustment Mechanism or CAM is currently only used to help fund natural gas energy efficiency programs, statutes are in place that would allow the Electric Companies to implement the CAM for electric programs as well. This could result in a significant resource to support increased energy efficiency programming, attractive rate financing and savings. Prior to the application of the mill rate in 1998, conservation was funded through the Conservation Adjustment Mechanism (CAM). This process could be reinstated to serve as an additional source of program funding for energy efficiency.

Decoupling

Decoupling exists in Connecticut; however UI has limited decoupling and CL&P’s decoupling plan was not approved in its last rate case. An appropriate application of decoupling in Connecticut will allow program funding for energy efficiency as well as allow the utilities to recover lost revenues from conservation efforts.

Integrated Resource Plan

As noted earlier, Public Act 07-242 called for any future energy resource needs to be first met by implementation of all cost-effective energy efficiency. PA 07-242 also charged the Electric Companies with developing an integrated resource plan (“IRP”).

Now, as part of Public Act 11-80, the responsibility for developing the IRP has shifted from the Companies to the newly created Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“DEEP”). Despite this shift in responsibility, the requirement to implement all cost-effective energy efficiency as a first resource remains in effect.

The 2010 IRP consisted of two incremental investment strategies. The first strategy was called *Targeted Demand Side Management* (“DSM”) and it consisted of enough energy efficiency investment

² An Act Concerning the Establishment of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and Planning for Connecticut's Energy Future

to eliminate load growth over the planning horizon. The second strategy was called *All-Achievable Cost-Effective DSM*. In summary, funding the Targeted DSM expansion strategy would have required an additional outlay of approximately \$19 million per year (2010 dollars) and the All Cost-Effective DSM strategy would have required approximately an additional \$65 million per year.

The Companies expect that incremental investments in energy efficiency will continue to be an important part of future IRPs to meet the requirements embodied in the statute. We are working closely with the staff at DEEP to provide the necessary information to insure that energy efficiency investments are recognized as a core part of Connecticut's energy strategy.

PA 11-80 and the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund

Connecticut's landmark energy reform bill, PA 11-80, makes significant changes to Connecticut's energy conservation policy and structure, representing a fundamentally new approach to achieving energy efficiency. Energy efficiency is now a national policy priority and Connecticut's new administration has positioned the State to take a leadership role. PA 11-80 allows our State to align its energy efficiency goals with national goals and objectives and work towards positioning Connecticut as a leader in the nation for energy efficiency³.

Many of the Act's specific provisions are in alignment with the mission and goals of the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund and are addressed through the programs detailed in this C&LM 2012 Plan.

Specifically, the Act addresses leveraging existing funds to provide low-cost energy efficiency financing and the utilization of savings based, performance contracting initiatives. As noted earlier, both financing and performance contracting are action items in the C&LM 2012 Plan and are detailed in subsequent chapters.

The Act also calls for reducing energy use in state buildings by ten (10) percent by 2012. This has been a long-term goal of the Companies and we fully support the new administration's efforts to make this a priority. In fact, during the last four years, the Energy Efficiency Fund-supported Retro Commissioning program has been actively involved with the State university system. Retro Commissioning projects have been completed at ECSU, CCSU, UCONN Waterbury and UCONN Stamford. Current projects at UCONN's Storrs campus are estimated to save approximately six (6) to eight (8) percent annually in electricity consumption. The comprehensive nature of the Retro Commissioning program also captures gas heating savings and other ancillary savings, like water and fuel oil. The State university projects are just an example of the how the Energy Efficiency Fund is supporting energy reduction in State buildings. Another notable project was the work done at approximately 40 state facilities through a partnership with Connecticut's Department of Administrative Services. The upgrades were done as part of the Small Business Energy Advantage program and resulted in the reduction of almost 681 kW and 4.4 million annual kWh representing approximately \$700,000 in annual energy savings.

³ Ranking via the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy ("ACEEE")

Additionally, the Companies and the EEB recommend the establishment of a State Strategic Energy Management Working Group composed of representatives from DEEP, DAS, EEB and Energy Efficiency Fund program administrators to provide input into the creation of the State building energy reduction plan called for in the Act.

Act 11-80 also sets a goal to weatherize eighty (80) percent of Connecticut homes by 2030. In 2010 alone, the Home Energy Solutions program performed weatherization services in ⁴ nearly 50,000 homes⁵. The Companies in conjunction with the EEB and DEEP are seeking the appropriate definition of Weatherization as well as defining Residential to meet the goal set in Public Act 11-80. The Home Energy Solutions Program serves as the gateway and mechanism to achieve this goal. However, the statute in Act 11-80 that caps funding for fuel-oil heated homes poses a significant challenge in meeting the goal.

Codes, Standards and Changes in the Market Process

The Companies will continue to support the adoption of the most recent energy code and will also continue with their efforts to increase compliance through education and outreach to the design and construction communities, as well as to building owners and building officials. Code compliance is integral to reducing energy consumption and compliance rates increase with awareness of the code and a better understanding of the purpose and inherent benefits.

The Companies and the EEB will also continue to structure program incentives for new construction to encourage owners, design professionals and contractors to go beyond the code requirements and focus on “whole-building” energy modeling and analysis. Given the current state of the residential building market and financial economic environment the Companies believe that adopting more stringent codes will deliver energy savings however the need for enhanced support of the construction industry to achieve code compliance will be paramount.

Energy Efficiency Board

The Energy Efficiency Board (formerly known as the Energy Conservation Management Board) is an appointed group of 14 members, mandated by Connecticut General Statutes § 16-25m and § 16-32f. As required by state statute, the EEB holds public meetings on a regular basis and receives public input. In its September 19, 2001, Final decision in Docket No. 01-01-14, The Department of Public Utility Control, now Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (“PURA”), adopted the EEB’s process for obtaining public comment (“Roadmap Process”). Pursuant to the Roadmap Process, the EEB has received

⁴ Weatherization services provided via the Home Energy Solutions core program include, when appropriate, an energy assessment; installation of door, window, shell and duct sealing; limited insulation; and the installation of energy-efficient light bulbs. (See Chapter 2 for more program details.)

⁵ Per 2010 Report of the Energy Efficiency Board; Home Energy Solutions served 34,296 homes, Home Energy Solutions-Income Eligible served 15,347 homes.

public comments in connection with the 2012 C&LM Plan. The EEB solicited public involvement at the onset of the 2012 C&LM Plan development process to allow public comments to be incorporated throughout the planning process.

With the passing of Public Act 11-80, the EEB remains in place with two important changes. In Section 33 of the Act, DEEP removes the utilities as voting members of the EEB and establishes the Commissioner of DEEP as the EEB chair. Consistent with prior C&LM plans, this 2012 C&LM Plan was developed with the advice and assistance of the EEB and its consultants.

BUDGET TABLES (ELECTRIC COMPANIES)

Table A1
2012
CL&P/UI Proposed C&LM Budget

CL&P/UI C&LM BUDGET	2012 CL&P Proposed Base Budget	2012 UI Proposed Base Budget	2012 CL&P/UI Proposed Budget Total
RESIDENTIAL			
Residential Retail Products	\$ 4,850,000	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 6,605,855
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 4,850,000	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 6,605,855
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,261,000	\$ 177,329	\$ 1,438,329
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting)	\$ 11,757,000	\$ 2,281,658	\$ 14,038,658
HES Income Eligible	\$ 9,399,700	\$ 2,118,093	\$ 11,517,793
Subtotal Residential	\$ 27,267,700	\$ 6,332,935	\$ 33,600,635
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL			
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY			
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,503,000	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 10,889,221
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,503,000	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 10,889,221
C&I LARGE RETROFIT			
Energy Opportunities	\$ 13,241,680	\$ 2,957,319	\$ 16,198,999
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 4,171,000	\$ 631,298	\$ 4,802,298
PRIME	\$ 485,000	\$ 116,141	\$ 601,141
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 17,897,680	\$ 3,704,758	\$ 21,602,438
Small Business	\$ 11,640,000	\$ 2,227,636	\$ 13,867,636
Subtotal C&I	\$ 38,040,680	\$ 8,318,615	\$ 46,359,295
OTHER - EDUCATION *			
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400,000	\$ 481,746	\$ 881,746
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,300,000
K-8 Education	\$ 325,000	\$ 401,825	\$ 726,825
Science Center	\$ 166,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 208,000
Subtotal Education	\$ 1,891,000	\$ 1,225,571	\$ 3,116,571
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS			
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 448,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 560,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 2,051,429	\$ 347,280	\$ 2,398,709
C&I Loan Program	\$ 500,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 550,000
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 150,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 200,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 3,149,429	\$ 559,280	\$ 3,708,709
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT			
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D			
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 350,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 575,000
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 350,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 575,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING			
Administration	\$ 900,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,650,000
Marketing Plan	\$ 200,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 250,000
Planning (UI Planning & Evaluation)	\$ 650,000	\$ 316,765	\$ 966,765
Evaluation (UI Evaluation, Outside Services)	\$ 2,010,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 2,580,000
Information Technology	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 342,500	\$ 2,042,500
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 550,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 850,000
Performance Management Fee	\$ 3,982,940	\$ 1,003,333	\$ 4,986,273
Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 9,992,940	\$ 3,332,598	\$ 13,325,538
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS			
Residential	\$ 31,056,929	\$ 7,781,037	\$ 38,837,966
C&I	\$ 42,543,880	\$ 9,969,364	\$ 52,513,244
Other*	\$ 10,590,940	\$ 3,619,598	\$ 14,210,538
TOTAL Note 1	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 21,369,999	\$ 105,561,748

* OTHER -EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.


Note 1: See Table A2 for Revenue Breakdown

Table A2
2012, 2013, 2014
CL&P/UI C&LM Revenues

CL&P/UI C&LM REVENUES	2012 Base Budget with RGGI			2012 with RGGI & Increased Savings		
	2012 CL&P Revenues	2012 UI Revenues	2012 CL&P/UI Total	2012 CL&P Revenues	2012 UI Revenues	2012 CL&P/UI Total
Collections (Mil Rate)	\$ 67,359,070	\$ 16,494,000	\$ 83,853,070	\$ 67,359,070	\$ 16,494,000	\$ 83,853,070
ISO-NE Other Demand Resources (ODRs)	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 8,100,000	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 8,100,000
ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market Demand Response Revenues	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000
Class III Renewable Energy Credits	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 4,500,000
Carrying Charges	\$ 800,000		\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000		\$ 800,000
RGGI*	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679
Other Fuel Revenues (Oil Funding)				\$ 12,907,000	\$ 4,155,287	\$ 17,062,287
Other Revenues (i.e., CAM, other)				\$ 74,337,794	\$ 21,934,370	\$ 96,272,164
Total - C&LM Revenues	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 21,370,000	\$ 105,561,749	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 47,459,657	\$ 218,896,200
CL&P/UI C&LM REVENUES	2013 Proposed Base Budget			2014 Proposed Base Budget		
	2013 CL&P Revenues	2013 UI Revenues	2013 CL&P/UI Total	2014 CL&P Revenues	2014 UI Revenues	2014 CL&P/UI Total
Collections (Mil Rate)	\$ 68,429,150	\$ 16,515,000	\$ 84,944,150	\$ 69,467,920	\$ 16,641,000	\$ 86,108,920
ISO-NE Other Demand Resources (ODRs)	\$ 6,200,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 7,600,000
ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market Demand Response Revenues	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 4,100,000
Class III Renewable Energy Credits	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 3,800,000
RGGI*	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679
Total - C&LM Revenues	\$ 83,261,829	\$ 21,015,000	\$ 104,276,829	\$ 83,900,599	\$ 21,141,000	\$ 105,041,599

*RGGI Budget is based on 50% of the \$2.00 / allowance for 2012 through 2014

Statewide (CL&P and UI) 2012 C&LM Budget and Parity Analysis
Table A1 Pie Chart



Customer Class	Budget (\$,000)	% of Total C&LM Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget	% of Residential & C&I Revenue	Difference
Res. Income Eligible	\$11,517,793	10.91%	12.61%	11.98%	0.63%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$27,320,173	25.88%	29.91%	29.68%	0.23%
Residential Subtotal	\$38,837,966	36.79%	42.51%	41.66%	0.85%
C&I	\$52,513,244	49.75%	57.49%	58.34%	-0.85%
C&I Subtotal	\$52,513,244	49.75%	57.49%	58.34%	-0.85%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$91,351,210	86.54%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Other Expenditures					
Other Expenditures	\$14,210,538	13.46%			
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$14,210,538	13.46%			
C&LM TOTAL	\$105,561,748	100.00%			
CL&P	\$84,191,749	79.76%			
UI	\$21,369,999	20.24%			

Totals may vary due to rounding

**TABLE B2
STATEWIDE TOTAL RESOURCE COSTS AND BENEFITS FOR C&LM PROGRAMS**

Program	Utility Costs 2012	Customer Cost 2012	Total Resource Cost 2012	Total Resource Benefit 2012	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Annualized Savings kWh	Lifetime Savings kWh	Load Savings kW	Annual Water Savings (Gal)	Lifetime Water Savings (Gal)	Annual Gas Savings (CCF)	Lifetime Gas Savings (CCF)	Peak Day Gas Savings (CCF)	Annual Oil Savings (Gal)	Lifetime Oil Savings (gal)	Annual Propane Savings (Gal)	Lifetime Propane Savings (Gal)	CO2 Emissions Reductions (Lifetime Tons)	
Residential Retail Products	\$ 6,605,855	\$ 4,061,420	\$ 10,667,274	\$ 39,525,941	3.7	60,625,142	286,962,384	4,597	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	144,113	
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 6,605,855	\$ 4,061,420	\$ 10,667,274	\$ 39,525,941	3.7	60,625,142	286,962,384	4,597	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	144,113
Water Heating	\$ 156,265	\$ 327,952	\$ 484,217	\$ 297,613	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	46,788	561,454	150	-	0	-	0	-	3,277
Residential New Construction	\$ 2,588,329	\$ 1,988,480	\$ 4,576,809	\$ 5,616,992	1.4	1,959,510	32,841,854	459	3,973,757	38,703,568	789,137	2,456,781	893	2,305	57,620	19,408	485,204	34,541	
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 19,562,793	\$ 4,750,256	\$ 24,333,049	\$ 47,884,958	2.0	23,348,138	300,774,836	3,365	3,049,224	16,441,212	172,276	15,072,328	6,988	1,722,716	3,022,801	56,538	732,451	277,377	
HES Income Eligible	\$ 14,869,368	\$ 1,635,748	\$ 16,505,116	\$ 32,618,734	2.0	16,798,459	156,677,390	1,138	3,049,224	16,441,212	386,948	7,240,811	2,991	333,333	4,103,181	4,413	425,511	169,422	
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 43,802,610	\$ 12,343,856	\$ 56,146,466	\$ 125,943,638	2.2	102,731,249	777,256,464	9,559	7,022,981	55,144,770	1,331,144	25,331,374	11,023	507,914	7,183,602	80,359	1,643,167	628,729	
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 14,759,221	\$ 1,972,086	\$ 16,731,307	\$ 52,160,075	3.1	26,793,051	410,981,354	5,468	-	-	712,816	10,843,219	5,415	-	-	-	-	-	269,678
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 14,759,221	\$ 1,972,086	\$ 16,731,307	\$ 52,160,075	3.1	26,793,051	410,981,354	5,468	-	-	712,816	10,843,219	5,415	-	-	-	-	-	269,678
Energy Opportunities	\$ 18,928,999	\$ 26,515,711	\$ 45,444,710	\$ 78,325,473	1.7	51,191,679	634,950,626	7,200	-	-	841,715	9,595,114	13,195	-	-	-	-	-	374,872
Oil/ Svcs (BSC, Training, RetroCx)	\$ 5,202,298	\$ 3,989,966	\$ 9,172,264	\$ 20,933,206	2.3	16,846,560	156,201,477	2,525	-	-	157,142	1,571,436	1,931	-	-	-	-	-	87,616
PRIME	\$ 601,141	\$ 50,513	\$ 641,654	\$ 16,033,655	25.0	2,320,339	11,601,961	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5,627
TOTAL - C&I LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 24,732,439	\$ 30,526,190	\$ 55,258,629	\$ 115,292,334	2.1	72,360,578	802,754,063	9,725	-	-	988,857	11,166,550	15,126	-	-	-	-	-	468,314
Small Business	\$ 14,167,636	\$ 16,490,817	\$ 30,658,453	\$ 47,033,308	1.5	33,212,419	408,900,900	5,689	-	-	(117,845)	(1,491,706)	(626)	-	-	-	-	-	196,644
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 53,659,296	\$ 48,989,093	\$ 102,648,388	\$ 214,485,717	2.1	132,366,049	1,622,636,317	20,882	-	-	1,593,828	20,518,062	19,915	-	-	-	-	-	934,636

This page intentionally blank

BUDGET TABLES (CL&P)

Table A
CL&P 2012 Proposed C&LM Budget

CL&P C&LM BUDGET	2011 CL&P Revised Budget 06/30/11	2012 CL&P Proposed Base Budget 10/01/11	2012 (A) CL&P Proposed Budget Increased Savings 10/01/11	2013 CL&P Proposed Base Budget 10/01/11
RESIDENTIAL				
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ 6,132,901	\$ 4,850,000	\$ 10,960,000	\$ 4,818,475
Appliance Rebate Program / New Programs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 6,132,901	\$ 4,850,000	\$ 14,960,000	\$ 4,818,475
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,460,024	\$ 1,261,000	\$ 1,838,050	\$ 1,252,803
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 4	\$ 17,749,370	\$ 11,757,000	\$ 19,905,000	\$ 11,729,390
HES Income Eligible	\$ 11,027,047	\$ 9,399,700	\$ 19,039,000	\$ 9,338,600
Subtotal Residential	\$ 36,369,342	\$ 27,267,700	\$ 55,742,050	\$ 27,139,268
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL				
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,759,606	\$ 8,503,000	\$ 8,669,250	\$ 8,447,516
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,759,606	\$ 8,503,000	\$ 8,669,250	\$ 8,447,516
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 25,935,919	\$ 13,241,680	\$ 33,614,000	\$ 13,155,610
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 4,729,740	\$ 4,171,000	\$ 9,581,000	\$ 4,143,900
PRIME	\$ 488,087	\$ 485,000	\$ 536,550	\$ 485,000
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 31,153,746	\$ 17,897,680	\$ 43,731,550	\$ 17,784,510
Small Business	\$ 13,436,752	\$ 11,640,000	\$ 38,305,000	\$ 11,577,638
Subtotal C&I	\$ 53,350,104	\$ 38,040,680	\$ 90,705,800	\$ 37,809,664
OTHER - EDUCATION *				
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,350	\$ 400,000
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,500,400	\$ 850,000
K-8 Education	\$ 225,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000
Science Center		\$ 166,000	\$ 166,000	\$ 166,000
Subtotal Education	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,891,000	\$ 2,391,750	\$ 1,741,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000
Other Funding Requests	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 3,650,000	\$ 2,051,429	\$ 2,050,700	\$ 2,175,238
C&I Loan Program	\$ 475,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 135,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 150,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 4,708,000	\$ 3,149,429	\$ 3,298,700	\$ 3,273,238
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT				
ISO Load Response Program Note 2	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D				
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 375,900	\$ 350,000
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 375,900	\$ 350,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Administration	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,199,700	\$ 900,000
Marketing Plan	\$ 176,651	\$ 200,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 200,000
Planning Note 3	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 779,550	\$ 650,000
Evaluation Note 3	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,010,000	\$ 2,210,400	\$ 2,010,000
Information Technology	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 1,700,000
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 400,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 550,000
Performance Management Fee	\$ 5,216,455	\$ 3,982,940	\$ 8,132,693	\$ 3,938,659
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 10,843,106	\$ 9,992,940	\$ 15,422,343	\$ 9,948,659
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS				
Residential	\$ 41,385,663	\$ 31,056,929	\$ 60,171,150	\$ 30,932,306
C&I	\$ 57,245,434	\$ 42,543,880	\$ 95,519,150	\$ 41,782,864
Other*	\$ 11,314,455	\$ 10,590,940	\$ 15,746,243	\$ 10,546,659
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 109,945,552	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 83,261,829
TOTAL	\$ 109,945,552	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 83,261,829

* OTHER -EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.



Note 1: Retail Products includes Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances.

Note 2: ISO-NE Load Response Customer payments are funded from the Forward Capacity Market

Note 3: Planning and Evaluation activities split into separate budget line items.

Note 4: Residential HVAC program renamed "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

CL&P 2012 C&LM Budget and Parity Analysis
Table A Pie Chart



Customer Class	Budget	% of Total C&LM Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget	% of Residential & C&I Revenue	Difference
Res. Income Eligible	\$9,399,700	11.16%	12.77%	11.98%	0.79%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$21,657,229	25.72%	29.43%	30.61%	-1.18%
Residential Subtotal	\$31,056,929	36.89%	42.20%	42.59%	-0.39%
C&I Small/Med	\$19,314,922	22.94%	26.24%	26.06%	0.18%
C&I Large	\$23,228,958	27.59%	31.56%	31.35%	0.21%
C&I Subtotal	\$42,543,880	50.53%	57.80%	57.41%	0.39%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$73,600,809	87.42%	100.00%	100.0%	0.0%
<i>Other Expenditures</i>					
Other Expenditures	\$10,590,940	12.58%			
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$10,590,940	12.58%			
C&LM TOTAL	\$84,191,749	100.00%			

C&I Non-Gov't	
Budget	Revenue
57.80%	57.41%

Note - Municipalities and state facilities are eligible to participate in C&I Program offerings as applicable.

**TABLE B
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS**

COMPARISON OF CL&P CONSERVATION PROGRAMS FOR 2012																		
Program	Utility Costs (000)	Customer Costs (000)	Total Resource Costs (000)	Electric System Benefit (000)	Total Resource Benefit (000)	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Statewide Total Resource B/C Ratio	# of Units	Units	Annualized Savings (MWh)	Lifetime Savings (MWh)	KW Impact (T/E)	Demand Cost \$KW-yr**	Demand Cost \$KW-yr**	Cost Rate \$/kW Annualize**	Utility Cost Ratio \$/LTKWh**	
RESIDENTIAL																		
Residential Retail Products - Note 1	\$ 4,850	\$ 3,103	\$ 7,953	\$ 17,205	\$ 29,645	3.5	3.7	3.7	1,450,413	Products	45,894	214,581	3,271	\$ 1,483	\$ 317	\$ 0.106	\$ 0.023	
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 4,850	\$ 3,103	\$ 7,953	\$ 17,205	\$ 29,645	3.5	3.7	3.7			45,894	214,581	3,271	\$ 1,483	\$ 317	\$ 0.106	\$ 0.023	
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,281	\$ 749	\$ 2,010	\$ 2,319	\$ 4,009	1.8	2.0	1.4	499	Homes	1,718	29,901	356	\$ 3,538	\$ 203	\$ 0.734	\$ 0.042	
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) - Note 2	\$ 11,757	\$ 3,638	\$ 15,395	\$ 18,701	\$ 34,631	1.6	2.2	2.0	21,301	Cash/HVAC Rebates	19,832	259,149	2,631	\$ 4,135	\$ 316	\$ 0.548	\$ 0.042	
HES Income Eligible	\$ 9,400	\$ 979	\$ 10,379	\$ 8,752	\$ 22,516	0.9	2.2	2.0	14,445	Customers	13,728	116,400	929	\$ 10,121	\$ 1,194	\$ 0.685	\$ 0.081	
Subtotal Residential	\$ 27,268	\$ 8,470	\$ 35,738	\$ 46,977	\$ 90,801	1.7	2.5	2.2			81,173	620,031	7,187	\$ 3,794	\$ 497	\$ 0.336	\$ 0.044	
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL																		
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY																		
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,503	\$ 323	\$ 8,826	\$ 27,282	\$ 34,648	3.2	3.9	3.1	484	Customers	20,055	307,732	4,375	\$ 1,944	\$ 127	\$ 0.424	\$ 0.028	
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,503	\$ 323	\$ 8,826	\$ 27,282	\$ 34,648	3.2	3.9	3.1			20,055	307,732	4,375	\$ 1,944	\$ 127	\$ 0.424	\$ 0.028	
C&I LARGE RETRO FIT																		
Energy Opportunities	\$ 13,242	\$ 17,747	\$ 30,989	\$ 45,260	\$ 59,605	3.4	1.9	1.7	590	Customers	42,199	521,131	6,027	\$ 2,197	\$ 178	\$ 0.314	\$ 0.025	
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC) - Note 3	\$ 4,171	\$ 3,281	\$ 7,432	\$ 13,834	\$ 18,518	3.3	2.5	2.3	90	Customers	17,350	144,421	2,349	\$ 1,775	\$ 213	\$ 0.240	\$ 0.029	
PRIME	\$ 485	\$ 51	\$ 536	\$ 803	\$ 15,774	1.7	29.5	25.0	72	Customers	1,896	9,479	-	N/A	N/A	\$ 0.256	\$ 0.051	
Large - C&I Retrofit	\$ 17,898	\$ 21,059	\$ 38,957	\$ 59,896	\$ 93,897	3.3	2.4	2.1	752		61,445	675,031	8,377	\$ 2,137	\$ 194	\$ 0.291	\$ 0.027	
Small Business	\$ 11,640	\$ 11,897	\$ 23,537	\$ 29,754	\$ 39,003	2.6	1.7	1.6	1,440	Customers	28,138	344,349	4,828	\$ 2,411	\$ 197	\$ 0.414	\$ 0.034	
Subtotal C&I	\$ 38,041	\$ 33,279	\$ 71,320	\$ 116,933	\$ 167,747	3.1	2.4	2.1			109,637	1,327,112	17,579	\$ 2,164	\$ 179	\$ 0.347	\$ 0.029	
OTHER - EDUCATION*																		
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 400															
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ 1,000															
K-8 Education	\$ 325	\$ -	\$ 325															
Science Center	\$ 168	\$ -	\$ 168															
Subtotal Education	\$ 1,891	\$ -	\$ 1,891	\$ -	\$ -													

**TABLE B
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS**

COMPARISON OF CL&P CONSERVATION PROGRAMS FOR 2012																		
Program	Utility Costs (000)	Customer Costs (000)	Total Resource Costs (000)	Electric System Benefit (000)	Total Resource Benefit (000)	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Statewide Total Resource B/C Ratio	# of Units	Units	Annualized Savings (MWh)	Lifetime Savings (MWh)	kW Impact (VE)	Demand Cost \$/kW**	Demand Cost \$/kW-yr**	Cost Rate \$/kwh Annualize**	Utility Cost Ratio \$/LT-kWh**	
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS																		
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 448	\$ -	\$ 448															
Residential Loan Program	\$ 2,051	\$ -	\$ 2,051															
C&I Loan Program	\$ 600	\$ -	\$ 600															
C&I Loan Defaults	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 150															
Total Other Programs/Requirements	\$ 3,149	\$ -	\$ 3,149	\$ -	\$ -													
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT																		
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	1.0	1.0		400	Customers	-	-	100,000	\$ 35	\$ 35	N/A	N/A	
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	1.0	1.0						100,000	\$ 35	\$ 35			
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D																		
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ 350															
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ 350	\$ -	\$ -													
Administration	\$ 900																	
Marketing Plan	\$ 200																	
Planning and Evaluation	\$ 2,660																	
Information Technology	\$ 1,700																	
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 650																	
Performance Management Fee	\$ 3,983																	
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 9,993																	
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS																		
Residential	\$ 31,057										81,173	620,031	7,187					
C&I	\$ 42,544										109,637	1,327,112	117,579					
Other*	\$ 10,591										-	-	-					
TOTAL C&I/M BUDGET	\$ 84,192	\$ 41,749	\$ 115,948	\$ 167,408	\$ 262,048	2.0	2.3				190,810	1,947,143	124,766	\$ 3,258	\$ 3,119	\$ 0.441	\$ 0.043	

* OTHER - includes ISE/ECSU RD&D, Admin, Planning & Evaluation, IT, EEB and PMF
** Total Ratio Columns exclude ISO-NE Load Response

Note 1: Beginning in 2006, Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances were combined into one program - Residential Retail Products.
Note 2: HES Cost Rates (\$/kW, \$/MW-Year, \$/annual kWh, \$/lifetime kWh) include \$0.4M of funding for oil measures - Residential HVAC program renamed "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.
Note 3: O&M Services includes RetroCK, BSC budget and associated savings.
General Note: Costs and benefits associated with the gas programs that are delivered integrated with the electric programs are not included in the TRC analysis of the 2012 electric programs.
Gas program costs and benefits for integrated delivery programs were included in the 2012 Gas Plan.

**TABLE B1
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF PROGRAM BENEFITS**

Program	Rate Impact (Program Costs less DRIFE) (000)	Electric System				Non-Electric Benefits				Total Benefits
		Energy Benefits (000)	Capacity Benefits (000)	DRIFE (000)	Electric System Benefits (000)	Resource Benefits (000)	Non-Resource Benefits (000)	Emissions Benefits (000)	Total Non- Electric Benefits (000)	Total Resource Benefits (000)
RESIDENTIAL										
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ 509	\$ 11,865	\$ 1,000	\$ 4,341	\$ 17,205	\$ -	\$ 4,456	\$ 7,984	\$ 12,440	\$ 29,645
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 509	\$ 11,865	\$ 1,000	\$ 4,341	\$ 17,205	\$ -	\$ 4,456	\$ 7,984	\$ 12,440	\$ 29,645
Residential New Construction	\$ 855	\$ 1,478	\$ 435	\$ 406	\$ 2,319	\$ 1,040	\$ 2	\$ 648	\$ 1,690	\$ 4,009
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 2	\$ 8,342	\$ 13,126	\$ 2,160	\$ 3,415	\$ 18,701	\$ 8,582	\$ 1,207	\$ 6,141	\$ 15,930	\$ 34,631
HES Income Eligible	\$ 7,329	\$ 6,320	\$ 361	\$ 2,071	\$ 8,752	\$ 9,509	\$ 629	\$ 3,627	\$ 13,764	\$ 22,516
Subtotal Residential	\$ 17,035	\$ 32,789	\$ 3,955	\$ 10,233	\$ 46,977	\$ 19,131	\$ 6,294	\$ 18,400	\$ 43,824	\$ 90,801
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL										
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY										
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 2,679	\$ 17,316	\$ 4,142	\$ 5,824	\$ 27,282	\$ (265)	\$ 222	\$ 7,608	\$ 7,565	\$ 34,848
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 2,679	\$ 17,316	\$ 4,142	\$ 5,824	\$ 27,282	\$ (265)	\$ 222	\$ 7,608	\$ 7,565	\$ 34,848
C&I LARGE RETRO FIT										
Energy Opportunities	\$ 2,198	\$ 29,989	\$ 4,227	\$ 11,043	\$ 45,260	\$ (352)	\$ 242	\$ 14,456	\$ 14,346	\$ 59,605
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC) Note 3	\$ 499	\$ 8,910	\$ 1,251	\$ 3,672	\$ 13,834	\$ (29)	\$ 20	\$ 4,693	\$ 4,684	\$ 18,518
PRIME	\$ 285	\$ 582	\$ -	\$ 220	\$ 803	\$ -	\$ 14,609	\$ 362	\$ 14,971	\$ 15,774
Large - C & I Retrofit	\$ 2,962	\$ 39,482	\$ 5,479	\$ 14,936	\$ 59,896	\$ (382)	\$ 14,871	\$ 19,511	\$ 34,000	\$ 93,897
Small Business	\$ 4,398	\$ 19,140	\$ 3,372	\$ 7,242	\$ 29,754	\$ (1,131)	\$ 777	\$ 9,604	\$ 9,249	\$ 39,003
Subtotal C & I	\$ 10,038	\$ 75,938	\$ 12,992	\$ 28,002	\$ 116,933	\$ (1,778)	\$ 15,870	\$ 36,723	\$ 50,815	\$ 167,747
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT										
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500
Other (Educational, Other Programs/Requirements, RD&D, Admin & Planning)	15,383	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL C&LM	\$ 45,957	\$ 108,727	\$ 20,448	\$ 38,235	\$ 167,409	\$ 17,352	\$ 22,164	\$ 55,123	\$ 94,639	\$ 262,048

Note 1: Beginning in 2006, Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances were combined into one program - Residential Retail Products.

Note 2: Residential HVAC program renamed "CT Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

Note 3: O&M Services includes RetroCx budget, BSC, and associated savings.

General Note: Costs and benefits associated with the gas programs that are delivered integrated with the electric programs are not included in the Total Resource Cost (TRC) analysis of the 2012 electric programs.


Gas program costs and benefits for integrated delivery programs are included in the 2012 Gas Plan.

Table C
CL&P 2012 C&LM Budget Details

CL&P C&LM BUDGET (\$000)	CL&P Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Contractor Labor	Incentives	Marketing	Other **	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
Residential Retail Products	\$ 144	\$ 2	\$ 865	\$ 9	\$ 3,180	\$ 600	\$ 30	\$ 20	\$ 4,850
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 144	\$ 2	\$ 865	\$ 9	\$ 3,180	\$ 600	\$ 30	\$ 20	\$ 4,850
Residential New Construction	\$ 174	\$ 3	\$ 35	\$ 28	\$ 981	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 1,261
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting)	\$ 590	\$ 25	\$ 364	\$ 350	\$ 9,996	\$ 325	\$ 75	\$ 32	\$ 11,757
HES Income Eligible	\$ 662	\$ 30	\$ 107	\$ 442	\$ 7,767	\$ 275	\$ 50	\$ 68	\$ 9,400
Subtotal Residential	\$ 1,570	\$ 60	\$ 1,371	\$ 829	\$ 21,924	\$ 1,235	\$ 155	\$ 125	\$ 27,269
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL									
C & I LOST OPPORTUNITY									
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 950	\$ 10	\$ 867	\$ 321	\$ 6,137	\$ 100	\$ 70	\$ 48	\$ 8,503
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 950	\$ 10	\$ 867	\$ 321	\$ 6,137	\$ 100	\$ 70	\$ 48	\$ 8,503
C & I LARGE RETROFIT									
Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,509	\$ 20	\$ 377	\$ 503	\$ 10,563	\$ 160	\$ 30	\$ 80	\$ 13,242
O&M (Service, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 517	\$ 10	\$ 638	\$ 52	\$ 2,844	\$ 60	\$ 15	\$ 35	\$ 4,171
PRIME	\$ 45	\$ 2	\$ 10	\$ 2	\$ 394	\$ 20	\$ 3	\$ 10	\$ 485
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 2,071	\$ 32	\$ 1,025	\$ 557	\$ 13,801	\$ 240	\$ 48	\$ 125	\$ 17,899
Small Business	\$ 683	\$ 10	\$ 237	\$ 274	\$ 8,619	\$ 300	\$ 17	\$ 1,500	\$ 11,640
Subtotal C&I	\$ 3,704	\$ 52	\$ 2,129	\$ 1,151	\$ 28,557	\$ 640	\$ 135	\$ 1,673	\$ 38,042
OTHER - EDUCATION									
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 28	\$ 10	\$ 347	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 305	\$ -	\$ 656	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 1,000
K-8 Education	\$ 84	\$ 3	\$ 231	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 325
Science Center	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166
Subtotal Education	\$ 417	\$ 13	\$ 1,400	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ 39	\$ 2	\$ 5	\$ 1,892
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS									
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 448	\$ -	\$ 448
Other Funding Requests	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Residential Loan Program	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 2,013	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,051
C&I Loan Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150	\$ -	\$ 150
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 2,513	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 598	\$ -	\$ 3,149
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT									
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 342	\$ 5	\$ 743	\$ 94	\$ 2,295	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ 12	\$ 3,500
Power Factor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 342	\$ 5	\$ 743	\$ 94	\$ 2,295	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ 12	\$ 3,500
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D									
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 73	\$ 2	\$ 269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 349
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 73	\$ 2	\$ 269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 349
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING									
Administration	\$ 759	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ 90	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17	\$ 30	\$ 900
Marketing Plan	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ 180	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200
Planning	\$ 579	\$ 6	\$ 20	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 19	\$ 650
Evaluation	\$ 194	\$ 5	\$ 1,801	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ 2,010
Information Technology	\$ 550	\$ 200	\$ 870	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 80	\$ 1,700
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 550
Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,983	\$ -	\$ 3,983
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 2,087	\$ 215	\$ 3,241	\$ 110	\$ -	\$ 180	\$ 4,025	\$ 134	\$ 9,993
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS									
Residential	\$ 1,960	\$ 71	\$ 4,550	\$ 856	\$ 21,924	\$ 1,411	\$ 157	\$ 130	\$ 31,058
C&I	\$ 4,114	\$ 59	\$ 3,606	\$ 1,251	\$ 30,852	\$ 693	\$ 285	\$ 1,685	\$ 42,545
Other*	\$ 2,155	\$ 217	\$ 3,510	\$ 95	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,473	\$ 139	\$ 10,590
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 8,228	\$ 347	\$ 11,666	\$ 2,202	\$ 52,776	\$ 2,104	\$ 4,915	\$ 1,954	\$ 84,192

* Other - includes ISE/ECSU, RD&D, Admin, Planning & Evaluation, and IT
 ** Other includes Performance Management Fee, ECSU, Energy, Conservation Loan Fund, Loan Defaults, Dues, Postage.

CL&P
2011 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
C&LM Budget By Expense Class
Table C Pie Chart



<u>Expense Classes</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
NU Labor	\$ 8,228	9.8%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 347	0.4%
Outside Services	\$ 11,666	13.9%
Other Labor	\$ 2,202	2.6%
Incentives	\$ 52,776	62.7%
Marketing	\$ 2,104	2.5%
Other	\$ 4,915	5.8%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 1,954	2.3%
Total	\$ 84,192	100.00%

**Table D
CI&P Historical and Projected \$ and kW**

	Expenditures \$												Load Savings kW											
	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Budget	2012 Budget	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Goal	2012 Goal					
RESIDENTIAL																								
Retail Products Note 1	3,154,881	6,001,655	6,440,269	5,626,761	5,961,939	4,903,424	3,223,833	3,764,502	4,850,000	1,604	1,042	1,437	5,160	5,678	4,024	14,589	8,691	3,271						
Appliance Rebate Program		1,446,975	2,034,262	1,188,636	268,935									443	235									
Customer Initiated Programs		244,933	329,182					3,615,349																
Total - Consumer Products	3,154,881	7,693,563	8,803,716	6,815,397	5,961,939	5,172,459	3,223,833	12,379,851	4,850,000	1,604	7,464	6,306	5,603	5,678	6,492	14,589	8,691	3,271						
Residential New Construction Note 2	1,115,726	767,514	1,187,496	1,688,185	1,414,189	1,563,639	494,994	1,460,433	1,261,000	476	268	1,885	2,225	505	521	256	339	584	356					
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 3	1,462,685	1,438,871	2,029,389	4,313,563	5,497,875	7,167,887	21,409,693	17,246,370	11,757,000	972	2,188	2,856	3,151	2,520	3,261	2,220	5,054	5,086	2,631					
HES Income Eligible	3,180,815	4,590,734	4,682,547	5,298,638	7,112,862	7,035,693	7,758,462	9,361,764	9,399,700	427	652	866	1,110	1,067	1,271	1,172	1,146	1,767	929					
Subtotal Residential	8,914,107	14,490,682	16,703,048	18,115,783	19,956,566	20,959,578	19,426,108	45,185,051	36,369,342	3,479	10,572	11,853	12,089	9,770	11,545	21,128	16,128	7,187						
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL																								
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY																								
Energy Conscious Blueprint Note 4	10,410,843	14,479,658	12,468,319	9,448,615	13,084,740	18,460,385	6,756,126	8,033,028	8,759,606	10,750	21,714	10,655	8,771	9,354	8,279	5,331	4,039	4,237	4,375					
Total - Lost Opportunity	10,410,843	14,479,658	12,468,319	9,448,615	13,084,740	18,460,385	6,756,126	8,033,028	8,759,606	10,750	21,714	10,655	8,771	9,354	8,279	5,331	4,039	4,237	4,375					
C&I LARGE RETROFIT																								
C&I RFP	2,049,863	4,037,727	9,176,612	9,081,115	22,928,130	29,565,448	10,231,492	17,863,695	25,935,919	642	3,260	7,355	15,295	17,675	14,859	6,017	8,693	11,045	6,027					
Energy Opportunities Note 5	766,397	777,245	1,026,898	1,414,189	1,563,639	1,414,189	1,084,433	1,460,433	1,261,000	1,286	1,426	2,431	2,225	505	521	256	339	584	356					
O&M (Service, RetroC, BSC)	450,905	933,762	1,833,005	1,435,302	1,929,890	1,100,065	1,347,241	4,729,740	4,171,000	142	774	2,208	504	432	711	376	531	2,123	2,349					
PRIME Note 6						394,290	476,627	488,087	485,000															
Municipal Energy & Schools Note 7	2,288,449	6,718,880	4,401,007							1,219	761	1,147												
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	5,555,614	12,467,614	16,437,522	10,516,417	24,041,952	31,495,638	11,725,847	19,687,563	31,155,746	3,289	6,221	13,141	15,799	18,107	15,570	6,393	9,244	13,168	8,377					
Small Business	2,167,157	3,263,609	2,710,538	7,497,147	10,204,453	11,390,772	4,879,817	12,100,944	13,486,152	2,430	3,354	2,349	8,497	9,310	8,287	4,987	5,244	6,531	4,828					
Subtotal C&I	18,133,614	30,210,881	31,616,379	27,462,179	47,331,945	61,346,995	23,561,491	39,821,635	53,569,104	16,469	31,289	26,145	33,067	36,771	32,156	16,712	18,807	23,926	17,579					
OTHER EDUCATION																								
Smart Living Center	292,526	61,519	80,760	86,739	207,200	107,047	92,465	131,950	400,000															
Science Center																								
EESmart* (K - 12 Education)	249,053	61,542	242,897	159,987	232,784	208,451	197,076	331,133	225,000															
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot							46,308	960,047	850,000															
Community Based Program (SWCT)	73,081	96,251	168,371	201,382	212,080																			
Subtotal Education	614,660	219,312	692,028	655,308	719,206	529,901	543,021	1,423,130	1,475,000															
OTHER PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS																								
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	950,000	716,000	404,391	242,000	240,000	320,000	400,000	448,000	448,000															
Residential Loan Program							18,285	18,569,958	3,650,000															
C&I Loan Program							9,634	204,898	475,000															
Other Funding Requests								325,385																
C&I Loan Defaults			139,710	138,126	71,492	37,933	104,822	110,056	135,000															
Subtotal Other Programs/Requirements	950,000	855,710	532,517	313,592	297,267	357,933	533,741	19,610,297	4,706,000															
OTHER - LOAN MANAGEMENT																								
ISO Loan Response Program	2,436,621	1,411,769	1,241,601	491,060	456,025	102,909	2,864,364	3,000,000	3,500,000	45,951	29,900	60,755	23,576	16,467	17,294	13,296	118,432	110,000	100,000					
Demand Reduction Note 8	118,454	62,067	12,663	9,513																				
Power Factor	33,000	477,007	123,615	144,901	64,128																			
Wait Unit \$300	209,639	100,000																						
Subtotal Loan Management	2,436,621	501,326	2,050,843	1,377,879	645,474	520,153	102,909	2,864,364	3,000,000															
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D																								
Renewables Incentives	7,898	3,019																						
Research, Development & Demonstration	1,721,585	1,117,495	625,597	22,769	131,220	114,559	75,087	102,434	200,000															
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	1,721,585	1,125,493	628,616	22,769	131,220	114,559	75,087	102,434	200,000															
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING																								
Administration	2,330,603	852,550	504,237	728,465	663,411	586,304	747,757	835,729	900,000															
Marketing Plan			284,419	67,020	420,292	3,618	5,804	63,349	176,651															
Planning and Evaluation	812,535	827,799	2,008,477	1,138,717	750,975	1,433,843	1,617,773	2,043,326	2,450,000															
Information Technology	307,548	701,153	811,472	1,812,738	1,656,432	1,636,304	1,268,936	1,810,543	1,700,000															
Energy Efficiency Board	247,321	98,984	316,021	255,176	309,122	476,799	568,509	431,860	400,000															
Audit			294,459																					
Performance Management Fee	2,180,501	3,937,752	3,866,548	4,056,741	4,788,385	3,903,735	2,259,767	5,474,571	5,992,940															
Admin Planning Expenditures	5,978,508	6,418,238	8,085,733	8,058,857	8,588,617	8,040,397	6,248,547	10,669,378	10,843,106															
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS																								
Residential																								
C&I	9,455,646	14,888,079	17,632,785	18,725,643	20,914,421	21,408,083	19,922,869	65,011,019	41,385,663	3,379	10,572	11,853	12,089	9,770	11,545	7,671	21,128	16,128	7,187					
Other Note 9	20,643,356	30,673,832	33,842,058	29,024,118	48,215,129	61,970,085	23,650,260	49,231,922	57,245,434	62,420	61,983	102,461	60,819	57,650	50,477	30,008	136,939	133,926	117,579					
TOTAL (includes ISO Loan Response)	38,649,095	53,821,542	60,309,164	55,960,829	91,849,506	50,290,904	116,676,789	109,945,552	84,191,449															
TOTAL (excludes ISO Loan Response)	36,212,474	53,681,309	58,897,395	54,719,228	77,178,135	91,393,481	50,187,995	116,812,425	106,945,552	19,948	42,655	53,559	49,332	50,953	44,728	24,383	39,635	40,054	24,766					

Note 1: Includes Residential Lighting, Smart Living Catalog and Children's Welfare programs.
 Note 2: Includes Residential Lighting, Smart Living Catalog and Children's Welfare programs.
 Note 3: Includes

BUDGET TABLES (UI)



Table A
UI 2012 Proposed C&LM Budget

UI C&LM BUDGET	2011	2012	2012	2013
	UI REVISED BASE BUDGET 3/15/2011	UI PROPOSED BASE BUDGET 9/1/2011	UI PROPOSED INCREASED SAVINGS BUDGET 9/1/2011	UI PROPOSED BASE BUDGET 9/1/2011
RESIDENTIAL				
Residential Retail Products	\$ 2,133,216	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,744,913
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 2,133,216	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,744,913
Residential New Construction	\$ 215,440	\$ 177,329	\$ 177,329	\$ 176,224
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting)	\$ 2,960,781	\$ 2,281,658	\$ 7,364,631	\$ 2,267,440
HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,498,996	\$ 2,118,093	\$ 5,038,002	\$ 2,104,894
Subtotal RESIDENTIAL	\$ 7,808,433	\$ 6,332,935	\$ 16,025,266	\$ 6,293,471
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL				
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 3,174,527	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 2,371,352
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 3,174,527	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 2,371,352
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 3,811,021	\$ 2,957,319	\$ 10,529,387	\$ 2,938,891
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 429,667	\$ 631,298	\$ 3,776,044	\$ 627,364
PRIME	\$ 86,008	\$ 116,141	\$ 402,385	\$ 115,417
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 4,326,696	\$ 3,704,759	\$ 14,707,816	\$ 3,681,673
Small Business	\$ 2,717,634	\$ 2,227,636	\$ 4,512,339	\$ 2,213,754
Subtotal C&I	\$ 10,218,857	\$ 8,318,616	\$ 23,102,973	\$ 8,266,779
OTHER - EDUCATION				
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 459,246	\$ 481,746	\$ 481,746	\$ 481,746
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 176,822	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
Science Center	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000
K - 8 Education	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825
Subtotal Education	\$ 1,037,893	\$ 1,225,571	\$ 1,225,571	\$ 1,225,571
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 589,087	\$ 347,280	\$ 347,280	\$ 328,755
C&I Loan Program	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 173,000	\$ 50,000
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 801,087	\$ 559,280	\$ 682,280	\$ 540,755
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT				
ISO Load Response Program Support	\$ -	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,100,000
Subtotal Load Management	\$ -	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,100,000
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D				
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Administration	\$ 646,635	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 782,163
Planning and Evaluation	\$ 308,819	\$ 316,765	\$ 316,765	\$ 332,332
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ 430,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000
Information Technology	\$ 243,000	\$ 342,500	\$ 342,500	\$ 342,500
EEB	\$ 210,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 300,000
2011 Performance Management Fee	\$ 1,083,486	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333	\$ 2,243,318	\$ -
2013 Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 986,429
Marketing Plan	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 50,000
Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 2,971,940	\$ 3,332,598	\$ 4,822,583	\$ 3,363,424
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS				
Residential	\$ 9,348,199	\$ 7,781,037	\$ 17,633,368	\$ 7,723,048
C&I	\$ 10,456,071	\$ 9,969,365	\$ 24,916,722	\$ 9,641,528
Other*	\$ 3,158,940	\$ 3,619,598	\$ 4,909,583	\$ 3,650,424
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 22,963,210	\$ 21,370,000	\$ 47,459,673	\$ 21,015,000

* OTHER -EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.

Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT BUDGET PIES
TABLE A**



Customer Class	Budget	% of Total C&LM Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget	% of Residential & C&I Revenue	Difference
Res. Low Income	\$ 2,448,340	11.46%	13.79%	11.99%	1.81%
Res Non-Low Income	\$ 5,332,697	24.95%	30.04%	26.12%	3.92%
Residential Sub-total	\$ 7,781,037	36.41%	43.84%	38.11%	5.73%
Small Business <150kW	\$ 2,227,636	10.42%	12.55%	18.68%	-6.13%
Med & Large Commercial	\$ 5,421,082	25.37%	30.54%	28.48%	2.06%
Med & Large Industrial	\$ 1,904,506	8.91%	10.73%	10.76%	-0.03%
Municipal	\$ 416,141	1.95%	2.34%	3.96%	-1.62%
C & I Sub-total	\$ 9,969,365	46.65%	56.16%	61.89%	-5.73%
Sub-total for Residential and C&I	\$ 17,750,402	83.06%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Other Expenditures	\$ 3,619,598	16.94%			
Other Expenditures Sub-total	\$ 3,619,598	16.94%			
GRAND TOTAL *	\$ 21,370,000	100%			

Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
COMPARISON OF UI CONSERVATION PROGRAMS
INCLUDES DRIPE AND CO²
TABLE B**

Program	Utility Costs 2012	Customer Cost 2012	Total Resource Cost 2012	Electric System Benefit 2012	Total Resource Benefit 2012	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Goals/# Units	Units of Measure	Annualized Savings kWh	Lifetime Savings kWh	Load Savings kW	Demand Cost \$/kW	Demand Cost \$/kW Yr	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh Annualized	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh Lifetime
Residential Retail Products	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 958,138	\$ 2,713,992	\$ 5,877,338	\$ 9,880,518	3.35	3.64	491,954	Bulbs, Fixtures	14,731,133	72,381,047	1,325.8	\$ 1,324	\$ 270	\$ 0.1192	\$ 0.024
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS						3.35	3.64			14,731,133	72,381,047	1,325.8	\$ 1,324	\$ 270	\$ 0.1192	\$ 0.024
Residential New Construction	\$ 177,329	\$ 154,071	\$ 331,400	\$ 349,378	\$ 434,448	1.97	1.31	113	No. of Units	241,509	2,941,285	103.0	\$ 1,722	\$ 141	\$ 0.7343	\$ 0.060
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 2,281,658	\$ 348,288	\$ 2,629,956	\$ 3,484,785	\$ 5,244,101	1.53	1.99	3,454	No. of Participants	3,515,822	41,625,954	734.1	\$ 3,108	\$ 283	\$ 0.6490	\$ 0.055
HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,118,093	\$ 641,466	\$ 2,759,559	\$ 2,670,017	\$ 6,084,330	1.26	2.20	3,121	Customers	3,070,255	40,277,158	209.7	\$ 10,100	\$ 770	\$ 0.6899	\$ 0.053
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 6,332,935	\$ 2,101,972	\$ 8,434,907	\$ 12,381,518	\$ 21,643,398	1.96	2.57			21,558,719	157,225,443	2,372.6	\$ 2,669	\$ 366	\$ 0.2938	\$ 0.040
Energy Conscious Blueprint (a)	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 690,775	\$ 3,076,997	\$ 8,659,995	\$ 11,281,917	3.63	3.67	72	Projects	6,738,345	103,249,390	1,093.3	\$ 2,183	\$ 142	\$ 0.3541	\$ 0.023
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY						3.63	3.67			6,738,345	103,249,390	1,093.3	\$ 2,183	\$ 142	\$ 0.3541	\$ 0.023
Energy Opportunities	\$ 3,007,319	\$ 5,072,532	\$ 8,079,851	\$ 9,868,802	\$ 12,686,804	3.22	1.57	80	Projects	8,992,818	113,819,163	1,172.2	\$ 2,565	\$ 203	\$ 0.3344	\$ 0.026
Oil	\$ 631,298	\$ 336,000	\$ 977,298	\$ 1,050,052	\$ 1,442,016	1.66	1.48	14	Projects	1,488,221	11,780,836	176.1	\$ 3,584	\$ 456	\$ 0.4214	\$ 0.054
Services (BSC, Training, RetroV)	\$ 116,141	\$ -	\$ 106,141	\$ 179,783	\$ 259,954	1.55	2.45	21	Projects	424,564	2,122,820	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.2736	\$ 0.055
PRIME	\$ 3,754,759	\$ 5,408,532	\$ 9,163,290	\$ 10,898,638	\$ 14,388,573	2.90	1.57			10,915,603	127,722,819	1,348.4	\$ 2,785	\$ 238	\$ 0.3440	\$ 0.029
TOTAL - C&I/LARGE RETROFIT						2.90	1.57			10,915,603	127,722,819	1,348.4	\$ 2,785	\$ 238	\$ 0.3440	\$ 0.029
Small Business	\$ 2,227,636	\$ 4,202,702	\$ 6,430,338	\$ 5,701,016	\$ 7,392,134	2.56	1.15	191	Projects	5,074,638	64,551,988	860.9	\$ 2,587	\$ 203	\$ 0.4390	\$ 0.035
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 8,368,616	\$ 10,302,010	\$ 18,670,625	\$ 25,259,648	\$ 33,062,625	3.02	1.77			22,728,586	295,524,197	3,302.6	\$ 2,534	\$ 195	\$ 0.3682	\$ 0.028
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 481,746							15,000	Customers							
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 300,000															
Science Center	\$ 42,000															
K-8 Education	\$ 401,825															
SUB-TOTAL EDUCATION	\$ 1,225,571															
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 112,000															
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 347,280															
C&I Loan Defaults	\$ 50,000															
SUB-TOTAL PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS	\$ 509,280															
ISO Load Response Program Support	\$ 1,376,000															
SUB-TOTAL LOAD MANAGEMENT	\$ 1,376,000															
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 225,000															
SUB-TOTAL RENEWABLES AND RD&D	\$ 225,000															
Administration	\$ 750,000															
Planning & Evaluation	\$ 316,765															
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ 570,000															
Information Technology	\$ 342,500															
EEB	\$ 300,000															
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ 1,003,333															
Marketing Plan	\$ 50,000															
SUB-TOTAL ADMIN & PLANNING	\$ 3,332,598															
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS																
RESIDENTIAL	\$ 7,811,037	\$ 2,101,972	\$ 8,434,907	\$ 12,381,518	\$ 21,643,398	1.59	2.57			21,558,719	157,225,443	2,372.6	\$ 3,280	\$ 450	\$ 0.3609	\$ 0.049
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL	\$ 9,969,365	\$ 10,302,010	\$ 18,670,625	\$ 25,259,648	\$ 33,062,625	2.53	1.77			22,728,586	295,524,197	3,302.6	\$ 3,019	\$ 232	\$ 0.4386	\$ 0.034
OTHER*	\$ 3,619,598	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -						34,000.0					
TOTAL C&I M BUDGET Note 2	\$ 21,370,000	\$ 12,403,982	\$ 27,405,532	\$ 37,641,167	\$ 54,706,022	1.76	2.02			44,287,305	452,749,640	39,675.2	\$ 3,523	\$ 345	\$ 0.4825	\$ 0.047

Notes:
(a) Energy Blueprint includes Motors and Cool Choice

* Other - Education is primarily allocated to Residential Programs

Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
COMPARISON OF UI CONSERVATION PROGRAMS
INCLUDES DRIPE AND CO²
TABLE B1**


Program	Electric System					Non-Electric Benefits				
	Energy Benefits	Capacity Benefits	DRIPE	Electric System Benefits 2011	Resource Benefits	Non-Resource Benefits	Emissions Benefits	Total Non-Electric Benefits	Total Non-Electric Benefits	Total Resource Benefits 2011
Residential Retail Products	\$ 4,004,251	\$ 433,500	\$ 1,439,587	\$ 5,877,338	\$ -	\$ 1,343,537	\$ 2,659,642	\$ 4,003,180	\$ 4,003,180	\$ 9,880,518
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 4,004,251	\$ 433,500	\$ 1,439,587	\$ 5,877,338	\$ -	\$ 1,343,537	\$ 2,659,642	\$ 4,003,180	\$ 4,003,180	\$ 9,880,518
Residential New Construction	\$ 153,414	\$ 131,165	\$ 64,799	\$ 349,378	\$ -	\$ 14,553	\$ 70,517	\$ 85,070	\$ 85,070	\$ 434,448
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 2,119,354	\$ 689,280	\$ 676,150	\$ 3,484,785	\$ 546,638	\$ 168,524	\$ 1,044,154	\$ 1,759,317	\$ 1,759,317	\$ 5,244,101
HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,057,451	\$ 125,739	\$ 486,827	\$ 2,670,017	\$ 2,311,853	\$ 113,900	\$ 988,560	\$ 3,414,313	\$ 3,414,313	\$ 6,084,330
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 8,334,470	\$ 1,379,685	\$ 2,667,363	\$ 12,381,518	\$ 2,858,491	\$ 1,640,515	\$ 4,762,873	\$ 9,261,879	\$ 9,261,879	\$ 21,643,398
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 5,799,959	\$ 1,008,949	\$ 1,851,087	\$ 8,659,995	\$ (44,115)	\$ 105,576	\$ 2,560,460	\$ 2,621,922	\$ 2,621,922	\$ 11,281,917
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 5,799,959	\$ 1,008,949	\$ 1,851,087	\$ 8,659,995	\$ (44,115)	\$ 105,576	\$ 2,560,460	\$ 2,621,922	\$ 2,621,922	\$ 11,281,917
Energy Opportunities	\$ 6,524,763	\$ 871,914	\$ 2,272,125	\$ 9,668,802	\$ (300,079)	\$ 178,999	\$ 3,138,882	\$ 3,017,801	\$ 3,017,801	\$ 12,686,604
O&M										
Services (BSC, Training, RetroX, PRIME)	\$ 837,973	\$ 68,999	\$ 322,864	\$ 1,229,835	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 472,134	\$ 472,134	\$ 472,134	\$ 1,701,970
TOTAL - C&I/LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 7,362,736	\$ 940,913	\$ 2,594,988	\$ 10,898,638	\$ (300,079)	\$ 178,999	\$ 3,611,017	\$ 3,489,936	\$ 3,489,936	\$ 14,388,573
Small Business	\$ 3,697,627	\$ 653,109	\$ 1,350,279	\$ 5,701,016	\$ (210,654)	\$ 125,656	\$ 1,776,117	\$ 1,691,119	\$ 1,691,119	\$ 7,392,134
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 16,860,323	\$ 2,602,971	\$ 5,796,355	\$ 25,259,648	\$ (554,848)	\$ 410,231	\$ 7,947,594	\$ 7,802,976	\$ 7,802,976	\$ 33,062,625
TOTAL C&I/M BUDGET	\$ 25,194,792	\$ 3,982,656	\$ 8,463,718	\$ 37,641,167	\$ 2,303,643	\$ 2,050,745	\$ 12,710,467	\$ 17,064,855	\$ 17,064,855	\$ 54,706,022

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
TABLE C**

PROGRAM NAME	UI Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Contractor Labor	Incentives	Marketing	Other (b)	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
Residential Retail Products	\$ 184,412	\$ 4,993	\$ 190,000	\$ -	\$ 1,106,000	\$ 260,000	\$ 5,803	\$ 4,647	\$ 1,755,855
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 184,412	\$ 4,993	\$ 190,000	\$ -	\$ 1,106,000	\$ 260,000	\$ 5,803	\$ 4,647	\$ 1,755,855
Residential New Construction	\$ 58,166	\$ 1,500	\$ 7,500	\$ -	\$ 92,663	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 177,329
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 271,894	\$ 3,500	\$ 60,452	\$ -	\$ 1,835,212	\$ 100,500	\$ -	\$ 10,100	\$ 2,281,658
HES Income Eligible	\$ 189,057	\$ 5,000	\$ 31,000	\$ -	\$ 1,851,536	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ 6,500	\$ 2,118,093
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 703,529	\$ 14,993	\$ 288,952	\$ -	\$ 4,885,411	\$ 410,500	\$ 5,803	\$ 23,747	\$ 6,332,935
Energy Conscious Blueprint (a)	\$ 537,396	\$ 3,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,671,825	\$ 30,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 2,386,221
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 537,396	\$ 3,000	\$ 96,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,671,825	\$ 30,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 2,386,221
Energy Opportunities	\$ 538,015	\$ 3,050	\$ 102,500	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,160,084	\$ 33,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 152,670	\$ 3,007,319
O&M Services (RFP, BSC, Training, RetroX, PRIME)	\$ 31,696	\$ 1,000	\$ 476,400	\$ -	\$ 214,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 1,250	\$ 8,093	\$ 747,439
TOTAL - C&LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 569,711	\$ 4,050	\$ 578,900	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,374,084	\$ 48,000	\$ 4,250	\$ 160,763	\$ 3,754,758
Small Business	\$ 262,536	\$ 3,266	\$ 50,000	\$ 10,500	\$ 1,559,934	\$ 30,000	\$ 1,100	\$ 310,300	\$ 2,227,636
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 1,369,643	\$ 10,316	\$ 724,900	\$ 35,500	\$ 5,605,843	\$ 108,000	\$ 13,350	\$ 501,063	\$ 8,368,615
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 65,395	\$ 6,621	\$ 27,000	\$ 171,814	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ 174,016	\$ 2,000	\$ 481,746
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 28,297	\$ 6,000	\$ 253,703	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000
Science Center	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,000
K-8 Education	\$ 65,395	\$ 8,621	\$ 197,698	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ 47,411	\$ -	\$ 7,800	\$ 401,825
SUB-TOTAL EDUCATION	\$ 159,087	\$ 21,042	\$ 520,401	\$ 171,814	\$ 75,000	\$ 94,411	\$ 174,016	\$ 9,800	\$ 1,225,571
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 112,000	\$ -	\$ 112,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 30,045	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 317,235	\$ -	\$ 347,280
C&L Loan Defaults	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000
SUB-TOTAL PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS	\$ 30,045	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 479,235	\$ -	\$ 509,280
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 125,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 351,000	\$ -	\$ 878,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 1,376,000
SUB-TOTAL LOAD MANAGEMENT	\$ 125,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 351,000	\$ -	\$ 878,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 1,376,000
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000
SUB-TOTAL RENEWABLES AND RD&D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000
Administration	\$ 643,268	\$ 2,500	\$ 98,532	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,700	\$ 750,001
Planning & Evaluation	\$ 311,348	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,417	\$ 316,765
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570,000
Information Technology	\$ 49,983	\$ 134,631	\$ 155,386	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,600	\$ 342,500
EEB	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000
Marketing Plan	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333
SUB-TOTAL ADMIN & PLANNING	\$ 1,004,599	\$ 137,031	\$ 1,123,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 1,003,333	\$ 13,717	\$ 3,332,599
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS									
RESIDENTIAL	\$ 873,923	\$ 33,631	\$ 744,812	\$ 137,451	\$ 4,960,411	\$ 535,511	\$ 462,251	\$ 33,147	\$ 7,781,037
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL	\$ 1,513,381	\$ 17,820	\$ 1,140,441	\$ 69,863	\$ 6,483,843	\$ 137,400	\$ 98,153	\$ 508,463	\$ 9,969,364
OTHER	\$ 1,004,599	\$ 137,031	\$ 1,348,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,115,333	\$ 13,717	\$ 3,619,599
TOTAL C&L M BUDGET	\$ 3,391,903	\$ 188,382	\$ 3,234,171	\$ 207,314	\$ 11,444,254	\$ 672,911	\$ 1,675,737	\$ 555,327	\$ 21,370,000

Notes:
(a) Energy Blueprint includes Motors and Cool Choice
(b) Other expenses include:
- Performance Management Fee
- Smart Living Center Lease
- Smart Living Center Utilities
- ECSU
- Energy Conservation Loan Fund
- Neighborhood Housing Services
- C&L M Loan Defaults
- NEEP Participation
- Postage
- Telephone Expense
Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
C&LM BUDGET BY EXPENSE CLASS**



<u>Expense Classes</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
UI Labor	\$ 3,391,903	15.87%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 188,382	0.88%
Outside Services	\$ 3,234,171	15.13%
Contractor Labor	\$ 207,314	0.97%
Incentives	\$ 11,444,254	53.55%
Marketing	\$ 672,911	3.15%
Other	\$ 1,675,737	7.84%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 555,328	2.60%
Total	\$ 21,370,000	100.00%

Table D
UI Historical and Projected \$ and kW

		Expenditures \$ (000)											
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Goal	Goal
RESIDENTIAL													
	Residential Retail Products	1,589	1,303	592	1,267	1,592	1,664	1,247	1,282	1,344	2,430	2,133	1,756
	Appliance Retirement	-	-	867	867	887	109	-	160	-	-	-	-
	Total - Consumer Products	1,589	1,303	592	2,134	2,479	1,773	1,247	1,442	1,344	2,430	2,133	1,756
	Residential New Construction	497	520	357	606	1,140	375	153	440	198	176	215	177
	Home Energy Solutions	229	286	268	423	673	784	1,079	2,067	3,090	3,883	2,961	2,282
	HES Income Eligible	1,500	1,168	799	803	1,086	1,250	1,107	939	3,448	2,976	2,499	2,118
	Subtotal RESIDENTIAL	3,815	3,277	2,016	3,966	5,378	4,182	3,586	4,888	8,080	9,465	7,808	6,333
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL													
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY													
	Energy Conscious Blueprint	2,304	2,019	1,963	2,021	3,787	3,174	5,051	3,422	4,337	5,270	3,175	2,386
	Total - Lost Opportunity	2,304	2,019	1,963	2,021	3,787	3,174	5,051	3,422	4,337	5,270	3,175	2,386
C&I LARGE RETROFIT													
	C&I RFP	22	88	185	122	387	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Energy Opportunities	3,401	1,271	1,169	2,259	3,917	2,977	5,843	3,119	4,789	4,845	3,811	3,007
	O&M RetroCk, BSC, RFP PRIME)	-	-	70	184	108	72	141	17	133	188	516	747
	Municipal Energy & Schools	934	775	573	625	828	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total - C&I Large Retrofit	4,357	2,134	1,997	3,190	5,240	3,049	5,984	3,136	4,922	5,033	4,327	3,755
	Small Business	1,397	997	846	844	1,396	1,638	1,842	2,145	2,170	2,972	2,718	2,228
	Subtotal C&I	8,058	5,150	4,806	6,055	10,413	7,861	12,877	8,703	11,429	13,275	10,220	8,369
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT													
	ISO Load Response Program Support	63	424	604	33	209	11	8	6	4	-	-	1,376
	Subtotal Load Management	63	424	604	33	209	11	8	6	4	-	-	1,376
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS													
	Residential	3,815	3,277	2,016	3,966	5,378	4,182	3,586	4,888	8,080	9,465	7,808	6,333
	C&I	8,121	5,574	5,410	6,088	10,622	7,872	12,895	8,709	11,433	13,275	10,220	9,745
	TOTAL	11,936	8,851	7,426	10,054	16,000	12,054	16,471	13,597	19,513	22,740	18,028	16,078
Load Savings kW													
RESIDENTIAL													
	Residential Retail Products	759	635	639	1,286	1,339	1,168	1,615	1,613	1,186	3,788	3,518	1,326
	Appliance Retirement	-	-	491	636	491	36	-	13	-	-	-	-
	Total - Consumer Products	759	635	639	1,922	1,830	1,194	1,615	1,626	1,186	3,788	3,518	1,326
	Residential New Construction	62	69	25	173	212	231	290	267	31	52	89	103
	Home Energy Solutions	132	2,137	368	728	1,061	631	414	933	984	1,461	861	734
	HES Income Eligible	655	597	283	294	416	474	338	229	277	324	252	210
	Subtotal RESIDENTIAL	1,608	3,438	1,315	3,117	3,518	2,530	2,657	3,055	2,478	5,625	4,720	2,373
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL													
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY													
	Energy Conscious Blueprint	5,134	3,761	3,815	4,180	4,367	4,685	2,622	2,337	2,620	1,329	1,335	1,093
	Total - Lost Opportunity	5,134	3,761	3,815	4,180	4,367	4,685	2,622	2,337	2,620	1,329	1,335	1,093
C&I LARGE RETROFIT													
	C&I RFP	36	87	521	59	81	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Energy Opportunities	4,799	2,467	2,191	3,180	3,850	3,345	3,993	3,530	2,977	2,303	2,057	1,172
	O&M RetroCk, BSC, RFP PRIME)	-	-	-	674	674	237	55	-	27	-	168	176
	Municipal Energy & Schools	859	1,107	1,317	1,019	427	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Total - C&I Large Retrofit	5,694	3,661	4,029	4,258	5,032	3,582	4,048	3,530	3,004	2,303	2,225	1,348
	Small Business	683	659	1,031	1,035	1,953	1,661	2,008	2,149	1,574	1,172	1,238	861
	Subtotal C&I	11,511	8,081	8,875	9,473	11,362	9,927	8,678	8,016	7,198	4,804	4,798	3,303
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT													
	ISO Load Response Program Support	10,925	10,925	14,465	3,975	2,060	3,338	2,867	1,868	782	89	-	34,000
	Subtotal Load Management	10,925	10,925	14,465	3,975	2,060	3,338	2,867	1,868	782	89	-	34,000
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS													
	Residential	1,608	3,438	1,315	3,117	3,518	2,530	2,657	3,055	2,478	5,625	4,720	2,373
	C&I	22,044	22,444	24,655	16,565	16,940	15,795	14,202	12,939	10,458	10,518	9,518	39,675

**Table D1
UI Historical and Projected Annual kWh and Lifetime kWh**

		Annual kWh (000)											
		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
		Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual	Goal	Goal
RESIDENTIAL													
Residential Retail Products		9,563	7,997	3,465	12,166	14,968	15,216	21,152	17,390	12,485	42,955	39,951	14,731
Appliance Retirement		-	-	-	2,667	2,567	261	-	7	-	-	-	-
Total - Consumer Products		9,563	7,997	3,465	14,833	17,535	15,477	21,152	17,397	12,485	42,955	39,951	14,731
Residential New Construction		208	230	297	385	1,038	1,038	1,672	802	62	123	313	242
Home Energy Solutions		75	1,216	231	415	517	455	1,063	3,331	2,515	5,134	4,147	3,516
HES Income Eligible		6,086	5,550	2,779	4,052	5,130	4,784	3,498	2,511	3,122	4,204	3,576	3,070
Subtotal RESIDENTIAL		15,932	14,993	6,772	19,685	24,220	21,754	27,385	24,041	18,184	52,416	47,987	21,559
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL													
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY													
Energy Conscious Blueprint		25,568	18,731	10,994	22,420	20,122	13,765	15,090	14,302	16,308	11,355	9,526	6,738
Total - Lost Opportunity		25,568	18,731	10,994	22,420	20,122	13,765	15,090	14,302	16,308	11,355	9,526	6,738
C&I LARGE RETROFIT													
C&I RFP		228	544	2,414	856	563	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Energy Opportunities		25,592	13,156	11,929	18,591	24,167	20,704	21,573	20,668	18,128	16,948	12,768	8,993
O&M (RetroCx, BSC, RFP, PRIME)		-	-	-	-	2,206	1,453	2,386	-	498	453	1,186	1,923
Municipal Energy & Schools		4,278	5,511	4,240	5,497	2,059	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total - C&I Large Retrofit		30,098	19,211	18,583	24,944	28,995	22,157	23,959	20,668	18,626	17,401	13,944	10,916
Small Business		6,506	6,279	3,578	4,399	7,590	5,830	7,644	9,480	7,914	7,769	7,717	5,075
Subtotal C&I		62,172	44,221	33,155	51,763	56,707	41,752	46,693	44,450	42,848	36,545	31,187	22,729
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS													
Residential		15,932	14,993	6,772	19,685	24,220	21,754	27,385	24,041	18,184	52,416	47,987	21,559
C&I		62,172	44,221	33,155	51,763	56,707	41,752	46,693	44,450	42,848	36,545	31,187	22,729
TOTAL		78,104	59,214	39,927	71,448	80,927	63,506	74,078	68,491	61,032	88,961	79,174	44,287
Lifetime kWh (000)													
RESIDENTIAL													
Residential Retail Products		114,927	87,336	34,208	115,967	111,484	126,122	180,938	135,890	84,297	203,783	178,151	72,381
Appliance Retirement		-	-	-	13,002	12,761	1,306	-	90	-	-	-	-
Total - Consumer Products		114,927	87,336	34,208	128,969	124,245	127,428	180,938	135,980	84,297	203,783	178,151	72,381
Residential New Construction		4,338	5,044	5,940	7,412	11,240	15,812	23,327	12,628	884	1,542	3,993	2,941
Home Energy Solutions		1,125	18,240	4,389	7,839	8,264	5,865	11,997	33,731	31,331	51,377	39,636	41,626
HES Income Eligible		60,860	55,500	24,412	17,352	36,581	36,749	32,284	20,676	24,878	40,905	42,455	40,277
Subtotal RESIDENTIAL		181,250	166,120	68,949	161,572	180,330	185,855	248,556	203,015	141,390	297,607	264,235	157,225
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL													
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY													
Energy Blueprint / Energy Conscious Construction		383,520	280,965	164,910	336,293	343,568	191,708	224,566	203,135	268,292	177,958	154,180	103,249
Total - Lost Opportunity		383,520	280,965	164,910	336,293	343,568	191,708	224,566	203,135	268,292	177,958	154,180	103,249
C&I LARGE RETROFIT													
C&I RFP		3,420	8,160	36,210	12,835	10,700	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Energy Opportunities		383,196	190,038	178,935	278,872	409,048	310,557	291,700	272,595	233,761	209,052	159,471	113,819
O&M (RetroCx, BSC, RFP, PRIME)		-	-	-	-	22,061	21,790	35,790	-	3,640	2,855	7,276	13,904
Municipal Energy & Schools		64,170	82,665	63,600	82,451	36,659	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total - C&I Large Retrofit		450,786	280,863	278,745	374,158	478,468	332,347	327,490	272,595	237,401	211,907	166,747	127,723
Small Business		97,600	94,200	53,670	65,987	119,909	76,975	92,649	99,684	88,186	97,574	92,339	64,552
Subtotal C&I		931,906	656,028	497,325	776,438	941,945	601,030	644,705	575,414	593,879	487,439	413,266	295,524
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS													
Residential		181,250	166,120	68,949	161,572	180,330	185,855	248,556	203,015	141,390	297,607	264,235	157,225
C&I		931,906	656,028	497,325	776,438	941,945	601,030	644,705	575,414	593,879	487,439	413,266	295,524
TOTAL		1,113,156	822,148	566,274	938,010	1,122,275	786,885	893,261	778,429	735,269	785,046	677,501	452,750

This page intentionally blank


BUDGET TABLES (NATURAL GAS COMPANIES)

**Table A1
YGS, CNG & SCG
Proposed Natural Gas Conservation Plan Budget**

	2011					2012				
	2011 Yankee Filed Budget	2011 CNG Filed Budget	2011 SCG Filed Budget	2011 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total	2012 Yankee Proposed Budget	2012 CNG Proposed Budget	2012 SCG Proposed Budget	2012 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total		
Natural Gas C&LM Budget										
RESIDENTIAL										
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 900,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 2,600,000	\$ 1,170,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 3,270,000		
HES Income Eligible - Audits	\$ 30,000	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,803	\$ 81,575	\$ 30,000	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,803	\$ 81,575		
HES Income Eligible - Total	\$ 930,000	\$ 825,772	\$ 925,803	\$ 2,681,575	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,025,772	\$ 1,125,803	\$ 3,351,575		
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 4,600,000	\$ 1,904,000	\$ 1,815,345	\$ 1,824,790	\$ 5,544,135		
Residential New Construction	\$ 500,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,150,000		
Water Heating	\$ 136,600	\$ 105,400	\$ 121,000	\$ 363,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 40,055	\$ 46,210	\$ 156,265		
Subtotal Residential	\$ 3,166,600	\$ 2,781,172	\$ 2,846,803	\$ 8,794,575	\$ 3,674,000	\$ 3,231,172	\$ 3,296,803	\$ 10,201,975		
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY										
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 3,670,000	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 3,870,000		
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 3,670,000	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 3,870,000		
C&I LARGE RETROFIT										
Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 760,000	\$ 700,000	\$ 2,480,000	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 860,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 2,680,000		
O&M (RetroCx, Training)	\$ 200,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000		
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 1,220,000	\$ 860,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 2,880,000	\$ 1,220,000	\$ 960,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 3,080,000		
Small Business	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000		
Subtotal C&I	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,850,000	\$ 6,550,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 7,250,000		
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS										
CHIF Loan Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000		
Residential Financing Subsidies	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 270,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 270,000		
C&I Financing Subsidies	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000		
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 570,000		
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING										
Information Technology	\$ 35,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 95,000		
Planning	\$ 59,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 161,000	\$ 59,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 161,000		
Evaluation	\$ 234,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 208,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 284,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 800,000		
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 49,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 49,500		
Subtotal Other - Administrative & Planning	\$ 344,500	\$ 305,500	\$ 305,500	\$ 955,500	\$ 394,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 1,105,500		
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS										
Residential	\$ 3,306,600	\$ 2,921,172	\$ 2,986,803	\$ 9,214,575	\$ 3,814,000	\$ 3,371,172	\$ 3,436,803	\$ 10,621,975		
C&I	\$ 2,750,000	\$ 2,050,000	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 6,700,000	\$ 2,850,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 7,400,000		
Other	\$ 344,500	\$ 305,500	\$ 305,500	\$ 955,500	\$ 394,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 1,105,500		
TOTAL	\$ 6,401,100	\$ 5,276,672	\$ 5,192,303	\$ 16,870,075	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 19,127,475		

Note 1 - 2011 Budgets do not reflect July 2011 PURA approval of \$1.2 million increased funding for YGS Residential programs and \$1.0 million increased funding for CNG Residential programs.
 Note 2 - 2011 Budgets do not include PURA-approved projects that are over \$100K in customer incentive payments.

**Statewide 2012 Budget Analysis
Table A1 Pie Chart**



Customer Class	Budget (\$,000)	% of Total Conservation Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget
Res. Income Eligible	\$3,351,575	17.52%	19.20%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$6,850,400	35.81%	39.25%
Residential Subtotal	\$10,201,975	53.34%	58.46%
Commercial and Industrial	\$7,250,000	37.90%	41.54%
C&I Subtotal	\$7,250,000	37.90%	41.54%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$17,451,975	91.24%	100.00%
Other Expenditures			
Other Expenditures	\$1,675,500	8.76%	
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$1,675,500	8.76%	
TOTAL	\$19,127,475	100.00%	
Yankee	\$7,058,500	36.90%	
CNG	\$6,076,672	31.77%	
SCG	\$5,992,303	31.33%	

Table A2
YGS, CNG & SCG
Natural Gas Conservation Plan Revenues

	2011					2012 - Base				
	2011 Yankee Revenues	2011 CNG Revenues	2011 SCG Revenues	2011 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total	2011 Yankee Revenues	2012 CNG Revenues	2012 Yankee Revenues	2012 CNG Revenues	2012 SCG Revenues	2012 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total
Natural Gas C&LM Revenues	\$ 882,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,932,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Collections (Rates)*	\$ 5,519,100	\$ 4,526,672	\$ 4,892,303	\$ 14,938,075	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 19,127,475
Conservation Adjustment Mechanism (CAM)**	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Gross Receipts Tax (GRT)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Revenues	\$ 6,401,100	\$ 5,276,672	\$ 5,192,303	\$ 16,870,075	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 19,127,475

	2012 - Increased Savings					2013				
	2012 Yankee Revenues	2012 CNG Revenues	2012 SCG Revenues	2012 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total	2012 Yankee Revenues	2013 CNG Revenues	2013 Yankee Revenues	2013 CNG Revenues	2013 SCG Revenues	2013 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total
Natural Gas C&LM Revenues	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Collections (Rates)*	\$ 13,047,184	\$ 10,645,821	\$ 10,510,984	\$ 34,203,989	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 19,127,475
Conservation Adjustment Mechanism (CAM)**	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Gross Receipts Tax (GRT)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Revenues	\$ 13,047,184	\$ 10,645,821	\$ 10,510,984	\$ 34,203,989	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 19,127,475

*The 2011 Base rate amounts for CNG and SCG are subject to modification and/or proration based upon the final determination of the Superior court appeal of Docket No. 08-12-06 (CNG) and 08-12-07 (SCG)

**Estimated to be collected in CAM:
2012 & 2013 CAM has not yet been filed.


Table A
YGS
Proposed Natural Gas Conservation Plan Budget

Natural Gas C&LM Budget	2011 Yankee Filed Budget	2012 Yankee Proposed Base Budget	2012 Yankee Proposed Increased Savings	2013 Yankee Proposed Budget
RESIDENTIAL				
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,170,000	\$ 2,181,500	\$ 1,170,000
HES Income Eligible - Audits	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 30,000
HES Income Eligible - Total	\$ 930,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 2,216,500	\$ 1,200,000
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,904,000	\$ 3,101,859	\$ 1,904,000
Residential New Construction	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 500,000
Water Heating	\$ 136,600	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 70,000
Subtotal Residential	\$ 3,166,600	\$ 3,674,000	\$ 5,988,359	\$ 3,674,000
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 3,136,612	\$ 1,480,000
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 3,136,612	\$ 1,480,000
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 2,474,834	\$ 1,020,000
O&M (RetroCx, Training)	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 324,548	\$ 200,000
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 1,220,000	\$ 1,220,000	\$ 2,799,382	\$ 1,220,000
Small Business	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 246,081	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I	\$ 2,700,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 6,182,075	\$ 2,800,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Residential Financing Subsidies	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 90,000
C&I Financing Subsidies	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 190,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Information Technology	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 52,500	\$ 35,000
Planning	\$ 59,000	\$ 59,000	\$ 88,500	\$ 59,000
Evaluation	\$ 234,000	\$ 284,000	\$ 426,000	\$ 284,000
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 24,750	\$ 16,500
Subtotal Other - Administrative & Planning	\$ 344,500	\$ 394,500	\$ 591,750	\$ 394,500
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS				
Residential	\$ 3,306,600	\$ 3,814,000	\$ 6,198,359	\$ 3,814,000
C&I	\$ 2,750,000	\$ 2,850,000	\$ 6,257,075	\$ 2,850,000
Other	\$ 344,500	\$ 394,500	\$ 591,750	\$ 394,500
TOTAL	\$ 6,401,100	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 13,047,184	\$ 7,058,500

Note 1 - 2011 Budget does not reflect July 2011 PURA approval of \$1.2 million increased funding for YGS Residential programs.

Note 2 - 2011 Budget does not include PURA approved projects that are over \$100K in customer incentive payments.

YGS 2012 Budget Analysis



Customer Class	Budget	% of Total Conservation Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget
Res. Income Eligible	\$1,200,000	17.00%	18.54%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$2,474,000	35.05%	38.21%
Residential Subtotal	\$3,674,000	52.05%	56.75%
Commercial and Industrial	\$2,800,000	39.67%	43.25%
C&I Subtotal	\$2,800,000	39.67%	43.25%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$6,474,000	91.72%	100.00%
Other Expenditures			
Other Expenditures	\$584,500	8.28%	
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$584,500	8.28%	
TOTAL	\$7,058,500	100.00%	


Table A
CNG
Proposed Natural Gas Conservation Plan Budget

Natural Gas C&LM Budget	2011 CNG Filed Budget	2012 CNG Proposed Budget	2012 CNG Proposed Increased Savings	2013 CNG Proposed Budget
RESIDENTIAL				
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 2,078,744	\$ 1,000,000
HES Income Eligible - Audits	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,772
HES Income Eligible - Total	\$ 825,772	\$ 1,025,772	\$ 2,104,516	\$ 1,025,772
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,815,345	\$ 2,852,249	\$ 1,815,345
Residential New Construction	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000
Water Heating	\$ 105,400	\$ 40,055	\$ 40,055	\$ 40,055
Subtotal Residential	\$ 2,781,172	\$ 3,231,172	\$ 5,346,820	\$ 3,231,172
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 2,362,464	\$ 1,240,000
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 2,362,464	\$ 1,240,000
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 760,000	\$ 860,000	\$ 1,735,328	\$ 860,000
O&M (RetroCx, Training)	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 190,515	\$ 100,000
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 860,000	\$ 960,000	\$ 1,925,843	\$ 960,000
Small Business	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 192,444	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 4,480,751	\$ 2,300,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Residential Financing Subsidies	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 90,000
C&I Financing Subsidies	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 190,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Information Technology	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 30,000
Planning	\$ 51,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 76,500	\$ 51,000
Evaluation	\$ 208,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 387,000	\$ 258,000
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 24,750	\$ 16,500
Subtotal Other - Administrative & Planning	\$ 305,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 533,250	\$ 355,500
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS				
Residential	\$ 2,921,172	\$ 3,371,172	\$ 5,556,820	\$ 3,371,172
C&I	\$ 2,050,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 4,555,751	\$ 2,350,000
Other	\$ 305,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 533,250	\$ 355,500
TOTAL	\$ 5,276,672	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 10,645,821	\$ 6,076,672

Note 1 - 2011 Budget does not reflect July 2011 PURA approval of \$1.0 million increased funding for CNG Residential programs.

Note 2 - 2011 Budget does not include PURA approved projects that are over \$100K in customer incentive payments.

CNG 2012 Budget Analysis



Customer Class	Budget	% of Total Conservation Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget
Res. Income Eligible	\$1,025,772	16.88%	18.55%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$2,205,400	36.29%	39.87%
Residential Subtotal	\$3,231,172	53.17%	58.42%
Commercial and Industrial	\$2,300,000	37.85%	41.58%
C&I Subtotal	\$2,300,000	37.85%	41.58%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$5,531,172	91.02%	100.00%
Other Expenditures			
Other Expenditures	\$545,500	8.98%	
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$545,500	8.98%	
TOTAL	\$6,076,672	100.00%	


Table A
SCG
Proposed Natural Gas Conservation Plan Budget

Natural Gas C&LM Budget	2011 SCG Filed Budget	2012 SCG Proposed Budget	2012 SCG Proposed Increased Savings	2013 SCG Proposed Budget
RESIDENTIAL				
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 2,317,498	\$ 1,100,000
HES Income Eligible - Audits	\$ 25,803	\$ 25,803	\$ 25,803	\$ 25,803
HES Income Eligible - Total	\$ 925,803	\$ 1,125,803	\$ 2,343,301	\$ 1,125,803
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,824,790	\$ 3,093,661	\$ 1,824,790
Residential New Construction	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
Water Heating	\$ 121,000	\$ 46,210	\$ 46,211	\$ 46,210
Subtotal Residential	\$ 2,846,803	\$ 3,296,803	\$ 5,783,173	\$ 3,296,803
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 2,080,462	\$ 1,150,000
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 2,080,462	\$ 1,150,000
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 700,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 1,457,286	\$ 800,000
O&M (RetroCx, Training)	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 184,050	\$ 100,000
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 800,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,641,336	\$ 900,000
Small Business	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 187,763	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I	\$ 1,850,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 3,909,561	\$ 2,150,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Residential Financing Subsidies	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 90,000
C&I Financing Subsidies	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 50,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 190,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Information Technology	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 30,000
Planning	\$ 51,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 76,500	\$ 51,000
Evaluation	\$ 208,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 387,000	\$ 258,000
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 24,750	\$ 16,500
Subtotal Other - Administrative & Planning	\$ 305,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 533,250	\$ 355,500
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS				
Residential	\$ 2,986,803	\$ 3,436,803	\$ 5,993,173	\$ 3,436,803
C&I	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 3,984,561	\$ 2,200,000
Other	\$ 305,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 533,250	\$ 355,500
TOTAL	\$ 5,192,303	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 10,510,984	\$ 5,992,303

Note 1 - 2011 Budget does not reflect SCG request of PURA approval of \$350K increased funding for SCG Residential programs.

Note 2 - 2011 Budget does not include PURA approved projects that are over \$100K in customer incentive payments.

SCG 2012 Budget Analysis




Customer Class	Budget	% of Total Conservation Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget
Res. Income Eligible	\$1,125,803	18.79%	20.67%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$2,171,000	36.23%	39.86%
Residential Subtotal	\$3,296,803	55.02%	60.53%
Commercial and Industrial	\$2,150,000	35.88%	39.47%
C&I Subtotal	\$2,150,000	35.88%	39.47%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$5,446,803	90.90%	100.00%
Other Expenditures			
Other Expenditures	\$545,500	9.10%	
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$545,500	9.10%	
TOTAL	\$5,992,303	100.00%	

**Table C
YGS 2012 Budget Details**

GAS CONSERVATION BUDGET (\$000)	Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Incentives	Marketing	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL							
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 175,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 90,000	\$ 892,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,170,000
HES Income Eligible - Audits		\$	\$ 30,000				\$ 30,000
HES Income Eligible Total	\$ 175,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 120,000	\$ 892,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,200,000
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 285,600	\$ 5,000	\$ 156,874	\$ 1,428,366	\$ 20,000	\$ 8,160	\$ 1,904,000
Residential New Construction	\$ 34,580	\$ 1,625	\$ 6,150	\$ 442,145	\$ 11,500	\$ 4,000	\$ 500,000
Water Heating	\$ 3,500	\$ 256	\$ 4,100	\$ 56,917	\$ 4,207	\$ 1,020	\$ 70,000
Subtotal Residential	\$ 499,180	\$ 9,381	\$ 287,124	\$ 2,819,429	\$ 43,207	\$ 15,680	\$ 3,674,000
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LOST OPPORTUNITY							
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 212,800	\$ 1,681	\$ 138,232	\$ 1,090,672	\$ 16,783	\$ 19,832	\$ 1,480,000
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 212,800	\$ 1,681	\$ 138,232	\$ 1,090,672	\$ 16,783	\$ 19,832	\$ 1,480,000
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LARGE RETROFIT							
Energy Opportunities	\$ 107,730	\$ 1,159	\$ 95,268	\$ 790,608	\$ 11,567	\$ 13,668	\$ 1,020,000
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 65,170	\$ 500	\$ 5,500	\$ 125,930	\$ 2,600	\$ 300	\$ 200,000
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 172,900	\$ 1,659	\$ 100,768	\$ 916,538	\$ 14,167	\$ 13,968	\$ 1,220,000
Small Business	\$ 10,660	\$ 140	\$ 1,680	\$ 71,900	\$ 1,000	\$ 14,620	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I	\$ 396,360	\$ 3,480	\$ 240,680	\$ 2,079,110	\$ 31,950	\$ 48,420	\$ 2,800,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS & PLANNING							
CHIF Loan Fund			\$ 50,000				\$ 50,000
Residential Financing Subsidies			\$ 90,000				\$ 90,000
C&I Financing Subsidies			\$ 50,000				\$ 50,000
Information Technology			\$ 35,000				\$ 35,000
Planning	\$ 59,000						\$ 59,000
Evaluation	\$ 31,920		\$ 252,080				\$ 284,000
Energy Efficiency Board			\$ 16,500				\$ 16,500
Subtotal Other	\$ 90,920	\$ -	\$ 493,580	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 684,500
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS							
Residential	\$ 499,180	\$ 9,381	\$ 427,124	\$ 2,819,429	\$ 43,207	\$ 15,680	\$ 3,814,000
C&I	\$ 396,360	\$ 3,480	\$ 290,680	\$ 2,079,110	\$ 31,950	\$ 48,420	\$ 2,850,000
Other	\$ 90,920	\$ -	\$ 303,580	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 394,500
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 986,460	\$ 12,861	\$ 1,021,384	\$ 4,898,539	\$ 75,157	\$ 64,100	\$ 7,058,500

YGS
2012 Gas Conservation
Budget By Expense Class




Expense Classes	Budget	% of Budget
Labor	\$ 986,460	14.0%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 12,861	0.2%
Outside Services	\$ 1,021,384	14.5%
Incentives	\$ 4,898,539	69.4%
Marketing	\$ 75,157	1.1%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 64,100	0.9%
Total	\$ 7,058,500	100.00%

**Table C
CNG 2012 Budget Details**

GAS CONSERVATION BUDGET (\$000)	Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Incentives	Marketing	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 168,744	\$ 3,500	\$ 36,950	\$ 785,606	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 1,000,000
HES Income Eligible - Audits			\$ 25,772				\$ 25,772
HES Income Eligible Total	\$ 168,744	\$ 3,500	\$ 62,722	\$ 785,606	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600	\$ 1,025,772
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 297,920	\$ 5,040	\$ 124,223	\$ 1,368,054	\$ 12,548	\$ 7,560	\$ 1,815,345
Residential New Construction	\$ 33,250	\$ 840	\$ 53,305	\$ 251,545	\$ 8,260	\$ 2,800	\$ 350,000
Water Heating	\$ 5,000	\$ 500	\$ 2,305	\$ 23,800	\$ 6,450	\$ 2,000	\$ 40,055
Subtotal Residential	\$ 504,914	\$ 9,880	\$ 242,555	\$ 2,429,005	\$ 29,858	\$ 14,960	\$ 3,231,172
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LOST OPPORTUNITY							
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 150,290	\$ 3,150	\$ 107,507	\$ 970,323	\$ 3,060	\$ 5,670	\$ 1,240,000
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 150,290	\$ 3,150	\$ 107,507	\$ 970,323	\$ 3,060	\$ 5,670	\$ 1,240,000
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LARGE RETROFIT							
Energy Opportunities	\$ 103,180	\$ 198	\$ 51,194	\$ 698,948	\$ 1,980	\$ 4,500	\$ 860,000
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 33,180	\$ 50	\$ 5,000	\$ 60,970	\$ 300	\$ 500	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 136,360	\$ 248	\$ 56,194	\$ 759,918	\$ 2,280	\$ 5,000	\$ 960,000
Small Business	\$ 10,664	\$ 135	\$ 1,680	\$ 76,901	\$ 996	\$ 9,624	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I	\$ 297,314	\$ 3,533	\$ 165,381	\$ 1,807,142	\$ 6,336	\$ 20,294	\$ 2,300,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS & PLANNING							
CHIF Loan Fund		\$ 50,000					\$ 50,000
Residential Financing Subsidies		\$ 90,000					\$ 90,000
C&I Financing Subsidies		\$ 50,000					\$ 50,000
Information Technology		\$ 30,000					\$ 30,000
Planning	\$ 51,000						\$ 51,000
Evaluation	\$ 25,270		\$ 232,730				\$ 258,000
Energy Efficiency Board			\$ 16,500				\$ 16,500
Subtotal Other	\$ 76,270	\$ -	\$ 469,230	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 545,500
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS							
Residential	\$ 504,914	\$ 9,880	\$ 382,555	\$ 2,429,005	\$ 29,858	\$ 14,960	\$ 3,371,172
C&I	\$ 297,314	\$ 3,533	\$ 215,381	\$ 1,807,142	\$ 6,336	\$ 20,294	\$ 2,350,000
Other	\$ 76,270	\$ -	\$ 279,230	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 355,500
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 878,498	\$ 13,413	\$ 877,166	\$ 4,236,147	\$ 36,194	\$ 35,254	\$ 6,076,672

CNG
2012 Gas Conservation
Budget By Expense Class




Expense Classes	Budget	% of Budget
Labor	\$ 878,498	14.5%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 13,413	0.2%
Outside Services	\$ 877,166	14.4%
Incentives	\$ 4,236,147	69.7%
Marketing	\$ 36,194	0.6%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 35,254	0.6%
Total	\$ 6,076,672	100.00%

Table C
SCG 2012 Budget Details

GAS CONSERVATION BUDGET (\$000)	Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Incentives	Marketing	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL							
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 164,994	\$ 3,960	\$ 37,950	\$ 887,156	\$ 2,970	\$ 2,970	\$ 1,100,000
HES Income Eligible - Audits			\$ 25,803				\$ 25,803
HES Income Eligible Total	\$ 164,994	\$ 3,960	\$ 63,753	\$ 887,156	\$ 2,970	\$ 2,970	\$ 1,125,803
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 297,920	\$ 5,040	\$ 124,852	\$ 1,376,870	\$ 12,548	\$ 7,560	\$ 1,824,790
Residential New Construction	\$ 33,250	\$ 720	\$ 45,690	\$ 210,860	\$ 7,080	\$ 2,400	\$ 300,000
Water Heating	\$ 5,000	\$ 496	\$ 2,638	\$ 28,600	\$ 7,477	\$ 2,000	\$ 46,210
Subtotal Residential	\$ 501,164	\$ 10,216	\$ 236,933	\$ 2,503,486	\$ 30,074	\$ 14,930	\$ 3,296,802
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LOST OPPORTUNITY							
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 145,290	\$ 324	\$ 106,844	\$ 887,651	\$ 3,213	\$ 6,678	\$ 1,150,000
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 145,290	\$ 324	\$ 106,844	\$ 887,651	\$ 3,213	\$ 6,678	\$ 1,150,000
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LARGE RETROFIT							
Energy Opportunities	\$ 81,820	\$ 228	\$ 63,783	\$ 645,133	\$ 2,256	\$ 6,780	\$ 800,000
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 25,180	\$ 100	\$ 10,000	\$ 63,220	\$ 500	\$ 1,000	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 107,000	\$ 328	\$ 73,783	\$ 708,353	\$ 2,756	\$ 7,780	\$ 900,000
Small Business	\$ 10,664	\$ 135	\$ 1,680	\$ 76,901	\$ 996	\$ 9,624	\$ 100,000
Subtotal C&I	\$ 262,954	\$ 787	\$ 182,307	\$ 1,672,905	\$ 6,965	\$ 24,082	\$ 2,150,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS & PLANNING							
CHIF Loan Fund			\$ 50,000				\$ 50,000
Residential Financing Subsidies			\$ 90,000				\$ 90,000
C&I Financing Subsidies			\$ 50,000				\$ 50,000
Information Technology			\$ 30,000				\$ 30,000
Planning	\$ 51,000						\$ 51,000
Evaluation	\$ 25,270		\$ 232,730				\$ 258,000
Energy Efficiency Board			\$ 16,500				\$ 16,500
Subtotal Other	\$ 76,270	\$ -	\$ 469,230	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 545,500
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS							
Residential	\$ 501,164	\$ 10,216	\$ 376,933	\$ 2,503,486	\$ 30,074	\$ 14,930	\$ 3,436,802
C&I	\$ 262,954	\$ 787	\$ 232,307	\$ 1,672,905	\$ 6,965	\$ 24,082	\$ 2,200,000
Other	\$ 76,270	\$ -	\$ 279,230	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 355,500
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 840,388	\$ 11,004	\$ 888,470	\$ 4,176,390	\$ 37,039	\$ 39,012	\$ 5,992,302

SCG
2012 Gas Conservation
Budget By Expense Class



Expense Classes	Budget	% of Budget
Labor	\$ 840,388	14.0%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 11,004	0.2%
Outside Services	\$ 888,470	14.8%
Incentives	\$ 4,176,390	69.7%
Marketing	\$ 37,039	0.6%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 39,012	0.7%
Total	\$ 5,992,302	100.00%

This page intentionally blank

CHAPTER TWO: RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS

Residential Overview (Electric and Natural Gas)

The Residential Subcommittee of the EEB, established in 2010, is comprised of EEB consultants, vendor and industry partners, representatives of the Companies and representatives of various Connecticut agencies. The subcommittee works together to promote and institute strategies that support both market transformation and market-based residential program initiatives.

The overall purpose of the Energy Efficiency Fund's Residential programs is to provide cost-effective in-home services and retail product incentives that allow Connecticut's households to save energy and money without sacrificing comfort or convenience. These nationally recognized programs will support the evolution of a sustainable energy climate in Connecticut through the design and implementation of comprehensive, whole-home solutions.

Consistent with this purpose, the residential programs continue to evolve through the addition of measures that exploit emerging technologies in lighting, heating and cooling, along with utilizing innovative financing and new ways to communicate and foster behavior changes. The overarching effect of these programs and services will be households with smaller carbon footprints and lower utility bills.

In 2012, the key themes of the residential programs include:

- Deep and meaningful savings goals (20-25%) that will have a real impact on individual residential energy bills and carbon footprints, and an aggregate energy-systems benefit that will contribute to the state's overall energy goals.
- Increased residential awareness of the value and benefits of weatherization.
- Increased incremental energy savings through high performance and ENERGY STAR Homes, HVAC system upgrades, and measures identified through advanced diagnostics
- Supporting customers in making energy management an integral part of their home practices and lifestyles through use of behavioral change tools and techniques including outreach, education and social networking.
- Innovative financing (as detailed in this Chapter and in Chapter 5).

Home Energy SolutionsSM

Home Energy Solutions (HES) is the residential portfolio flagship program. The HES Program began in 2006 as a residential duct sealing pilot. Since that time, it's grown to a multi-million dollar retrofit program with 26 vendors delivering "Core Services" to customers throughout Connecticut. In 2011, the Companies' limited income programs (UI Helps and WRAP) were merged under the existing HES

umbrella, allowing the Companies to market a single program to all eligible customers. The former WRAP and UI Helps programs' are now named Home Energy Solutions-Income Eligible (HES-IE). This change provides more consistency in weatherization practices, vendor training and creates a seamless brand identity for residential customers.

The HES program is moving towards a market-based approach. In five short years HES has significantly expanded the residential energy efficiency services sector in Connecticut contracting with 26 vendors who employ more than 200 technicians. The HES program generates customer leads and potential sales for HVAC dealers, fuel oil dealers, insulation, home improvement contractors and many other companies that provide additional energy efficiency products and services to customers after their initial HES service call. Connecticut has the highest per capita contractor base certified and trained in Building Performance Institute (BPI), as Building Analyst, Envelope and/or Multi-family specialist in the United States.

In coordination with the EEB and PURA, the Companies have made a number of recent enhancements to improve the delivery and quality of HES services:

- Established a standard co-payment for electric and natural gas customers allowing the program to maintain steady customer participation.
- Created and enhanced the standardized HES Summary Assessment Report that each program participant receives.
- In 2011, HES gained recognition from the US EPA establishing Connecticut as a Home Performance with ENERGY STAR state. Home Performance with ENERGY STAR allows contractors to provide HES core services and then create a scope of work for additional measures that will be eligible for incentives and financing.
- Established a low interest financing program with on-bill repayment (Details in Chapter 5).
- Enhanced vendor quality control and assurance protocols.
- Enhanced technician certification and trainings for the following:
 - Building Performance Institute - Building Analyst 1 certification
 - Building Performance Institute - Envelope Specialist certification
 - Building Performance Institute - Multi-Family Specialist
 - Home Improvement Contractor with Dept. of Consumer Protection

HES program administrators are also working towards the accomplishment of new program enhancements, including the following:

- Establishing a licensing requirement for Home Energy Assessment professionals by 2012. Throughout 2012, the Companies will work with the appropriate regulatory agencies and the

legislature to establish this license. The license will allow the industry to police itself and will help ensure high quality service and increased customer satisfaction.

- Review and evaluation of new field monitoring tools that demonstrate to customers the value and benefits of additional energy efficiency measures (i.e., payback, tax credits, financing, etc.)
- Improve the kitchen table wrap up session by replacing the toolbox kit with the Print on Demand (POD) kit and implementing the Home Energy Yardstick Tool (HEY). Furnishing the POD allows vendors to have more meaningful and effective conversations about the services provided to the customer and leave behind only applicable add-on measures information to customer. The POD will help improve the program goals of selling and tracking of add-on measures, while providing substantial information to customers about their home efficiency improvements.

Implementing the full version of the HEY tool, should encourage customers to look at the potential for deeper savings opportunity measures, which benefit the customers overall home efficiency, utility consumption and carbon footprint.

- Continue improvement and enhancement of existing data tools that will allow tracking of program and vendor performance by focusing on key metrics and guiding program changes and enhancements.
- During 2012 the Companies' will ensure that both 3rd party vendors and Community Action Agencies will follow the same technical and quality assurance protocols of their HES colleagues.
- Low-cost capital to offer low-interest financing for fuel oil heating customers.

The Companies are continuing to look to ways to transform the HES market. This effort to transform the market must be gradual to assure proper vendor training and delivery of services and to assure customer satisfaction and energy savings. The transformation process will likely involve many steps, working in conjunction with EEB to ensure that the process is thorough and complete.

One of the core focuses and challenges of 2012 will be to squeeze additional electric and natural gas savings from both the core services and add-on measures. The Companies look toward a performance metric of ten (10) percent increase savings and twenty-five (25) percent savings in the increase savings scenario. In order to achieve such savings, the Companies will need to insist upon deeper measure penetration in homes by the vendor base. The Companies and the vendors will need to better prescreen HES customers for potential savings and educate participants that the core services of HES are just the beginning and that additional "add-on" measures are available.

In 2012, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies' will continue to offer residential customers a variety of nationally recognized in-home services and rebates to help them save energy and money, while improving comfort levels for occupants. The residential programs are constantly assessed, modified and reviewed to exceed standard practice, respond to customer needs and to ensure cost-effectiveness.

Home Energy Solutions Fuel Oil Funding

ARRA dollars and electric fund allocations from RGGI and PA 11-80 have allowed fuel oil heated homes to pay the same low co-pay (currently \$75 for HES, no charge for HES-IE) as electric and natural gas heated homes. Once that funding is exhausted, serving fuel oil heated customers while passing the utility cost test will be a challenge. Without a fuel oil funding mechanism, such as a penny-a-gallon assessment on home heating oil, which would generate approximately \$6 million annually, maintaining a \$75 co-pay for fuel oil heated homes would require drastically abridged services to those customers in order to be cost-effective. This could have the effect of essentially locking 50 percent or more of Connecticut residents out of many of the direct-install services enjoyed by the rest of the residents of the State.

Alternatively, without oil funding fuel oil customers would need to pay in excess of \$500 to receive the full breadth of core services - an effective barrier to participation. An additional or complementary way to address this challenge would be to utilize a cost-effectiveness test that counts all energy benefits, not just electricity, when measuring the cost-effectiveness of the program, allowing the Companies to claim both electric and non-electric benefits when calculating cost effectiveness. However, this would still be limited by the \$500,000 cap established in PA 11-80.

Heat Pump Water Heaters

In 2011, the Energy Efficiency Fund began offering eligible customers a \$400 rebate for Heat Pump Water Heaters (HPWHs). This rebate will continue to be offered through HES and, where appropriate, in HES-IE. The Companies are cognizant of potential issues that may arise if units are not installed properly and plan on working with industry professionals to ensure that installation standards are followed. In addition, the Companies are working with a group of national stakeholders to develop standards that reflect colder climate installations. An increase in promoting HPWHs available through big-box retail channels will be pursued as a number of large retailers carry and sell HPWHs.

Residential Retail Products Program

Although use of the common compact fluorescent light bulb ("CFL") has become more acceptable by residential consumers and is widely available through various retail channels, the 2009 evaluation conducted by the EEB, "The Market for CFLs in Connecticut" showed socket saturation of CFLs was around twenty-three (23) percent, and over thirty-four (34) percent of households in Connecticut completely lack CFLs. In 2011, the Companies increased their efforts to promote common CFLs, in addition to the push for specialty CFLs started in 2009 and 2010. The EEB will conduct another socket saturation study of CFLs to see what impact the efforts of the 2010 and 2011 Retail Products Program have had on achieving the mandated socket penetration rate of thirty-six (36) percent.

Additionally, the Energy Independence and Security Act ("EISA") of 2007 will phase out certain standard use incandescent bulbs beginning in 2012. However, as the lighting market continues to develop in

response to EISA 2007, it is not anticipated that there will be a complete phase-out of incandescent bulbs or that CFLs will become the baseline. Several large manufacturers already have full lines of EISA compliant halogen products on the shelves of U.S. retail stores. These halogen bulbs are approximately twenty-five (25) percent more efficient than current incandescent bulbs, while CFL technology is approximately seventy-five (75) percent more efficient than current incandescent bulbs. Lighting efficacy is commonly measured by a ratio known as lumens per watt. There are also indications that the industry's response to EISA; e.g., producing lower lumen halogens to meet the standard, may result in even smaller savings than anticipated, leaving greater savings potential from CFLs. Therefore, it appears that there will be the need to continue aggressive promotion of CFL technology through and past the phase-in of EISA 2007.

In 2011, the Companies began to offer upstream incentives for LEDs in a handful of retailers. In 2012 the Companies plan on increasing the number of LEDs under negotiated cooperative promotions (NCPs) to educate customers on the benefits and availability of LEDs at numerous retailer outlets across the State. The benefits of LEDs compared to more traditional light sources include high efficiency (higher lumens per watt), relatively small size and configuration, and very long lifetimes.

With new LED products and the adoption of EISA 2007, the need to educate and guide consumers to choose appropriate energy efficient lighting, as well as educating customers on lumen output will be an important focus in 2012.

ENERGY STAR's "Most Efficient" and the "TopTenUSA" initiative identify and make available to consumers the best of the best in energy saving appliances (clothes washers, refrigerators, freezers, and dishwashers), heating and cooling equipment, and consumer electronics (televisions, computers and monitors). These initiatives provide an opportunity to educate consumers on the most efficient products on the market, as well as offer promotions on these product categories on a case-by-case basis. The Retail Products program will be looking for promotional opportunities with these new ENERGY STAR initiatives.

The Companies will explore the feasibility of developing higher state efficiency codes and/or standards for various products, including boilers, television set top boxes, hot tubs, pool heaters, and electronics products.

Residential New Construction Program ("RNC")

RNC will phase in the new ENERGY STAR version 3.0 requirements. The Companies began the impending transition in 2011 with ENERGY STAR 2.5 requirements leading to ENERGY STAR 3.0 requirements by 2012. All projects must meet these standards in order to receive the ENERGY STAR label and recognition. The new ENERGY STAR requirements include additional thermal enclosure system requirements, thermal bridging criteria and water management systems. These requirements represent a significant increase in building science requirements and increase the differentiation between an ENERGY STAR and "standard" new home in energy efficiency and durability performance.

The CT Zero Energy Challenge will continue in 2012, but since low-load home construction has proven to be a viable building practice, it will now become an integral part of the RNC program through the addition of a new incentive track called Low Load Homes.

With homeowners extremely aware of the monthly expenses necessary to operate their home, a marketing campaign, tentatively called ENERGY STAR: New Home, No Bill, will be explored to offer an exciting way for homebuyers to see the value of an ENERGY STAR Home as soon as they move in. This would offer the homeowner the opportunity to move into a new ENERGY STAR home without having to pay an electric bill for the first year, while also receiving educational tips on how to save energy.

The Companies will also work with local building officials and builders to help prepare the market for the expected transition to the 2009 International Energy Efficiency Code ("2009 IECC"), which is expected to be adopted mid-2012. The Companies are prepared to continue to support the impending code change to IECC 2012 in 2013. These requirements to comply with the code will be factored into the program criteria before 2012, thus preparing the building sector for additional code changes with IECC 2012.

Financing

The Companies ran a Residential Financing Pilot program from June 1, 2010 through May 31, 2011. The pilot program offered loans at attractive, below-market interest rates. The pilot also allowed the Companies to engage customers and contractors in a new way by reducing barriers to deeper energy efficiency. The Residential Financing Pilot program successfully funded loans to over 1,250 customers representing over \$14.5 million in energy efficient home improvements.

Although the pilot was successful, the cost to the Fund for interest rate buy downs was high due to the capital source used by the third party financing vendor. The Companies, in conjunction with the EEB, sought alternative financing models to reduce the cost to the Fund. On June 1, 2011 the Companies introduced a new residential loan program by offering subsidized, low interest rate loans with on-bill repayment to HES residential customers who make qualified energy efficiency improvements to their homes. The new loan program will cost the Fund less since the pilot program source of capital (Fannie Mae at 14.99 percent) was replaced with less expensive funds (shareholder capital and/or \$6 million of 2010 unspent energy efficiency funds). This program will be one of the first in the nation to offer on-bill repayment of energy efficiency measures for residential customers.

The Companies will continue to seek options to lower the cost of capital to offer low-interest financing for oil heating customers. (See Chapter 5 for more details.)

Residential Retail Products (Electric)

Objective:

The objective of the Residential Retail Products program is to increase awareness, consumer acceptance and market share of ENERGY STAR® lighting, appliances and electronics. In particular, the 2012 Retail Products Program will focus on increasing socket penetration of efficient lighting products in homes including solid state lighting (SSLs), also referred to as light emitting diodes (LEDs).

The Residential Retail Products program to date has been the model market transformation program within the residential portfolio. At the program's inception financial incentives were paid directly to consumers via an instant and/or mail-in rebate. Today, incentives are paid primarily through an upstream model -- consumers pay the discounted price at the point of purchase -- thus reducing overall program expenses by eliminating redemption costs and simplifying the consumer's purchasing experience.

Target Market:

The Companies residential customers who purchase new lighting, appliances and electronics in retail market channels, participants of the Energy Efficiency Fund's other residential programs, non-profit organizations (through the Shining Solutions fundraising program), and residential remodeling channels.

Program Description:

For 2012, the primary focus of the Residential Retail Products program will be to continue to offer discounted lighting products to consumers at retail outlets throughout the state. For lighting, Negotiated Cooperative Promotions ("NCPs") have proven to be a useful approach in generating increased stocking and sales of lighting products at considerably lower cost than traditional coupons and rebates. Such promotions involve a partnership between the Companies and retailers/manufacturers that tie payment of incentives to the Companies' receipt of store-level sales data. Coupons and mail-in rebates can be utilized if NCPs are not brought under agreement or only on a temporary campaign-oriented basis.

In 2012, the Companies plan to continue partnering with both manufacturers and retailers to offer education and training regarding the benefits of energy-efficient products to local retail sales staff and consumers. In addition, the Companies will continue to work with retailers to strategically secure special retail placement of lighting products such as isle end-cap space in big box stores. This strategy proved to be effective at increasing sales of efficient lighting products. The Companies will continue to work collaboratively with manufacturers and retailers in the design and placement of point-of-purchase display collateral. "In-store promotions" will be pursued to assist retailers in promoting the program and to educate consumers on the positive benefits and quick payback provided by energy-efficient technologies.

The Companies also plan to continue implementing retail lighting sales events. At these events, the Companies' vendor offer lighting products for retail sale at community events, fairs, and large customer enterprises.

In the 4th Quarter of 2011, the Companies will launch a streamlined printed version of the SmartLiving™ Catalog, which will be distributed at outreach events and mailed to customers upon request. The focus of the catalog will be specialty CFL bulbs, as well as emerging Light Emitting Diode (LED) lighting products. In addition, the SmartLivingCatalog.com website will be updated and enhanced to feature additional lighting and weatherization products. The Catalog will be promoted via links from the Companies' web sites, CTEnergyInfo.com, and at lighting events.

In 2012, the Companies will not offer an "everyday" in-store rebate for appliances or electronics, as data shows ENERGY STAR rebates are often not a cost-effective strategy given rising baseline efficiencies. However, the Companies will consider limited NCP promotions with retailers and manufacturers (which may or may not include customer rebates) on a case-by-case basis as a means of maintaining a market presence. Promotions will be considered for specific time periods, such as Earth Day and to coincide with manufacturer, retailer, state or federal promotions that promote/target the highest tier efficiency within the product category.

The Companies will coordinate with NEEP to leverage the TopTen initiative. TopTen is part of a global effort first launched in Europe to identify the highest performing appliances, electronics, and other products. TopTen is a nonprofit organization that identified and publicizes the most energy efficient products on the market (www.TopTenUSA.org). TopTen is modeled after organizations located in 16 different European countries. The Companies will leverage TopTen to help raise awareness and provide information to customers on the most efficient products available in various product categories.

Additionally, the Companies will continue to offer CFL fundraising opportunities to schools and civic groups through "Shining Solutions." The fundraising program will encourage children between grades K-12 to be energy efficient and recognize the environmental consequences of wasting energy, i.e., global warming. The fundraising program will motivate children to promote responsibility for saving energy through the sale of CFLs and stimulate general awareness utilizing instructional kick-off presentations. The fundraising program is cross promoted to teachers/schools who participate in the **eEsmarts** program and professional development workshops, as well as through the Clean Energy Communities program.

In 2012, the Companies plan on working with a group of national stakeholders to study the feasibility of developing efficient dryer technology to U.S. households through the Super Efficient Dryer Initiative (SEDI). Among the technologies being considered are heat pump dryers. Heat pump dryers are currently available in European and Asian markets. However, heat pump dryers have not yet been introduced domestically, are relatively expensive and their design is not aligned with the needs of the typical United States consumer (i.e., they are too small).

Marketing Strategy:

The marketing strategy for the Residential Retail Products program will continue to focus on building brand awareness of the unique benefits of energy-efficient products within the Companies' service territories. Specifically, the marketing of the program may include:

- Retail point-of-purchase materials to highlight the benefits of energy efficient products.
- The Companies will continue to seek out special retail placement opportunities including end-cap spaces and high traffic areas such as store entrances.
- Print, radio and on-line ads will promote CFL and LED products and will direct customers to look for the Energy Efficiency Fund logo when they purchase lighting products.
- Articles on the benefits of ENERGY STAR products will be placed in community and association newsletters (print and online).
- The SmartLiving Catalog will be distributed at events where the Companies are exhibiting such as home shows, community forums, fairs, Utility Days, etc.
- Cooperative opportunities with retailers and manufacturers will be leveraged to create general awareness of the ENERGY STAR brand, generate sales and extend the message into the community.
- Continued support of national and regional ENERGY STAR initiatives.
- Support of the TopTen USA initiative including a website portal that customers can access to seek information about energy savings and availability of the most efficient products at local retailers and online.
- Continued in 2012, consumer education addressing:
 - Federal Trade Commission Lighting Facts label
 - Proper lumen output and color selection technologies
 - Differences between LED, CFL, halogen and Incandescent lighting technologies
 - EISA 2007 lighting standard changes and the impact on the incandescent market.
- Cross-marketing opportunities with relevant statewide Fund programs such as Residential New Construction, *eesmarts*, and Home Energy Solutions.

Incentive Strategy:

As the lighting and appliance markets both evolve, the Companies plan to define specific incentive amounts or strategies for the targeted products as the market dictates. In addition, the Companies will look to increase promotion of CFLs in those retail outlets where sales data has shown that sales trail those of big box retailers.

However, certain expectations and assumptions have been utilized for planning purposes, including:

2012 base rebate levels are:

- NCP incentives for ENERGY STAR-qualified CFL common and specialty bulbs vary by wattage and style.
- \$10 per interior light fixture, portable lamp, or qualifying ceiling fan with light kits.
- NCP Incentives for ENERGY STAR-qualified LED products will be offered.
- Appliances and electronics incentives (if any) will be considered on a case-by-case basis and will be tied to the TopTen USA initiative.

Rebate levels for various products may be adjusted throughout the year to reflect market conditions including availability of product, consumer demand and program performance.

Goals:

Refer to standard filing requirement for program goals.

New Program Issues:

The Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA 2007) could impact the availability of certain general service incandescent bulbs beginning in 2012. However, as the lighting market continues to develop in response to EISA 2007, it is not anticipated that there will be a complete phase-out of general service incandescent bulbs nor will CFLs become the baseline. Several large manufacturers already have full lines of EISA 2007 compliant halogen products on the shelves of US retail stores. These bulbs are approximately twenty-five (25) percent more efficient than standard incandescent bulbs, while CFLs remain approximately seventy-five (75) percent more efficient than the EISA complaint products. Further, there are indications that industries' response to EISA, e.g., producing lower lumen halogens to meet the standard, may result in even smaller savings than anticipated, leaving greater savings potential for CFLs. Therefore, it appears that there will be the need to continue aggressive promotion of CFL technology through and past the phase-in of EISA 2007.

The Companies in coordination with the EEB will host energy efficiency lighting focus groups in the 3rd Quarter of 2011 to gauge customers understanding of EISA 2007, the changes ahead for lighting retrofits and customers' willingness to adopt new lighting technologies.

It will be important for the Companies to re-educate consumers as to the appropriate energy efficiency lighting source to utilize. The Companies will be challenged with not only educating consumers on lumen output, but more importantly on interpreting the recently released Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Lighting Labels. Consumer education will be an important aspect of the 2012 program as EISA 2007 introduces a new lighting world for consumers. EISA also presents the need to evaluate new lighting technologies that might be developed to meet the EISA requirements. To date we have seen

the more efficient halogen bulbs that do not provide customers with the energy savings compared to CFLs or LEDs, as well as the anticipated arrival of halogen 2x products which are twice as efficient as standard incandescent lighting products. Consumers will be receiving multiple messages regarding lighting and efficiency. The Companies will need to navigate through the manufacturer claims and educate consumers accordingly.

In July 2011, CFL Manufacturers announced that the cost of producing CFLs would increase due to a shortage in rare earth materials, specifically phosphor. Phosphor is a critical component in the production of CFLs (though CFLs are not the only technology affected) and had represented approximately 10-15 percent of the cost of a CFL. It may now exceed 50 percent of the total CFL production cost. Depending on the manufacturer, the retail cost for CFLs may increase between 10-25 percent. The increase will vary based on size and wattage of CFLs. It is anticipated that the retail price increase could take effect as soon as September 2011. The Companies will monitor the potential market impact and will adjust incentive strategies if the need should arise.

ENERGY STAR solid state (i.e., LED) lighting remains in its infancy in terms of consumer acceptance and overall retrofit product offering. The Companies will support their inclusion into the program based on availability and performance. There are limited ENERGY STAR-qualified LED products on the horizon that are suitable replacements for the standard A-type incandescent bulb, though there are a substantial number of qualified ENERGY STAR LED reflectors and flood lamps. The Companies will remain active in evaluating LED lighting technology and provide incentives on ENERGY STAR qualified products as they become available.

The Companies will continue to educate customers on the proper disposal of CFL bulbs. These strategies will include posting proper disposal information on Companies' websites and on point-of-purchase materials. In addition, the Companies have developed a CFL brochure which is available at lighting fairs, in-store promotions and used to educate customers through other programs such as the Home Energy Solutions programs.

The Energy Information Agency's Annual Energy Outlook 2006 projects that consumer electronics will account for nineteen (19) percent of residential energy use by 2020, compared with 14 percent of home energy consumption in 2006. The market for efficient electronic products has responded quickly to increased federal and ENERGY STAR standards. It is estimated that the majority of televisions sold in Connecticut already meet ENERGY STAR 4.2 criteria. Thus it appears that there may be limited savings potential within the television market. Despite this success, the Companies will continue to monitor and participate in the regional and national discussions around these technologies in coordination with CEE, NEEP and the EPA to piggy back on efforts that address the efficiency of consumer electronics. While most electronics manufacturers have responded quickly to higher efficiency standards, set-top boxes that are used in the cable and satellite TV industry have been lagging in terms of efficiency. The Companies will work with policymakers, including the PURA, to determine if higher standards for set-top boxes can be implemented in Connecticut.

In recent years, California has led the country in developing higher standards for various consumer electronic products. In 2011, the Companies have been active in working with local officials, regional and national organizations including the Consortium for Energy Efficiency and the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnership, to help identify energy savings potential and to work to capture this opportunity for developing higher standards. Based upon working within these initiatives, the Companies may develop, where practical, a methodology to appropriately attribute energy savings from these efforts.

The following table provides the current federal standard, updated DOE standard and potential effective date, the ENERGY STAR current specification, the planned ENERGY STAR revision effective date and the state of Connecticut specification.

Category/Product	Current Federal Standard	Updated DOE Standard Due	Potential Effective Date	ENERGY STAR Current Spec	Planned ENERGY STAR Revision/New Spec (effective date)	State of CT Spec	Notes
Lighting Products - Residential:							
Ceiling Fan Light Kits	N/A	2013	2016	(Sept 2006) At low speed, fans must have a minimum airflow of 1,250 CFM* and an efficiency of 155 CFM/Watt At high speed, fans must have a minimum airflow of 5,000 CFM* and an efficiency of 75 CFM/Watt	N/A	N/A	
Ceiling Fans	N/A	2013	2016	(Sept 2006) At low speed, fans must have a minimum airflow of 1,250 CFM* and an efficiency of 155 CFM/Watt At high speed, fans must have a minimum airflow of 5,000 CFM* and an efficiency of 75 CFM/Watt	N/A	N/A	
Decorative Light Strings	N/A			(March 2008) Products must meet efficiency (under 0.2W per bulb) and quality (3-year warranty, protection against over-voltage, maintained light output) requirements	N/A	N/A	
General Service Fluorescent Lamps		2013	2016	CFLs: 50-65 lm/W based on lamp wattage (December 2008)	ES recently launched tech neutral, perf based spec for replacement lamps	N/A	DOE Final Rule Due Date for next rev 2015 - Effective date 2018
General Service Incandescent Lamps		2017	2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Incandescent Reflector Lamps	EISA 2007 40-50 Nominal Lamp Wattage = 10.5 Lumens per Watt (LPW)	2017	2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	51-66 = 11.0 (LPW)						
	67-85 = 12.5 (LPW)						
	86-115 = 14.0 (LPW)						
	116-155 = 14.5 (LPW)						
	156-205 = 15.0 (LPW)						
Metal Halide Lamp Fixtures	Medium-Base Magnetic Probe Start – 78% Medium-Base Pulse Start – 77% Mogul-Base Magnetic Probe Start – 88% Mogul-Base Magnetic Pulse Start – 85% Mogul-Base Electronic Pulse Start – 87% Ceramic Metal Halide – 75% Fed St is ENERGY STAR	2012	2015				
Light Emitting Diodes		2017	2020	Integral LED, 50-55 lm/W based on lamp wattage (August 2010)	N/A	N/A	
Light Fixtures				August 2008 (CFL)/February 2009 (LED) >= 50 LPW for all lamp types below 30 total listed lamp watts. >= 60 LPW for all lamp types that are <= 24 inches and >= 30 total listed lamp watts. >= 70 LPW for all lamp types that are >= 24 inches and >= 30 total listed lamp watts.	April 2012	N/A	
Organic Light Emitting Diodes	LM-79/LLM-80	2017	2020	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Category/Product	Current Federal Standard	Updated DOE Standard Due	Potential Effective Date	ENERGY STAR Current Spec	Planned ENERGY STAR Revision/New Spec (effective date)	State of CT Spec	Notes
Heating Products - Residential:							
Direct heating equipment	Gas hearth up to 20,000 Btu/h AFUE* = 61% Gas hearth over 20,000 Btu/h and up to 27,000 Btu/h AFUE = 66% Gas hearth over 27,000 Btu/h and up to 46,000 Btu/h AFUE = 67% Gas hearth over 46,000 Btu/h AFUE = 68%	2018	2023	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Furnace Fans	N/A	2013	2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Furnaces	Gas AFUE 82% Oil AFUE 83%	2011	2013	(October 2006) Gas Furnaces 90% AFUE* or greater Oil Furnaces 85% AFUE or greater	N/A	N/A	
Mobile Home Furnace	Gas AFUE 81%			N/A	N/A	N/A	
Pool heaters (Gas Fired)	82% AFUE	2018	2021	N/A	N/A	1/1/09, partially pre-empted*	* Per federal legislation, states are pre-empted from establishing standards for pool heaters. However, states are permitted to prohibit standing pilot lights on pool heaters
Residential Boilers	Last Standard Issued 2007 Gas Hot Water Boilers = 82% AFUE Gas Steam Boilers = 80% AFUE Oil Hot Water = 84% AFUE Oil Steam = 82% AFUE	2015	2020	(June 1996) AFUE 85%	N/A	N/A	
Residential Water heaters	Electric - .95 EF Oil - .62 EF Gas - .62 EF Gas Tankless - .82 EF	2018	2023	(January 2009) Gas Condensing - .80 EF Gas Tankless - .82 EF Gas Storage - .67 EF Heat Pump Water Heater - 2.0 EF Solar - .05 SF	N/A	N/A	
Small Furnaces	Gas AFUE 82% Oil AFUE 83%			(October 2006) Gas Furnaces 90% AFUE* or greater Oil Furnaces 85% AFUE or greater	N/A	N/A	
Unit Heaters	8/1/2008	2013	2016	N/A	N/A	7/1/2008	

Category/Product	Current Federal Standard	Updated DOE Standard Due	Potential Effective Date	ENERGY STAR Current Spec	Planned ENERGY STAR Revision/New Spec (effective date)	State of CT Spec	Notes
Space Cooling Products - Residential:							
Central Air Conditioners and Central Air Conditioning Heat Pumps	August 2006 - Split system air conditioners 13 SEER Split system heat pumps 13 SEER 7.7 HSPF Single package heat pumps 13 SEER 7.7 HSPF Heat pumps-split system 10.9 SEER 7.1 HSPF	2011	2015	January 2009 - Air-Source Heat Pumps >= 8.2 HSPF / >= 14.5 SEER / >= 12 EER* for split systems >= 8.0 HSPF / >= 14 SEER / >= 11 EER* for gas/electric package units Central Air Conditioners >= 12 EER* for split systems >= 14 SEER / >= 11 EER* for single package equipment including gas/electric package units	N/A		
Room Air Conditioners	http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=room_mac_pr_crit_room_ac	2011	June 1, 2014	http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=room_mac_pr_crit_room_ac	N/A	7/1/2009	Standards are complex. Please click link for full description of Fed St and ENERGY STAR guidelines.
Large Packaged Air Conditioning Equipment	1/1/2010						
Appliances - Residential:							
Clothes dryers	Vented Electric, Standard (4.4 ft3 or greater capacity) - 3.73 lb/kWh Vented Electric, Compact (120 V) (less than 4.4 ft3 capacity) - 3.61 lb/kWh Vented Electric, Compact (240 V) (less than 4.4 ft3 capacity), 3.27 lb/kWh Vented Gas - 3.30 lb/kWh Ventless Electric, Compact (240 V) (less than 4.4 ft3 capacity) - 2.55 lb/kWh Ventless Electric Combination Washer/Dryer - 2.08 lb/kWh EISA 2007 Up to 35.00 (pints/day) = 1.35 (liters/kWh) 35.01 = 45.00 = 1.50 45.01 = 54.00 = 1.60 54.01 = 75.00 = 1.70 75.00 or more = 2.50	2011	January 1, 2015		N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A Update to spec in process - Nov 2010		
Dishwashers	Compact = 260 kWh/yr and 4.5 gal/cycle Standard = 355 kWh/yr and 6.5 gal/cycle EISA 2007	2015	2018	V4 Tier 1 - 324 kWh/yr, 5.6 WF (August 2009) N/A N/A	V5 Tier 1 - 295 kWh/yr, 4.25 gal/cycle (Jan 2012) Tier 2 TBD (Jan 2014) N/A N/A		
Kitchen ranges and ovens							
Microwave ovens							
Refrigerators, Freezers and Refrigerator-Freezers	http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliance_standards/residential/pdfs/refrig_top_r_fmnlce.pdf	2010	2014	20% better than Fed St	Revision launch TBA. Most Efficient Criteria 30% better than Fed St 2.0 MEF / 6.0 WF (July 2011) Most Efficient Criteria < 2.5 cub ft-3.0/3.5 > 2.5 cub ft-3.0/3.3 (June, 2011)		Standards are complex. Please click link for full description of Fed Standard guidelines.
Clothes washers	MEF 1.26 and WF 9.5 or less	2011	2015	1.8 MEF / 7.5 WF (July 2009)			
Room Air Cleaners and Purifiers	N/A			10% better than Fed St	15% better than Fed St - 1st draft proposal (Feb 2012)		

Category/Product	Current Federal Standard	Updated DOE Standard Due	Potential Effective Date	ENERGY STAR Current Spec	Planned ENERGY STAR Revision/New Spec (effective date)	State of CT Spec	Notes
Miscellaneous							
Gaming Consoles	N/A						
Audio/Video Equipment	N/A						
Battery Chargers	No efficiency standards currently exist for battery chargers. The federal standard will be initiated to chargers connected to or embedded within consumer products.	2011	2013	Non-active Energy Ratio (January 2006)	Revision process ongoing (June 2011 for products currently uncovered. March 2012 for products covered)		
External Power Supplies, Class A	http://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/appliances_standards/residentialbattery_external.html	2011	2013	Active mode equations no load mode and power factor (November 2008)	Specification being discont'd (Dec 31, 2010)	1/1/2008	Standards are complex. Please click link for full description of Fed Standard guidelines.
Computers	N/A			Version 5.0 (July 2009)	Kicking off next revision		
Cordless Phones	N/A			http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=phones.pr_crit_phones	N/A		Standards are complex. Please click link for full description of ENERGY STAR guidelines.
Digital to Analog Converter Boxes	N/A			N/A	Specification being discont'd (Dec 31, 2010)		
Displays (computer monitors, digital picture frames, professional signage)	N/A			Version 5.0 (July 2009 for small screens <30 in.) (Jan 2010 for large screens >30 in.)	Scheduled revision (October 2011)		
Imaging Equipment (copiers, fax machines, printers, mailing machines, and scanners)	N/A			July 2009	N/A		
Set-Top Boxes and Cable Boxes	N/A			Version 2.0 - Typical Energy Consumption (TEC) limits (January 2009)	Version 3.0 (Sept. 2011) Version 4.0 (July 2013)		Cannot find spec on ENERGY STAR site.
Television sets	N/A	2013	2016	Version 4.1 - Roughly CA Tier 2 (May, 2010)	Version 5.3 - includes consumption cap for screens >50 in (September 30, 2011) (~50% of mkt) ES 6.0 revision launched in May (~20% of mkt). Most Efficient Criteria - 3 eqs. based on size 80 W max (June, 2011)		
Enterprise Servers	N/A						
Audio/Video Equipment	N/A						
Low voltage dth-type transformers	1/1/2007	2013	2016			7/1/2006	Pre-empted by Fed St.
Commercial refrigerators and freezers	01/01/2010 - Walk-In Coolers - 16,200 (kWh/year) Walk-In Freezers - 21,400 (kWh/year) Walk-In Freezer/Cooler Combination Units - 30,200 (kWh/year)					7/1/2008	
Bottle-type water dispensers	N/A						
Comm. hot food holding cabinets	N/A						
Spas (hot tubs)	N/A						
Swimming pool pumps	N/A						
						1/1/2009	
						1/1/2009	
						1/1/2009	
						1/1/2010	

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Residential Retail Products (Lighting and Appliances)

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 91	\$ 116	\$ 176	\$ 55	\$ 197	\$ 144	\$ 144
Contractor Staff	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 9
Total Labor	\$ 91	\$ 116	\$ 176	\$ 55	\$ 197	\$ 153	\$ 153
Materials & Supplies	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 2	\$ 0	\$ 3	\$ 2	\$ 2
Outside Services	\$ 770	\$ 1,046	\$ 1,053	\$ 459	\$ 1,186	\$ 865 a)	\$ 859
Incentives	\$ 2,220	\$ 10,429	\$ 4,163 d)	\$ 3,206	\$ 4,678	\$ 3,180 b)	\$ 3,159
Marketing	\$ 95	\$ 770	\$ 689	\$ 83	\$ 774	\$ 600 c)	\$ 596
Administrative Expenses	\$ 4	\$ 7	\$ 20	\$ 2	\$ 22	\$ 20	\$ 20
Other	\$ 41	\$ 11	\$ 30	\$ 24	\$ 34	\$ 30	\$ 30
Total	\$ 3,224	\$ 12,380	\$ 6,133	\$ 3,829	\$ 6,896	\$ 4,850	\$ 4,819

- a) Outside Services - include field services support and fulfillment activities, sales training, placement and refresh of POP materials, verify delivery of products, in-store promotions, rebate processing and reporting activities.
- b) Incentives - Markdowns, Instant Coupons, the SmartLiving Catalog, Lighting and Fairs, and Fundraising incentives.
- c) Marketing - includes custom-designed Point of Purchase (POP) materials and rebate forms, brochures, bill insert, print ads, in-store collateral materials for product demonstrations, advertising campaigns, website, community events and trade shows.
- d) Includes \$2,687 for ARRA Appliance Rebate Program for 2010 only.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	3,270.9
Annual Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	45,894,009
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	214,581,337
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.106
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.023
Electric b/c Ratio	3.55
Total Resource b/c Ratio	3.73

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Residential Retail Lighting

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 91	\$ 99	\$ 176	\$ 55	\$ 197	\$ 144	\$ 144
Contractor Staff	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 9
Total Labor	\$ 91	\$ 100	\$ 176	\$ 55	\$ 197	\$ 153	\$ 153
Materials & Supplies	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 2	\$ 0	\$ 3	\$ 2	\$ 2
Outside Services	\$ 770	\$ 1,001	\$ 1,053	\$ 456	\$ 1,183	\$ 865 a)	\$ 859
Incentives	\$ 2,220	\$ 6,907	\$ 4,163	\$ 3,206	\$ 4,678	\$ 3,180 b)	\$ 3,159
Marketing	\$ 95	\$ 738	\$ 689	\$ 83	\$ 774	\$ 600 c)	\$ 596
Administrative Expenses	\$ 4	\$ 7	\$ 20	\$ 2	\$ 22	\$ 20	\$ 20
Other	\$ 41	\$ 11	\$ 30	\$ 24	\$ 34	\$ 30	\$ 30
Total	\$ 3,224	\$ 8,765	\$ 6,133	\$ 3,826	\$ 6,893	\$ 4,850	\$ 4,819

a) Outside Services - include field services support and fulfillment activities, sales training, placement and refresh of POP materials, verify delivery of products, in-store promotions, rebate processing and reporting activities.

b) Incentives - Markdowns, instant coupons, the SmartLiving Catalog, lighting and fairs, and fundraising incentives.

c) Marketing - includes custom-designed Point of Purchase (POP) materials and rebate forms, brochures, bill insert, print ads, in-store collateral materials for product demonstrations, advertising campaigns, website, community events and trade shows.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	3,270.9
Annual Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	45,894,009
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	214,581,337

Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.106
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.023

Electric b/c Ratio	3.55
Total Resource b/c Ratio	3.73

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Retail Lighting

Year	Program Costs			Cost/participant	\$/LT-kWh
	Budget	Actual	% of Budget		
2000	\$2,463,000	\$ 4,016,000	163%	\$17	0.009
2001	\$2,831,000	\$ 4,828,000	171%	\$12	0.008
2002	\$2,700,000	\$ 3,484,000	129%	\$10	0.009
		\$ (335,000)			
	Net 2002	\$ 3,149,000 ¹			
2003	\$2,450,000	\$ 1,256,000	51%	\$12	0.016
2004	\$3,300,000	\$ 4,393,000	133%	\$2	0.007
2005 Revised	\$3,525,928	\$ 4,990,979	142%	\$3	0.013
2006 Revised	\$4,769,287	\$ 4,650,971	98%	\$2	0.011
2007 Revised	\$5,040,000	\$ 5,407,000	107%	\$2	0.011
2008 Revised	\$4,440,000	\$ 4,815,000	108%	\$2	0.009
2009 Revised	\$5,347,000	\$ 3,223,712	60%	\$2	0.013
2010 Revised	\$8,599,750	\$ 8,764,502	102%	\$2	0.012
2011 Revised	\$6,132,901	\$ -	0%	\$0	0.000
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 3,825,562	62%	\$2	0.002
2011 Y/E Projected	\$6,132,901	\$ 6,892,595	112%	\$2	0.002
2012	\$4,850,450	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	Goal - Participation		
	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	150,000	233,558	156%
2001	171,731	410,908	239%
2002	325,557	340,560	105%
2003	235,394	104,246	44%
2004	776,473	1,792,216	231%
2005 Revised	1,008,021	1,444,142	143%
2006 Revised	1,499,192	1,980,791	132%
2007 Revised	1,295,355	2,409,313	186%
2008 Revised	1,737,107	2,375,501	137%
2009 Revised	2,543,370	1,606,793	63%
2010 Revised	2,616,015	4,046,226	n/a
2011 Revised	3,023,005	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	1,875,825	72%
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	3,751,650	143%
2012	1,450,413	n/a	n/a

Goal - Lifetime MWh savings				Goal - Installed kW Savings			
Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	Year	Goal	Actual	%of Goal
2000	152,772	438,631	287%	2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	244,030	610,545	250%	2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	366,566	398,613	109%	2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	201,631	78,468	39%	2003	1,391	607	43.6%
2004	354,614	591,781	167%	2004	2,970	5,144	173.2%
2005 Revised	293,530	376,443	128%	2005 Revised	3,382	4,279	126.5%
2006 Revised	367,504	427,603	116%	2006 Revised	3,957	4,703	118.8%
2007 Revised	359,509	483,854	135%	2007 Revised	3,665	5,584	152.4%
2008 Revised	400,146	540,122	135%	2008 Revised	4,561	6,243	136.9%
2009 Revised	436,889	240,352	55%	2009 Revised	6,479	4,024	62.1%
2010 Revised	348,967	730,452	209%	2010 Revised	5,981	14,589	243.9%
2011 Revised	444,923	n/a	-	2011 Revised	8,691	n/a	-
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	340,848	98%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	3,906	65.3%
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	530,048	152%	011 Y/E Projected	n/a	9,107	152.3%
2012	214,581	n/a	n/a	2012	3,271	n/a	n/a

Year	Program Ratios			
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.016	0.009	n/a	1,688
2001	0.012	0.008	n/a	1,279
2002	0.007	0.008	n/a	1,158
2003	0.011	0.016	1,663	2,069
2004	0.009	0.007	1,111	854
2005 Revised	0.012	0.013	1,043	1,166
2006 Revised	0.013	0.011	1,205	989
2007 Revised	0.014	0.011	1,375	968
2008 Revised	0.011	0.009	973	771
2009 Revised	0.012	0.013	825	801
2010 Revised	0.025	0.012	1,438	601
2011 Revised	0.014	n/a	706	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.011	n/a	979
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.013	n/a	757
2012	0.023	n/a	1,483	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Retail Lighting

Budget/FTE :

1.1 FTE's for program administration, vendor interaction, sales and field support.

Goal

1,450,413 Goal is lighting products including bulbs, fixtures and portables and reflects the continued focus on markdowns.
2012 goal will continue build off of NCP promotions with an increased focus on specialty bulbs.

Cost/Unit

\$3.34 Overall cost per product.
\$2.19 Average incentive cost per unit including products from the SmartLiving Catalog component of the coupons and markdowns.

Goal Setting

Average weighted incentive cost was calculated based on desired product mix and delivery mechanism; goal was calculated based on available incentive dollars divided by average incentive

Metric Changes

Program design will continue to pursue NCPs with industry partners that are willing and able to implement markdown promotions and supply adequate Point of Sale data reports.
Program will continue to move toward specialty (higher wattage, dimmables, three ways, etc.) in 2012.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Retail Appliances

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ -	\$ 16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ -	\$ 16	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Materials and Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ -	\$ 45	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -
Incentives	\$ -	\$ 3,522	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ 32	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ -	\$ 3,615 a)	\$ -	\$ 3 b)	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -

a) Represents the ARRA Appliance Rebate Program in 2010

b) Represents minor ARRA rollover expenses from Appliance Rebate Program in 2010

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Electric b/c Ratio	N/A
Total Resource b/c Ratio	N/A

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Retail Appliances

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	Cost/Partic.	\$/LT-kWh
2000	\$ 1,416,000	\$ 1,259,000	89%	\$171	0.049
2001	\$ 863,000	\$ 732,000	85%	\$155	0.045
2002	\$ 1,260,000	\$ 1,674,000	133%	\$64	0.041
2003	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 860,000	54%	\$33	0.029
2004	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,451,000	161%	\$56	0.027
2005 Revised	\$ 1,154,867	\$ 1,449,291	125%	\$71	0.019
2006 Revised	\$ 769,663	\$ 975,790	127%	\$55	0.014
2007 Revised	\$ 559,800	\$ 555,000	99%	\$50	0.040
2008 Revised	\$ 560,000	\$ 88,448	16%	\$58	0.045
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	\$2,687,200	\$ 3,615,349	135%	\$103	0.088
2011 Revised	\$ -	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 3,038	-	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Project	n/a	\$ 3,038	-	n/a	n/a
2012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Goal - Participation

Year	Goal (Units)	Actual	% of Goal
2000	8,320	7,383	89%
2001	5,451	4,714	86%
2002	16,444	26,000	158%
2003	22,160	13,813	62%
2004	11,900	26,134	220%
2005	11,435	20,514	179%
2006 Revised	14,047	17,597	125%
2007 Revised	16,500	11,003	67%
2008 Revised	n/a	1,536	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	35,136	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Project	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012			

Goal - Lifetime MWh Savings

Year	Goal (MWh)	Actual (MWh)	% of Goal
2000	23,016	25,736	112%
2001	21,322	16,244	76%
2002	32,945	41,111	125%
2003	51,655	29,791	58%
2004	23,799	54,186	228%
2005 Revised	52,447	77,371	148%
2006 Revised	54,081	67,748	125%
2007 Revised	5,785	14,018	n/a
2008 Revised	n/a	1,957	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	41,104	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Project	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012	n/a	n/a	n/a

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	4,772	815	17.1%
2004	586	1,195	203.9%
2005 Revised	497	553	111.3%
2006 Revised	365	457	125.3%
2007 Revised	1,182	95	n/a
2008 Revised	n/a	13	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	1,210	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012	n/a	n/a	n/a

Program Ratios

Year	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.074	0.049	n/a	10,458
2001	0.053	0.045	n/a	9,643
2002	0.038	0.041	n/a	1,568
2003	0.038	0.029	594	1,055
2004	0.038	0.027	1,535	1,214
2005 Revised	0.022	0.019	2,324	2,621
2006 Revised	0.014	0.014	2,111	2,136
2007 Revised	0.097	0.040	474	5,873
2008 Revised	-	0.045	-	6,701
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Project	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Retail Products

UI residential customers, appliance and lighting retailers

Budget Projections	2010 Act	2011 Revised Bud	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Bud	2013 Bud
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 170,647	\$ 176,283	\$ 79,338	\$ 176,283	\$ 184,412 a)	\$ 193,633
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - b)	
Total Labor	\$ 170,647	\$ 176,283	\$ 79,338	\$ 176,283	\$ 184,412	\$ 193,633
Materials & Supplies	\$ 6,765	\$ 7,500	\$ 64	\$ 2,000	\$ 4,993 c)	\$ 5,000
Outside Services	\$ 295,297	\$ 279,756	\$ 139,766	\$ 200,000	\$ 190,000 d)	\$ 190,000
Incentives	\$ 1,744,441	\$ 1,374,227	\$ 2,467,166	\$ 2,467,166	\$ 1,106,000 e)	\$ 1,080,480
Marketing	\$ 204,377	\$ 285,000	\$ 36,358	\$ 50,000	\$ 260,000 f)	\$ 260,000
Other	\$ 5,699	\$ 5,803	\$ 2,013	\$ 5,803	\$ 5,803 g)	\$ 5,800
Administrative Expenses	\$ 3,225	\$ 4,647	\$ 231	\$ 4,647	\$ 4,647 h)	\$ 10,000
Total	\$ 2,430,451	\$ 2,133,216	\$ 2,724,936	\$ 2,905,899	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 1,744,913

- a) 1.85 FTEs
- b) No comment
- c) Printing of Program forms and supplies for lighting fairs/events
- d) Incentive fulfillment services, field services for lighting fairs/events, NCP administrative services. Code and Standards monitoring
- e) 491,954 energy efficient lighting products - 471,306 CFLs, 18,000 LEDs and 2,647 Fixtures
- f) In-store POP, creation of coupons, forms, marketing materials, seasonal advertising and Public Relations
- g) NEEP participation
- h) Meals, miles, travel and training

Goals and Metrics Information:
Savings

	2012
Demand Savings (kW)	1,326
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	14,731,133
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	72,381,047
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.119
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.024
Cost per kW	\$ 1,324
Electric System B/C Ratio	3.35
Total Resource B/C Ratio	3.64

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Retail Products

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$1,546	\$1,831	118.4%
2001	\$1,665	\$1,589	95.4%
2002	\$1,379	\$1,303	94.5%
2003	\$1,070	\$592	55.3%
2004	\$1,361	\$1,267	93.1%
2005	\$1,506	\$1,592	105.7%
2006	\$1,521	\$1,664	109.4%
2007	\$1,238	\$1,247	100.7%
2008	\$1,208	\$1,282	106.1%
2009	\$1,863	\$1,344	72.1%
2010	\$2,303	\$2,430	105.5%
2011	\$2,133		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$2,133	\$2,725	127.8%
2011 YE Projected	\$2,133	\$2,906	136.2%
2012	\$1,756		

Goal - Number of Bulbs, Fixtures & Appliances

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	20,799	29,020	139.5%
2001	62,823	102,148	162.6%
2002	61,459	95,456	155.3%
2003	44,073	40,736	92.4%
2004	233,800	242,338	103.7%
2005	259,685	337,713	130.0%
2006	455,658	442,703	97.2%
2007	335,000	721,000	215.2%
2008	465,806	658,600	141.4%
2009	856,772	602,866	70.4%
2010	531,976	1,131,282	212.7%
2011	1,066,514		
2011 YTD (Jun)	1,066,514	788,013	73.9%
2011 YE Projected	1,066,514	1,461,124	137.0%
2012	491,954		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	4,487	7,078	157.7%
2001	7,124	9,563	134.2%
2002	4,523	7,997	176.8%
2003	3,747	3,465	92.5%
2004	11,564	12,166	105.2%
2005	11,314	14,968	132.3%
2006	14,695	15,216	103.5%
2007	9,658	21,152	219.0%
2008	12,893	17,390	134.9%
2009	21,208	12,485	58.9%
2010	20,067	42,955	214.1%
2011	39,951		
2011 YTD (Jun)	39,951	30,148	75.5%
2011 YE Projected	39,951	54,733	137.0%
2012	14,731		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	404	639	158.2%
2004	1,143	1,286	112.5%
2005	995	1,339	134.6%
2006	1,177	1,158	98.4%
2007	761	1,615	212.2%
2008	1,224	1,613	131.8%
2009	2,009	1,186	59.0%
2010	1,772	3,788	213.8%
2011	3,518		
2011 YTD (Jun)	3,518	2,629	74.7%
2011 YE Projected	3,518	4,820	137.0%
2012	1,326		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	76,065	116,542	153.2%
2001	91,689	114,927	125.3%
2002	48,850	87,336	178.8%
2003	47,247	34,208	72.4%
2004	108,108	115,967	107.3%
2005	80,398	111,485	138.7%
2006	113,098	126,122	111.5%
2007	69,512	180,938	260.3%
2008	91,460	135,890	148.6%
2009	127,649	84,297	66.0%
2010	116,297	203,783	175.2%
2011	178,150		
2011 YTD (Jun)	178,150	114,174	64.1%
2011 YE Projected	178,150	244,066	137.0%
2012	72,381		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh Target	Actual	\$/LT kWh Target	Actual	\$/kW Target	Actual	Cost/Socket
2000	\$0.345	\$0.259	\$0.020	\$0.016	\$0	\$0	\$63.094
2001	\$0.234	\$0.166	\$0.018	\$0.014	\$0	\$0	\$15.556
2002	\$0.305	\$0.163	\$0.028	\$0.015	\$0	\$0	\$13.650
2003	\$0.286	\$0.171	\$0.023	\$0.017	\$2,649	\$926	\$14.533
2004	\$0.118	\$0.104	\$0.013	\$0.011	\$1,191	\$985	\$5.228
2005	\$0.133	\$0.106	\$0.019	\$0.014	\$1,514	\$1,189	\$6.131
2006	\$0.104	\$0.109	\$0.013	\$0.013	\$1,292	\$1,437	\$3.652
2007	\$0.128	\$0.059	\$0.018	\$0.007	\$1,627	\$772	\$1.730
2008	\$0.094	\$0.074	\$0.013	\$0.009	\$987	\$795	\$1.947
2009	\$0.088	\$0.108	\$0.015	\$0.016	\$927	\$1,133	\$2.229
2010	\$0.115	\$0.057	\$0.020	\$0.012	\$1,300	\$641	\$2.148
2011	\$0.053		\$0.012		\$606		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.053	\$0.090	\$0.012	\$0.024	\$606	\$1,036	\$3.458
2011 YE Projected	\$0.053	\$0.053	\$0.012	\$0.012	\$606	\$603	\$1.989
2012	\$0.119		\$0.024		\$1,324		

The United Illuminating Company

LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - Residential Retail Lighting

Budget/FTE:

2012 UI Labor 1.85 FTE includes field support, data/financial administration and event participation

Goal:

	Units	Incentive
Non General Service CFLs @ 15w avg	72,146	\$ 2.99
General Service CFLs @15w avg	399,160	\$ 1.37
LEDs		\$15-20

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

2012 cost rates increase slightly due to an increase in the promotion of LEDs.

Goal Setting Methodology:

Goals are based on a measure mix and production levels based on available funds, retailer sales data, and average lighting wattages.

This page intentionally blank

Residential New Construction (Electric and Natural Gas)

Objective:

The objective of the electric and natural gas Residential New Construction (“RNC”) program is to reduce the energy use and peak demand in new housing. Related objectives include increasing builder and consumer awareness of energy-efficient building practices, and to affect permanent market movement to more energy-efficient residential new construction in the State of Connecticut.

Target Market:

The target market of the RNC program is any residentially metered single or multifamily unit (three (3) story or less) being built in Connecticut. Based on data from the 2010 U.S. Census Bureau and DECD, a total of 3,932 housing permits were issued in Connecticut. Housing permits issued within CL&P and UI territory total 3,822, of which 792 participated in the RNC program in 2010 (twenty-one (21) percent market share).

To have the most widespread effect on the market, the Companies will focus on four main areas: Building Code, ENERGY STAR® Homes, Low-Load Homes, and Outreach and Education.

1. Building Code:

The Companies will work to improve the energy efficiency of newly constructed homes by supporting the adoption of 2009 International Energy Conservation Code (“IECC”), adopted by the Regulation Review Committee as an Amendment to the 2005 State Building Code September 27, 2011. The 2003 International Residential Code (IRC) will still be in effect for one and two family homes and townhouses until the 2009 IRC is adopted in the second half of 2012. The Companies will work with code advocacy, code compliance, and code enforcement agencies and organizations, as well as the residential building sector. The residential building sector will be significantly impacted by the more stringent air and duct leakage requirements, including performance testing for duct leakage in many homes according to the 2009 IECC. Because many requirements of the new energy code will require qualified personnel for compliant implementation, proper support for the industry will be critical to effective adoption. These more stringent code requirements represent a large program opportunity given performance testing requirements for many homes. Air and Duct sealing will help the companies reach the goal of achieving deeper energy savings per home.

2. ENERGY STAR Qualified Homes:

As Connecticut adopts a more comprehensive building code, it will be critical at this point to influence builders and homeowners to take the next step to meet ENERGY STAR standards. The Companies will target residential new construction projects, particularly those projects where builders are willing to incorporate advanced building design practices and meet the increasing ENERGY STAR requirements, as set by the US Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA).

3. Low Load Homes:

Low-Load Home construction is a way of building that the leading high performance builders have started to focus on in Connecticut. These will be the way all homes are built in the future. These homes go above and beyond ENERGY STAR requirements to the development of near-zero energy homes. The Companies, in previous years, have offered the CT Zero Energy Challenge to recognize and award these types of homes. The CT Zero Energy Challenge will continue in 2012, but since low-load home construction has proven to be a viable building practice, it will now become an integral part of the RNC program in 2012.

4. Outreach and Education:

Outreach and education elements related to energy efficiency will focus on prospective new homebuyers, builders, developers, and other market participants such as architects, building code officials, home energy raters, insulation contractors, real estate agents, and HVAC contractors including geothermal installers. Relationships will continue to be fostered with the appropriate agents of single and multi-family housing for limited-income families, including Public Housing Authorities, the Connecticut Housing Finance Authority, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and other not-for-profit community development entities. Additionally, there is an opportunity for realtors, appraisers, and mortgage companies to recognize the advantages of the RNC program and how an energy-efficient home is more competitive in the marketplace than an inefficient home.

Program Description:

The Companies will offer four energy efficiency tracks to program participants, which are summarized below:

1.) ENERGY STAR Certification Incentive

Since the inception of the ENERGY STAR for New Homes program in 1995, the program's requirements have continued to evolve in response to increased rigor in mandated code requirements and more efficient standard building practices to ensure that homes that earn the label continue to represent a meaningful improvement over non-labeled homes. As codes and standard practices have continued to increase across the country, the U.S. EPA is releasing a third-generation of guidelines (ENERGY STAR Version 3) that is being phased in during 2011 and will become mandatory in 2012.⁶ To assure compliance with ENERGY STAR qualification criteria, all homes must be inspected and verified by a RESNET⁷ certified Home Energy Rating System ("HERS") rater under contract to the homeowner or builder. Such raters assist throughout the entire building process to assure ENERGY STAR standards are met. The Residential New Construction program is following the timeline proposed by the U.S. EPA. All homes with permit dates after January 1, 2012 must be qualified under Version 3. All homes with permit dates prior to January 1,

⁶ ENERGY STAR website, http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=bldrs_lenders_raters.nh_v3_guidelines

⁷ Residential Energy Services Network

2012 must be qualified under Version 3 if the final inspection dates are after July 1, 2012.⁸ The Companies will continue to pay tiered incentives for homes that comply with ENERGY STAR for Homes guidelines in accordance with the ENERGY STAR transition timeline.

2.) Home Energy Rating System Incentive

The HERS Incentive will be a new track for homes that comply with the standards of ENERGY STAR version 2.5. It will require a RESNET certified HERS rater, but will not receive an ENERGY STAR certification. This track is being added because of a forecasted decline in participation of ENERGY STAR 3.0. With version 3.0 requiring significant changes for builders and HVAC contractors, the HERS Incentive track will encourage continued participation in the program while the industry acclimates to the ENERGY STAR 3.0 requirements. Participants will receive tiered incentives for the HERS Incentive track but at a lesser amount than ENERGY STAR 3.0.

3.) RNC Prescriptive Incentive

Residential New Construction prescriptive incentives will continue to be provided for thermal enclosure systems, geothermal heating and cooling, high-efficiency HVAC, and high-efficiency domestic hot water systems. These incentives can be bundled with ENERGY STAR certification or the HERS incentive, but do not require the services of a HERS rater.

4.) Low Load Homes Incentive

The Companies will provide incentives for Low Load Homes to demonstrate methods and benefits of building homes that minimize peak load growth. This new track will involve moving builders and consumers beyond ENERGY STAR standards to the development of high-performing and near-zero energy homes. The Low Load Homes requirements will focus on reducing heat loss kWh per square foot.

In order to reduce costs and promote market competition, the program will continue to allow the free market of independent, certified HERS raters to participate in the program. In 2011 this process has continued to increase the cost-effectiveness of the program as builders and homeowners interested in obtaining a HERS rating have had to contribute to the cost of the rating. Home energy ratings are useful vehicles for builders to market their homes, but the ratings themselves do not generate energy savings. Because it is in the builder's best interest to have the rating performed, it is appropriate for the builder to be responsible for the rating's cost. Although the Electric and Natural Gas Companies do not subsidize the full cost of HERS ratings, tiered incentives are provided for homes that meet various levels of the ENERGY STAR HERS Index, rewarding those that achieve the greatest energy efficiency.

If available, federal and state tax credits, along with Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority (CEFIA) Solar PV, solar thermal rebate and geothermal rebate programs will be communicated to RNC participants.

⁸ ENERGY STAR web site, ENERGY STAR for Homes Version 3 Guidelines web page

Incentive Strategy:

The Electric and Natural Gas Companies will once again offer tiered incentives for homes that meet high-performance criteria based upon a HERS Index rating. The four incentive tracks available in 2012 are listed in the tables below:

Track 1: ENERGY STAR Certification Incentive

ENERGY STAR Certification Incentive Chart (Note 1 & 2)							
Tier	HERS Index	Single Family		Single Family Attached		Multi Family	
		Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive
Tier 1	74-65	\$500	\$100	\$375	\$100 (cap \$6,000/project)	\$250	\$100 (cap = \$5,000/project)
Tier 2	64-55	\$1,500	\$200	\$1,125	\$165 (cap \$7,250/project)	\$750	\$125 (cap = \$6,250/project)
Tier 3	54-45	\$2,500	\$300	\$1,500	\$230 (cap \$8,500/project)	\$1,000	\$150 (cap = \$7,500/project)
Tier 4	<45	\$3,000 + \$50/point below 45	\$400	\$2,000+\$40/point below 45	\$300 (cap \$9,950/project)	\$1,300+\$25/point below 45	\$175 (cap = \$8,750/project)

Track 2: Home Energy Rating System Incentive

Home Energy Rating System Incentive Chart (Note 1,2, 9)							
Tier	HERS Index	Single Family		Single Family Attached		Multi Family	
		Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive
Tier 1	74-65	\$250	\$50	\$200	\$75 (cap \$5,000/project)	\$150	\$25 (cap = \$3,000/project)
Tier 2	64-55	\$750	\$100	\$500	\$125 (cap \$6,250/project)	\$375	\$75 (cap = \$4,250/project)
Tier 3	54-45	\$1,500	\$200	\$1,125	\$150 (cap \$7,500/project)	\$700	\$125 (cap = \$5,500/project)
Tier 4	<45	\$2,000 + \$30/point below 45	\$300	\$1,500+\$20/point below 45	\$175 (cap \$8,750/project)	\$1,125+\$20/point below 45	\$175 (cap = \$6,750/project)

Track 3: RNC Prescriptive Incentives

Thermal Enclosure System (Note 1,3)	Thermal Enclosure System (Note 3)	\$0.50/square foot for above grade floor area for homes with gas or electric heat.
HVAC	ENERGY STAR (14.5 SEER 12 EER)	\$250 per system including ductless units
Water Heating (Note 1)	Energy Efficient Hot Water Heating	\$100 for ENERGY STAR natural gas instantaneous hot water with 0.82 efficiency and electronic ignition; \$100 for ENERGY STAR gas boiler with indirect hot water. \$400 for ENERGY STAR heat pump water heater and/or solar thermal in an all-electric home.
Geothermal (Note 4)	VIP Geothermal	\$500 per ton capped at \$1,500 per location for VIP systems that meet 2012 ENERGY STAR specifications.
Lights	ENERGY STAR Lighting	Required in 80 percent of qualifying sockets in homes that receive an ENERGY STAR or HERS rating incentive.
Appliances (Note 5)	ENERGY STAR Appliances	Required for clothes washer, dishwasher and refrigerator in any home that receives an ENERGY STAR or HERS incentive. A \$50 rebate will be paid for a TopTen refrigerator, washing machine or dishwasher (www.TopTenUsa.org)

Track 4: Low-Load Homes Incentive

Low-Load Homes Incentive Chart						
Requirements	Single Family		Single Family Attached		Multi Family	
	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive	Applicant Incentive	Rating Incentive
To Be Determined	\$2,000	\$200	\$2,000	\$200	\$2,000	\$200

Notes:

- The ENERGY STAR incentive and the HERS Incentive amounts are for homes with natural gas heat or homes with electric heat. Currently, full funding is not available for homes with fuel oil, propane or other heating systems. Therefore, for homes with fuel oil heat, propane heat (or other heat), the applicant incentives are 30 percent of the incentive amounts listed above. If funding for these homes becomes available, incentives will be paid at 100 percent. For homes with natural gas heat, 100 percent of the incentive for ENERGY STAR (including the rater incentive) and insulation incentive is allocated to the appropriate natural gas budget. Likewise, the water heating incentive is allocated to the appropriate natural gas or electric company. All other incentives including the 30 percent reduced Incentives for ENERGY STAR, HERS track, and insulation for fuel oil and propane heated homes will be allocated to the appropriate electric company. In situations where dual fuel heating or water heating systems are installed (e.g., geothermal system with natural gas back-up, electric heat pump with propane back-up), the incentive allocation is based on the estimated benefit associated with each fuel type.
- Homes must have a mechanical ventilation system installed to qualify for the ENERGY STAR or HERS Incentive. Homes looking to receive the ENERGY STAR certification incentive must meet all ENERGY STAR 3.0 Checklists and requirements including Thermal Enclosure System, HVAC System Quality Installation, and Water Management System. ENERGY STAR homes installing forced hot air HVAC systems are required to have an HVAC contractor that is credentialed through an EPA-recognized industry organization. The HERS Incentive homes must meet the Thermal Enclosure System Checklist.
- All insulation must meet Grade I standards as defined by RESNET. NO insulation batt products can qualify, except for approved hybrid options. In addition, walls must have at least R-21 insulation and ceilings must have at least R-40. Both walls and ceilings must qualify as whole system in order to receive rebate. Thermal Enclosure System rebates are based on above grade conditioned floor area and are capped at the following levels.
 - One bedroom home: \$960
 - Two bedroom homes: \$1,330
 - Three bedroom homes: \$1,695
 - Four bedroom homes: \$2,010
 - Five+ bedroom homes: \$2,195
- Homes must successfully meet the Energy Efficiency Fund's geothermal VIP requirements by having units operate at least 85 percent of their rated efficiency and capacity. Geothermal systems must meet 2012 ENERGY STAR requirements. Open loops are not eligible.
- The Electric Companies consider ENERGY STAR appliances to be the baseline and will not take credit for appliance savings in the RNC program.
- RNC program projects with residents on limited income will receive 125 percent of the incentives described above. Limited income is defined as individuals which are at 60 percent or below of the state's median income level.
- The Electric and Natural Gas Companies reserve the right to add additional rater incentives based on changing market conditions.
- RNC rebates and incentives noted above do not include any forthcoming ARRA limited-time rebates for appliances and HVAC equipment or CCEF funding for renewable energy.
- HERS Incentive Track follows the standards for ENERGY STAR ver. 2.5 and requires a certified HERS rater. All ENERGY STAR checklists must be submitted. Must have mechanical ventilation system installed. Must have ENERGY STAR lighting in 80 percent + of sockets. Homes with fuel oil heat, propane heat (or other heat), the applicant incentives are 30 percent of the incentive amounts listed.

Marketing Strategy:

The 2012 Residential New Construction program will continue to be promoted to prospective new homebuyers, builders, developers, and other market participants such as architects, building code officials, home energy raters, insulation contractors, real estate agents, real estate appraisers, and HVAC contractors, including geothermal installers. Ultimately, it will be the market leaders (builders and industry associations) that will drive participation in the RNC program. The marketing strategy will be based on getting them timely, relevant information. The messaging will include information on current technology/building trends and benefits and program details. Communication tactics may include:

- program seminars targeting builders using industry association lists as a base for participants;
- selected advertising in local and regional trade publications;
- submission of articles to local and regional trade publications and consumer publications (in print and on-line, which may be written in collaboration with builders);
- participation in consumer events such as home shows;
- participation in association events, including sponsorships, when appropriate;
- outreach to legislative audiences through their newsletters, forums, one-on-one meetings and public events;
- promotion of the RNC program through the media, and;
- any public relation marketing opportunities that the CT ZEC generates.

A marketing campaign will be explored in 2012 offering builders/developers a way to uniquely market ENERGY STAR homes to potential homebuyers. With homeowners extremely aware of the monthly expenses necessary to operate a home, the marketing campaign, tentatively called ENERGY STAR: New Home, No Bill, would offer an exciting way for homebuyers to see the value of an ENERGY STAR Home as soon as they move in. A homeowner that buys one of the homes under the ENERGY STAR: New Home, No Bill campaign would be able to move into the home and not pay an electric bill for one year. Over the course of a year, participants will receive their electric bill with no amount due, but showing their total usage, the actual costs incurred, and how they have performed in relation to similar homes in their demographic. Additionally, energy savings tips will be included each month to educate the homeowner on how to reduce their energy usage.

The campaign will be a pilot initially targeted to builders/developers/ building ENERGY STAR homes that have all electric heating and/or cooling. Fuel type may be expanded if successful.

The traditional structure of the RNC program is based on a homeowner or builder complying with program requirements and receiving an incentive check once the home is complete. Under the ENERGY STAR: New Home, No Bill campaign, builders/developers choosing to participate offer the

incentives in the form of a credit on the homebuyer's electric bill for one year. The electric utility bill credit will be offset by the incentive dollars that would otherwise have gone to the builder.

The goal of the campaign is threefold: one, to encourage participation in the RNC program; two, offer builders/developers an innovative marketing resources to help sell their ENERGY STAR homes; and three, for the homebuyer to have more direct participation in the Energy Efficiency Fund's RNC Program, instead of the Fund being solely behind the scene with the builder/developer.

With the new ENERGY STAR version 3.0 being launched in 2012, this campaign would offer homebuyers an exciting way to reap the benefits of their investment in an ENERGY STAR Home from the moment they move in.

Two key factors that have become increasingly important to today's homebuilders and homeowners are reducing their environmental impact and saving on the rising costs of energy. In pursuit of these goals, the inaugural CT Zero Energy Challenge (CT ZEC) was developed for 2010 and offered again in 2011 (see www.CTZeroEnergyChallenge.com). The CT ZEC has been a very successful demonstration project with participants reflecting a broad spectrum of designs, sizes and efficiency measures. Winners of the 2010 CT ZEC were announced in December, 2010, and many stories have appeared in many newspapers such as the Hartford Courant, The New Haven Register and The Day., and in several on-line publications. Additionally, many of the contestants have hosted open houses and media events at their building sites throughout construction. Based on the success of the CT ZEC Challenge, it will be offered again in 2012 and the same media strategy will be pursued in the new 2012 Challenge to help increase awareness of super-efficient homes.

New Program Issues:

The residential building code represents the minimum standard for new construction. While increasing code compliance is a critical component of this program, ENERGY STAR requirements represent a higher level of sustainability and long-term cost-effectiveness for consumers. During 2011, the current ENERGY STAR 2.0 framework began to shift to ENERGY STAR 3.0. The phase-in included a transitional period (ENERGY STAR 2.5) that is taking place in 2011. All homes that were permitted before April 1 and completed in 2011 can still qualify under version 2.0. All homes permitted after April 1, 2011 and completed in 2011 must comply with version 2.5. All homes with permit dates after January 1, 2012 must be qualified under Version 3. All homes with permit dates prior to January 1, 2012 must be qualified under Version 3 if the final inspection dates are after July 1, 2012. This revised program represents more stringent guidelines for the energy efficiency of new homes by addressing the control of air, thermal resistance, and moisture flow resulting in a more comfortable, durable, affordable, and healthy home. Detailed checklists (Thermal Enclosure System, HVAC System Quality Installation, HVAC System Quality Installation, and Water Management System) must be submitted to assure that program standards are being met. Participants can qualify for the full ENERGY STAR incentive if the project meets the 3.0 standards. To assist with the transition to the new 3.0 standards, lesser incentives will be offered for homes that meet the version 2.5 specifications under the HERS Incentive track.

With the housing market in a prolonged depression, the inventory of new homes and existing has increased. Therefore, it is imperative for builders and others involved in the home building industry to differentiate their products from the multitudes that do not incorporate the latest energy-saving technologies. Homes built to increased energy-efficiency standards are proving to be more attractive to prospective homebuyers since they not only help the environment, but can provide their owners the benefit of substantially reduced energy bills. Participation in the new ENERGY STAR program can thus encourage new home sales as well as helping promote energy efficiency.

While these revised standards are beneficial to the mission of greater energy efficiency and sustainability, they are stringent and challenging and may cause some builders to drop out of the ENERGY STAR program. The Companies anticipated this development and presented a series of training seminars through 2011 designed at making compliance to the new standards easier.

In addition to preparing the building industry for ENERGY STAR version 3.0 standards, for 2012 the Companies will work with the industry as it prepares for the adoption of 2009 IECC, which is estimated to take place in mid 2012.

2009 IECC major code changes include the following:

- Building air tightness must be demonstrated through testing procedures or verified with rigorous inspections.
- Programmable thermostats are required for forced-air heating systems.
- Duct systems are required to be tested for leakage, unless they are within conditioned space.
- Minimum floor insulation has been increased to R-38.
- Minimum basement wall insulation has been increased to R-19.
- At least 50% of all light fixtures in a residence must have a high-efficacy lamp.

40 lum/W	<=15W
50 lum/W	15W-40W
60 lum/W	>40W

The new duct testing requirement is a momentous step for the building code and it is anticipated building officials will need to rely on HERS raters in order to effectively enforce this aspect of the code.

The Companies will also help prepare the markets and support adoption of IECC 2012, which is expected to be introduced in 2012, and will require air leakage testing of all new homes as well as 75% efficient lighting.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Residential New Construction

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 94	\$ 108	\$ 200	\$ 87	\$ 197	\$ 174	\$ 174
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 14	\$ -	\$ 1	\$ 2	\$ 28	\$ 28
Total labor	\$ 94	\$ 122	\$ 200	\$ 88	\$ 199	\$ 202	\$ 202
Materials & Supplies	\$ 0	\$ 3	\$ 3	\$ 1	\$ 3	\$ 3	\$ 3
Outside Services	\$ (4)	\$ (4)	\$ 150	\$ 6	\$ 147	\$ 35	\$ 35
Incentives	\$ 363	\$ 864	\$ 1,059	\$ 595	\$ 1,041	\$ 981 a)	\$ 975
Marketing	\$ 24	\$ 38	\$ 40	\$ 8	\$ 25	\$ 35 b)	\$ 35
Administrative Expenses	\$ 7	\$ 6	\$ 8	\$ 2	\$ 8	\$ 5	\$ 5
Other	\$ 10	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ 6	\$ 12	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 494	\$ 1,034	\$ 1,460	\$ 706	\$ 1,436	\$ 1,261	\$ 1,254

a) Incentives Includes payments to builders and raters as well as incentives for home certification, insulation, geothermal commissioning, HVAC (including water), and lighting.

b) Marketing includes development and printing of an RNC brochure, sponsorship of various events and conferences including home shows, the Zero Energy Challenge (website and awards), promotional signs including lawn signs for RNC and Zero Energy participants, and additional incentives as necessary.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	356.4
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	1,718,002
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	29,900,570
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.734
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.042
Electric b/c Ratio	1.84
Total Resource b/c Ratio	1.99

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Residential New Construction

Year	Budget	Program Costs		Cost/participant	\$/LT-kWh
		Actual	% of Budget		
2000	\$ 1,744,000	\$ 1,508,000	86%	\$1,797	0.068
2001	\$ 1,315,000	\$ 1,283,000	98%	\$3,534	0.081
2002	\$ 1,400,000	\$ 1,275,000	91%	\$2,087	0.027
2003	\$ 1,655,000	\$ 1,115,726	67%	\$1,622	0.051
2004	\$ 900,000	\$ 767,514	85%	\$1,089	0.084
2005 Revised	\$ 1,320,429	\$ 1,187,496	90%	\$1,197	0.035
2006 Budget	\$ 1,769,000	\$ 1,688,185	95%	\$1,310	0.039
2007 Revised	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 1,414,189	83%	\$2,050	0.073
2008 Revised	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 1,563,639	95%	\$2,451	0.079
2009 Revised	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 494,394	37%	\$921	0.039
2010 Revised	\$ 2,499,625	\$ 1,034,433	41%	\$1,713	0.041
2011 Revised	\$ 1,460,024	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 705,716	48%	\$2,663	0.045
2011 Y/E Project	n/a	\$ 1,435,516	98%	\$2,709	0.054
2012	\$ 1,261,050	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	Goal - No. of New Homes Built to Standard		
	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
	686	839	122%
2001	734	363	49%
2002	605	611	101%
2003	1,005	688	68.5%
2004	600	705	117.5%
2005 Revised	932	992	106.4%
2006 Revised	1,421	1289	90.7%
2007 Revised	1,546	690	44.6%
2008 Revised	1,255	638	50.8%
2009 Revised	752	537	71.4%
2010 Revised	964	604	62.6%
2011 Revised	609	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	265	43.5%
2011 Y/E Project	609	530	87.0%
2012	499	n/a	n/a

Year	Goal - Lifetime MWh savings			Goal - Installed kW Savings			
	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	54,082	22,226	41%	2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	24,924	11,091	44%	2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	27,799	33,911	122%	2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	12,969	21,782	82%	2003	229	476	207.9%
2004	10,891	9,114	83.7%	2004	343	268	78.1%
2005 Revised	17,985	34,399	191.3%	2005	687	1,885	274.4%
2006 Revised	16,468	43,764	265.8%	2006 Budget	682	2,225	326.3%
2007 Revised	19,791	19,431	98.2%	2007 Revised	544	505	92.8%
2008 Revised	27,494	19,910	72.4%	2008 Revised	1,158	521	45.0%
2009 Revised	24,648	12,656	51.3%	2009 Revised	596	256	42.9%
2010 Revised	37,543	25,469	67.8%	2010 Revised	482	339	70.3%
2011 Revised	26,507	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	584	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	15,685	59.2%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	186	31.9%
2011 Y/E Project	26,507	26,660	100.6%	1 Y/E Projected	584	428	73.3%
2012	29,901	n/a	n/a	2012	356	n/a	n/a

Year	Program Ratios			
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.032	0.068	n/a	5470
2001	0.031	0.081	n/a	5359
2002	0.030	0.027	n/a	2012
2003	0.093	0.051	4,814	2,345
2004	0.083	0.084	2,627	2,862
2005 Revised	0.073	0.035	1,922	630
2006 Revised	0.107	0.039	2,594	759
2007 Revised	0.086	0.073	3,125	2,800
2008 Revised	0.060	0.079	1,425	2,999
2009 Revised	0.055	0.039	2,264	1,932
2010 Revised	0.067	0.041	5,187	3,051
2011 Revised	0.055	n/a	2,500	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.045	n/a	3,785
2011 Y/E Project	n/a	0.054	n/a	3,352
2012	0.042	n/a	3,538	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Residential New Construction

Budget/FTE

1.3 FTE for program administration, vendor interaction, sales and field support

Goal

499 Homes completed

Cost/Unit

\$2,529 Average cost

Goal Setting Methodology

Reflects shift
Average cost

Metric Changes

Program focus will move towards high performing "zero energy" homes.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Residential New Construction

Baseline Assumptions:

Budget Projections	Residential new construction					
	2010 Act	2011 Revised Bud	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Bud	2013 Bud
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 57,658	\$ 72,166	\$ 37,207	\$ 72,166	\$ 58,166 a)	\$ 61,074
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - b)	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 57,658	\$ 72,166	\$ 37,207	\$ 72,166	\$ 58,166	\$ 61,074
Materials & Supplies	\$ 368	\$ 2,500	\$ 250	\$ 2,500	\$ 1,500 c)	\$ 1,500
Outside Services	\$ 14,188	\$ 10,000	\$ 1,363	\$ 10,000	\$ 7,500 d)	\$ 7,500
Incentives	\$ 82,087	\$ 100,757	\$ 76,884	\$ 100,757	\$ 92,663 e)	\$ 88,650
Marketing	\$ 12,557	\$ 25,000	\$ 12,755	\$ 25,000	\$ 15,000 f)	\$ 15,000
Other	\$ 2,211	\$ -	\$ 760	\$ 760	\$ - g)	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 7,135	\$ 5,017	\$ (1,165)	\$ 4,257	\$ 2,500 h)	\$ 2,500
Total	\$ 176,204	\$ 215,440	\$ 128,054	\$ 215,440	\$ 177,329	\$ 176,224

- a) .60 FTEs
- b) No comment
- c) Printing of program forms and supplies
- d) Technical assistance for 113 homes
- e) Efficiency measure upgrades for 113 homes
- f) General awareness program marketing, Zero Energy Homes Challenge, builder co-op advertising
- g) No comment
- h) Meals, miles, travel and training

Goals and Metrics Information:

	2012
Savings	
Demand Savings (kW)	103
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	241,509
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	2,941,285
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.734
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.060
Cost per kW	\$ 1,722
Electric System B/C Ratio	1.97
Total Resource B/C Ratio	1.31

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Residential New Construction

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	\$359	\$513	142.9%
2001	\$536	\$497	92.7%
2002	\$424	\$520	122.6%
2003	\$523	\$357	68.3%
2004	\$541	\$606	112.0%
2005	\$841	\$1,140	135.6%
2006	\$644	\$375	58.2%
2007	\$396	\$153	38.6%
2008	\$396	\$440	111.1%
2009	\$442	\$198	44.8%
2010	\$356	\$176	49.4%
2011	\$215		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$215	\$128	59.6%
2011 YE Projected	\$215	\$215	100.2%
2012	\$177		

Goal - Number of Homes

Year	Goal No of Units	Actuals	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	100	110	110.0%
2001	127	127	100.0%
2002	106	141	133.0%
2003	120	276	230.0%
2004	400	407	101.8%
2005	500	548	109.6%
2006	500	613	122.6%
2007	300	425	141.7%
2008	300	300	100.0%
2009	219	23	10.5%
2010	91	46	50.5%
2011	86		
2011 YTD (Jun)	86	-	0.0%
2011 YE Projected	86	86	100.0%
2012	113		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	202	226	111.9%
2001	208	208	100.0%
2002	174	230	132.2%
2003	108	297	275.0%
2004	378	385	101.9%
2005	757	1,038	137.1%
2006	588	1,038	176.5%
2007	513	1,672	325.9%
2008	550	801	145.6%
2009	643	62	9.6%
2010	281	123	43.8%
2011	313		
2011 YTD (Jun)	313	-	0.0%
2011 YE Projected	313	313	100.0%
2012	242		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	23	25	108.7%
2004	170	173	101.8%
2005	318	212	66.7%
2006	175	231	131.9%
2007	210	290	138.1%
2008	196	267	136.2%
2009	138	31	22.5%
2010	71	52	73.2%
2011	89		
2011 YTD (Jun)	89	-	0.0%
2011 YE Projected	89	89	100.0%
2012	103		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	3,365	3,753	111.5%
2001	4,338	4,338	100.0%
2002	3,816	5,044	132.2%
2003	2,029	5,940	292.8%
2004	7,283	7,412	101.8%
2005	9,435	11,241	119.1%
2006	7,994	15,812	197.8%
2007	6,593	23,327	353.8%
2008	4,950	12,628	255.1%
2009	8,548	884	10.3%
2010	4,283	1,542	36.0%
2011	3,993		
2011 YTD (Jun)	3,993	-	0.0%
2011 YE Projected	3,993	3,993	100.0%
2012	2,941		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh Target	Actual	\$/LT kWh		\$/kW Target	Actual	Cost/Home
			Target	Actual			
2000	\$1.777	\$2.270	\$0.107	\$0.137	\$0	\$0	\$4,664
2001	\$2.577	\$2.389	\$0.124	\$0.115	\$0	\$0	\$3,913
2002	\$2.437	\$2.261	\$0.111	\$0.103	\$0	\$0	\$3,688
2003	\$4.843	\$1.202	\$0.258	\$0.060	\$22,739	\$14,280	\$1,293
2004	\$1.431	\$1.574	\$0.074	\$0.082	\$3,182	\$3,503	\$1,489
2005	\$1.111	\$1.098	\$0.089	\$0.101	\$2,645	\$5,377	\$2,080
2006	\$1.095	\$0.361	\$0.081	\$0.024	\$3,680	\$1,625	\$612
2007	\$0.772	\$0.092	\$0.060	\$0.007	\$1,886	\$528	\$360
2008	\$0.720	\$0.549	\$0.080	\$0.035	\$2,020	\$1,648	\$1,467
2009	\$0.687	\$3.194	\$0.052	\$0.224	\$3,203	\$6,387	\$8,609
2010	\$1.267	\$1.431	\$0.083	\$0.114	\$5,014	\$3,385	\$3,826
2011	\$0.687		\$0.054		\$2,416		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.687		\$0.054		\$2,416		
2011 YE Projected	\$0.687	\$0.688	\$0.054	\$0.054	\$2,416	\$2,421	\$2,505
2012	\$0.734		\$0.060		\$1,722		

The United Illuminating Company

LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - Residential New Construction

Budget/FTE:

2012 UI Labor .60 FTE includes field support, and data/financial administration
Reduced CEEF financial contribution to HERS rating lowering program costs
Decrease in incentives for CAC due to cost effectiveness

Goal:

113 unit goal reflects program changes and current economic downturn
Continue to promote Zero Energy Homes Challenge to support higher performing homes

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

Cost rates increase as production is reduced and concentration on higher performance homes.
Increase UI labor, and revised measure mix
113 unit goal is driven by available budget economic environment

Goal Setting Methodology:

Emphasis is on participation and the install of high performance measures with specific interest in ENERGY STAR Version 3.0, focus on Homes and building shell/envelope measures, HVAC, HVAC QIV, ductwork and domestic hot water heaters - Heat Pump Water Heaters, High Efficient Natural Gas and Solar Thermal

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Residential New Construction

<u>Budget Projections</u>	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 15,195	\$ 9,864	\$ 34,580	\$ 2,495	\$ 4,990	\$ 34,580
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 27,157	\$ 2,419	\$ 76,150	\$ 1,308	\$ 54,138	\$ 6,150
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 9	\$ 9	\$ 1,200	\$ 20	\$ 43	\$ 1,625
Incentives	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 267,049	\$ 422,541	\$ 372,570	\$ 83,252	\$ 619,912	\$ 442,145
Marketing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 4,379	\$ 3,173	\$ 11,500	\$ 464	\$ 983	\$ 11,500
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 729	\$ 1,892	\$ 4,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000
Total				\$ 314,517	\$ 439,898	\$ 500,000	\$ 87,539	\$ 680,066	\$ 500,000

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goal	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	31,287	41,991	41,170	10,318	80,158	43,996
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	782,194	1,049,784	1,029,259	257,950	2,003,943	1,099,892
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 10.05	\$ 10.48	\$ 12.14	\$ 8.48	\$ 8.48	\$ 11.36
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.42	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.45
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 684,673	\$ 1,107,077	\$ 790,643	\$ 198,149	\$ 1,539,363	\$ 519,877
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.18	\$ 2.52	\$ 1.58	2.26	2.26	\$ 1.04
Homes Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	326	206	95	44	342	224
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,399	5,096	10,834	5,863	5,863	4,904
Program Cost per Home	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 965	\$ 2,135	\$ 5,263	\$ 1,990	\$ 1,990	\$ 2,229
Benefit per Home	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,100	\$ 5,374	\$ 8,323	\$ 4,503	\$ 4,503	\$ 2,318

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	\$ 250,000	\$ 314,517	126%
2010	\$ 250,000	\$ 439,898	176%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 500,000	\$ 87,539	18%
2011 YE projection	\$ 500,000	\$ 680,066	136%
2012	\$ 500,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	150	326	217%
2010	101	206	204%
2011 YTD (June)	95	44	46%
2011 YE projection	95	342	360%
2012	224	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	37,800	31,287	83%
2010	30,194	41,991	139%
2011 YTD (June)	41,170	10,318	25%
2011 YE projection	41,170	80,158	195%
2012	43,996	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	945,000	782,194	83%
2010	754,853	1,049,784	139%
2011 YTD (June)	1,029,259	257,950	25%
2011 YE projection	1,029,259	2,003,943	195%
2012	1,099,892	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Residential New Construction

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Budget	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 14,856	\$ 8,465	\$ 33,250	\$ 1,015	\$ 33,250	\$ 33,250	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 258	\$ 2,347	\$ 53,305	\$ 1,270	\$ 53,305	\$ 53,305	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 840	\$ 15	\$ 840	\$ 840	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 158,889	\$ 409,069	\$ 251,545	\$ 230,642	\$ 263,342	\$ 251,545	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 4,361	\$ 1,839	\$ 8,260	\$ 396	\$ 8,260	\$ 8,260	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 583	\$ 317	\$ 2,800	\$ -	\$ 2,800	\$ 2,800	
Total				\$ 178,946	\$ 422,046	\$ 350,000	\$ 233,338	\$ 361,797	\$ 350,000	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Goals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	27,705	39,202	27,797	14,389	22,311	29,480	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	692,626	980,060	694,916	359,716	557,750	736,990	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 6.46	\$ 10.77	\$ 12.59	\$ 16.22	\$ 16.22	\$ 11.87	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.26	\$ 0.43	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.65	\$ 0.47	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 606,272	\$ 1,033,548	\$ 533,812	\$ 276,322	\$ 428,445	\$ 354,593	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 3.39	\$ 2.45	\$ 1.53	\$ 1.18	\$ 1.18	\$ 1.01	g=f/a
Homes Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	116	152	64	117	181	107	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	5,971	6,448	10,858	3,074	3,074	6,888	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,543	\$ 2,777	\$ 5,469	\$ 1,994	\$ 1,994	\$ 3,271	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,226	\$ 6,800	\$ 8,341	\$ 2,362	\$ 2,362	\$ 3,314	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	\$ 250,000	\$ 178,946	72%
2010	\$ 250,000	\$ 422,046	169%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 350,000	\$ 233,338	67%
2011 YE projection	\$ 350,000	\$ 361,797	103%
2012	\$ 350,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	150	116	77%
2010	101	152	150%
2011 YTD (June)	64	117	183%
2011 YE projection	64	181	283%
2012	107	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	37,800	27,705	73%
2010	30,194	39,202	130%
2011 YTD (June)	27,797	14,389	52%
2011 YE projection	27,797	22,311	80%
2012	29,480	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	945,000	692,626	73%
2010	754,853	980,060	130%
2011 YTD (June)	694,916	359,716	52%
2011 YE projection	694,916	557,750	80%
2012	736,990	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Residential New Construction

<u>Budget Projections</u>	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 9,864	\$ 5,842	\$ 33,250	\$ 1,131	\$ 7,131	\$ 33,250	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 178	\$ 2,205	\$ 45,690	\$ 1,202	\$ 7,202	\$ 45,690	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 720	\$ 15	\$ 720	\$ 720	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 174,098	\$ 84,790	\$ 210,860	\$ 197,295	\$ 220,095	\$ 210,860	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,371	\$ 1,336	\$ 7,080	\$ 266	\$ 7,080	\$ 7,080	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 401	\$ 152	\$ 2,400	\$ -	\$ 2,400	\$ 2,400	
Total				\$ 187,911	\$ 94,334	\$ 300,000	\$ 199,909	\$ 244,628	\$ 300,000	a

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	20,308	9,381	23,301	1,212	1,483	24,796	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	507,718	234,532	582,520	30,300	37,078	619,898	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 9.25	\$ 10.06	\$ 12.87	\$ 164.94	\$ 164.94	\$ 12.10	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.37	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.52	\$ 6.60	\$ 6.60	\$ 0.48	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 444,418	\$ 247,332	\$ 447,473	\$ 23,275	\$ 28,482	\$ 298,256	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.37	\$ 2.62	\$ 1.49	\$ 0.12	\$ 0.12	\$ 0.99	g=f/a
Homes Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	71	32	54	2	2	90	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	7,151	7,329	10,787	15,150	15,150	6,888	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,647	\$ 2,948	\$ 5,556	\$ 99,955	\$ 99,955	\$ 3,333	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 6,259	\$ 7,729	\$ 8,287	\$ 11,638	\$ 11,638	\$ 3,314	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	\$ 250,000	\$ 187,911	75%
2010	\$ 250,000	\$ 94,334	38%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 300,000	\$ 199,909	67%
2011 YE projection	\$ 300,000	\$ 244,628	82%
2012	\$ 300,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	150	71	47%
2010	101	32	32%
2011 YTD (June)	54	2	4%
2011 YE projection	54	2	5%
2012	90	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	37,800	20,308	54%
2010	30,194	9,381	31%
2011 YTD (June)	23,301	1,212	5%
2011 YE projection	23,301	1,483	6%
2012	24,796	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	945,000	507,718	54%
2010	754,853	234,532	31%
2011 YTD (June)	582,520	30,300	5%
2011 YE projection	582,520	37,078	6%
2012	619,898	n/a	-

This page intentionally blank

Home Energy Solutions (Electric and Natural Gas)

Objective:

Home Energy Solutions (“HES”) is the flagship residential retrofit program serving all existing residential structures including single and multi-family properties. The objective of the HES program is to reduce total residential energy use through the comprehensive treatment of all single-family and multi-family residential dwellings. HES will be the primary vehicle which will be used to fulfill the State of Connecticut’s goal of weatherizing 80 percent of existing homes by 2030 per Public Act No.11-80, Section 33.

Beginning in 2011, the existing limited income programs (formerly called WRAP and UI Helps) were combined under the Home Energy Solutions program umbrella. The Home Energy Solutions Income Eligible tract (“HES-IE”) serves customer who are at or below sixty (60) percent of the state’s median income. Also, the stand-alone Heating Ventilation and Cooling (“HVAC”) and retrofit geothermal equipment and HVAC Quality Installation and Verification (“QIV”) rebates are included under HES. This makes HES an inclusive program to provide comprehensive weatherization and energy efficiency services to all existing residential customers regardless of income.

Target Market:

The target market for HES is all residential customers including single and multi-family properties. Eligible electric and natural gas customers will typically have either electric or natural gas space heat. The Companies may establish high energy-use criteria based on normalized energy usage in order to target high-use customers and maximize cost effective savings.

Program History: (HES)

The Home Energy Solutions Program as it is known today began in 2006 as the Electric Distribution Companies’ Energy Efficiency Fund conservation duct sealing pilot. Later that year, the three natural gas companies (Yankee Gas, Connecticut Natural Gas, and Southern Connecticut Gas) began implementing the General Weatherization Program (“GWP”) in conjunction with the electric duct sealing pilot to provide customers a one stop shop approach for comprehensive duct sealing, weatherization and other energy saving measures. In 2006, more than 2,000 customers were served through these combined efforts.

In 2007, HES continued to evolve serving over 5,200 customers and received national recognition by the American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (“ACEEE”).

In 2008, the Companies developed formal training and vendor certification, (Building Performance Institute Building Analyst I), and introduced outside financing into the program to encourage homeowners to take more comprehensive efficiency measures.

In 2008, the Department of Public Utility Control (now known as PURA), established a formal HES Working Group consisting of representatives from the participating utilities, HES vendors, the EEB, and other interested parties.⁹ The working group first met on February 24, 2009. During this initial meeting, the group developed a mission statement: *minimizing total energy consumption and peak demand by maximizing energy efficiency in residential structures*. By 2009 the program had grown to 19 vendors with over 200 technicians serving customers.

In early 2009, President Barack Obama and the U.S. Congress passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (“ARRA”) which, in part, provided federal stimulus dollars to States that initiate energy conservation programs to benefit customers. Through the State Energy Program (“SEP”), the Department of Energy made ARRA funding available to the Connecticut Office of Policy and Management (“CT-OPM”) to support existing Fund programs administered by the Electric and Natural Gas Companies. These funds were granted to the Electric Companies and have been used for the Home Energy Solutions program. For Home Energy Solutions, ARRA funds have allowed fuel oil and propane-heated homes to participate in the program for the same \$75 co-pay and receive the same level of core services that the Electric and Natural Gas Companies’ customers receive. From December 2009 - December 2010 the Companies have been able to allocate over \$6.0 million of these funds into fossil fuel homes. In 2011 the Companies received another \$2.4 million to perform energy efficiency services in oil and propane heated homes through Home Energy Solutions.

In late 2010, a Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued to select vendors for the 2011 HES program. The RFP set minimum qualification criteria including cost for services, technical certifications, state licensure, registration with the Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection as a Home Improvement Contractor, mandatory equipment to be used in customer homes, network of third party contractors to implement energy efficiency measures, back office infrastructure and overall experience. There were 48 vendor responses and 26 companies selected to serve in the 2011 program. It is estimated that over 300 jobs in Connecticut are directly attributed to the HES Program while there are numerous sub-contractors in the HVAC, insulation, and home improvement trades that benefit from the HES program by performing energy efficiency upgrades. Therefore, HES continues to provide both energy savings to customers as well as economic development through job creation and retention throughout Connecticut.

Program History (HES-IE):

For over twenty years the EDCs and LDCs have offered energy efficiency services to limited income customers who heat their homes with electric or natural gas. Early services included weatherization and appliance replacement (refrigerators and room air conditioners). The Energy Efficiency Fund program coordinates with and leverages funds received by the state of Connecticut from the U.S. Department of Energy’s Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP).

⁹ Docket No. 08-10-03. DPUC Review of the Connecticut Light and Power Company and The United Illuminating Company’s Conservation and Load Management Plan.

In 2009 the state of Connecticut received \$65 million in ARRA Funds to support the state's WAP efforts. This influx of funds increased weatherization funds allocated for limited income residents twelve (12) fold. The \$65 million has an end spending date of March 2012. The Companies, in conjunction with the Community Action Agencies (CAA), Connecticut's Department of Social Services and DEEP have worked cooperatively to ensure that these federally allocated funds are spent on the most cost-effective measures and serve as many Connecticut residents as possible.

Through this effort the Companies have worked with the U.S. Department of Energy to have ductless split heat pumps as an approved technology supported by ARRA and the Energy Efficiency Fund to have more than 3,000 ductless split heat pumps installed in all electric heated residential dwellings. Promoting and installing this technology benefits Connecticut's limited income residents the most by reducing energy usage and making their homes more comfortable.

Additionally, the Companies have worked closely with Department of Social Services to ensure that the ARRA funds are spent as they are intended. Efforts include establishing appropriate level of cost sharing between the ARRA funds and the Energy Efficiency Fund. The Companies have provided customer leads, technical services and cost analysis to the CAAs to ensure the timely and appropriate expenditure of ARRA funds.

The HES-IE component of the program may be targeted to customers with the following criteria: (a) income that is at or below sixty (60) percent of the state median income, (b) energy burden (percent of total annual income spent on energy) that is high, (c) have not received energy conservation services in the prior eighteen (18) months, and (d) target customers who reside within Community Reinvestment Act areas and their eligible census tracts. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies can also target financially challenged customers facing other issues that may interfere with their ability to take advantage of conservation services. Examples of these customers include group living settings such as residential treatment facilities, group homes, halfway houses, disabled veterans groups, not for profit agencies who offer housing to disadvantaged residents and shelters.

The objectives of the Electric and Natural Gas Companies' income-eligible program is to provide comprehensive weatherization, energy conservation and education services to limited-income customers in order to reduce their energy burden; to make utility bills more affordable and homes more energy-efficient and comfortable; and to provide energy efficiency education to raise customer awareness of conservation and to encourage those customers to take behavioral and other steps beyond weatherization.

The Electric and Natural Gas Companies coordinate their program services to limited-income communities through their vendor network and/or the local CAA. This coordination enables the Electric and Natural Gas Companies to provide comprehensive services and maximize outreach to serve more families and has recently been recognized by the U.S. Department of Energy as a strong model of program delivery.

Program Description:

a) Core Services

The largest component of HES is the “Core Services” or “In-Home Services”. The objective of Core Services is to identify comprehensive cost effective energy conservation opportunities in single family homes and educate and communicate these opportunities to the homeowner. HES does so by providing initial diagnostic testing and evaluation of homes. In addition to testing and evaluation services, cost-effective measures including blower door guided air sealing, duct sealing, installation of CFLs, domestic hot water measures, and pipe insulation are installed as part of Core Services.

The following is a summary of HES and HES-IE Core Services measures that are provided:

- Blower door guided air sealing
 - A blower door test is a diagnostic tool that measures the amount of air infiltration or “draftiness” of a home. The test produces a partial vacuum in the house and measures the number of cubic feet per minute (“CFM”) leakage. The vacuum helps locate air leakage sites that may be sealed during the HES visit. A “before” and “after” reading is used to measure the total reduction in leakage in homes. The reduction in leakage translates directly to energy savings.
- Duct sealing
 - An Air flow test or heat rise test is performed to determine if it is appropriate to seal ducts based on the system air flow. If appropriate, a fan called a “ductblaster” is used to measure the amount of air leaks through the duct system that can be sealed with UL-rated adhesive products. Similar to the blower door, “before” and “after” measurements are taken to quantify the leakage reduction.
 - As Duct Sealing is required in both HES and HES-IE the Community Action Agencies (CAA) that perform WAP and HES-IE services do not perform Duct Sealing. The Companies will require duct sealing by the CAAs in 2012.
- Installation of CFL bulbs per HES guidelines and approved by customer
 - Currently, HES allows the installation of up to 10 common CFL bulbs and 15 specialty bulbs. For HES-IE, CFL bulbs are installed in all available sockets.
- Installation of water measures (low flow showerheads and aerators)
- Installation of pipe insulation for hot water piping
- An important part of the Core Services visit for both HES and HES-IE customers is the educational information provided to customers during the part of the visit called the Kitchen Table Wrap-up. Participants are presented with a “toolkit” that includes information such as conservation tips, CFL disposal, renewable energy opportunities, internet resources, etc.

- As part of HES core services, customers are provided rebates on various add-on measures including rebates for HVAC and appliance replacement, insulation, and window upgrades. (See rebate tables)
- Customers that qualify for HES-IE do not receive rebates, but may qualify for additional measures including insulation, refrigerator replacement, dehumidifiers, ductless split heat pumps and heat pump water heaters. These energy efficient measures are generally provided at no cost to customers however there may be some customer contribution required in some cases in order to maintain program cost effectiveness.

b.) Add-On Measures

- During the kitchen table wrap-up, opportunities for savings beyond HES Core Services are identified by the technician and communicated to the customer. In 2010, the Companies enhanced the wrap-up experience for HES with the creation of a Home Energy Yardstick (HEY) tool. The tool provides payback and investment information to customers to help them make decisions on purchasing and implementing additional energy efficiency and conservation measures, including insulation upgrades, HVAC replacements, window replacements and appliance upgrades.
- Fund subsidized low-interest financing with on-the-bill repayment is also available to HES customers to help encourage the investment of various energy efficient improvements recommended but not included in the core services. (See Chapter 5 for details.)

c.) HVAC (Heating, Ventilating and Air Conditioning)

The heating and cooling system efficiency component of HES provides incentives to increase heating and air conditioning equipment efficiency and to improve system installation quality. Induced replacement, i.e., retirement of older, inefficient equipment is a key market strategy. Proper performance and efficiency of central air conditioners and heat pumps is linked directly to the design and installation of the system.

The Companies offer a Residential Quality Installation Verification (“QIV”) through the HES-HVAC program which is a requirement for HES financing of HVAC measures. The residential QIV of ducted air conditioning, heat pump and natural gas furnace installations offers a financial incentive for the commissioning and documentation of performance through field testing. The QIV component is based upon the ACCA¹⁰ Standard 9 HVAC Quality Installation Verification Protocols. This standard establishes minimum requirements for verifying that residential and light commercial HVAC systems meet the ANSI¹¹/ ACCA 5 QI - 2010 (HVAC Quality Installation Specification) standard. The ACCA Standard 5 details minimum criteria for the correct installation of HVAC equipment.

¹⁰ Air Conditioner Contractors of America

¹¹ American National Standards Institute

The QIV offering focuses on the proper design and installation of HVAC systems. The required process addresses equipment sizing, ductwork and refrigerant charge. QIV is a commissioning process that begins with system design verification and ends when installed systems are tested and verified to match provided HVAC system plans. The passing QIV certificate, all records pertaining to the HVAC system installation, operation and maintenance records, “as -built” documents, manufacturers’ technical documents and warranties must be provided. In order for customers to receive financing through EEF for HVAC systems QIV is mandatory. Contractors receive training and site assistance for performing QIV and are listed on the companies’ websites. Training of the HVAC trades is a critical measure in the development of the QIV program in Connecticut.

The Residential Geothermal Verification of Installed Performance (VIP) for ground source heat pump (“GSHP”) installations offers a financial incentive for commissioning and documentation of performance through field testing. Customers installing geothermal systems will be required to participate in either the Residential New Construction Program or HES (or have a comparable energy assessment service to ensure that all cost-effective shell upgrades are made prior to the geothermal installation).

The Residential Ductless Heat Pump (“DHP”) initiative promotes the replacement of residential electric heat with ductless heat pumps. DHPs utilize an efficient technology that can be used as a cost effective heating and cooling option in a variety of residential situations. They have an impressive track record in Japan and to a lesser degree in small commercial application in the United States. Technological enhancements have greatly improved the efficiency of DHPs through the use of inverter technology. Inverter technology allows systems to run at more efficient partial load conditions rather than cycling on and off. Much like an automobile, constant speed operation of heat pumps is more efficient than “stop and go” operation. As a result of the inverter technology, DHPs are typically 10 to 30 percent more efficient than standard heat pumps. The Ductless Heat Pump Initiative fosters awareness and adoption of ductless heat pumps as a measure to reduce energy consumption. Qualified residential customers will receive a financial incentive for having a ductless heat pump installed by an approved contractor. A higher incentive is available for a home which utilizes electric resistive baseboard or heat panels as its heating source. A lower incentive will be available to other installations including, but not limited to, those in fossil fuel homes, basement remodels, and additions. The program contains a strong educational component which provides training assistance to HVAC contractors. In addition, participating customers are provided support to ensure that they understand the operating characteristics of Ductless Split Heat Pumps and routine maintenance procedures.

d.) Multi-Family Initiative (“MF”)

The Multi-Family initiative captures measures and savings that are currently being provided under various C&LM offerings but not clearly identified as MF projects. The MF initiative serves any type of multi-family property including assisted living facilities, dorms, group homes, apartment complexes high-rise dwellings and mixed-use developments.

The Companies will continue to expand its services available to MF projects by specifically inserting a MF aspect into current program offerings. To the extent possible, the initiative will utilize existing gas and electric C&LM programs including commercial and industrial offerings. MF Initiative removes barriers and offers customers a “one-stop” approach by having a single Program Administrator (“PA”) serve as the primary contact for customers to help facilitate the process and package the project making participation seamless.

In addition, other state and federal programs will be leveraged wherever possible. These may include other rebate programs such as State or Clean Energy Fund offerings, or local or federal tax credits.

e.) Consumer Financing

HES provides attractive third-party consumer financing for energy improvement projects recommended and/or offered through HES. In addition to the Energy Conservation Loan program offered through CHIF, the Companies, through a competitive bid process, sought out other financing mechanisms for residential consumers. A Residential Financing Pilot program was initiated on June 1, 2010 and continued through May 31, 2011. The pilot program offered loans at attractive below market interest rates. The pilot also allowed The Companies to engage the customer and contractor/vendor in a new way by helping reduce a barrier to deeper energy efficiency. The Residential Financing Pilot successfully funded loans to over 1,250 loans funded and over \$14.5 million in energy efficiency home improvements.

Although the pilot was successful, the Companies, in conjunction with the EEB, sought alternative financing models to reduce the costs to the Fund. On June 1, 2011 The Companies began an expanded relationship with CHIF to offer a residential financing program in place of the Residential Financing Pilot program. This program will offer cost-effective financing for specific energy efficiency measures. This program will be one of the first in the nation to offer on bill repayment of energy efficiency measures for residential customers.

CL&P’s new residential loan program is administered by CHIF and the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Finance Company (“CEEFCE”), a 501 (c)(3) Special Purpose Entity set up to administer the loan program and leverage Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund monies. UI’s residential loan program is administered by CHIF and funded by UI capital.

To qualify for the subsidized interest rates and obtain a loan, a customer must participate in the HES program through an Energy Efficiency Fund-approved HES contractor. All measures or equipment financed must meet energy efficiency criteria including the HES participation criteria.

For more information on the financing programs, please refer to Financing in Chapter 5.

f.) Home Performance with ENERGY STAR®

In late 2009 the Companies applied to the U.S. EPA Home Performance with ENERGY STAR Program to have HES recognized as a program participant. Based on HES' current program offering and the promotion of comprehensive services and measures, HES met the criteria and in early 2011, Connecticut was recognized as a U.S. EPA Home Performance with ENERGY STAR state.

This program element is designed to encourage and enable customers to complete comprehensive projects tailored to meet their individual needs. The first step in Home Performance is an initial analysis of the home including potential energy efficiency custom upgrade(s). The cost and energy savings for these custom projects will be reviewed by the Companies. Billing histories and comparing savings calculations to acceptable engineering practice will be considered during the review process. Once cost and savings estimates are finalized, a letter of agreement will be executed containing the incentive information. Customers will be paid once the project is completed and inspected by a company representative.

Home Performance is similar in design to the commercial & industrial retrofit energy efficiency programs, but accepts residential and multi-family projects into the program through letters of agreement with contractors. Home Performance projects may utilize other programs and offerings (e.g., commercial & industrial electric and natural gas Fund programs, tax credit programs, etc.) to deliver more comprehensive services to customers with potential attractive financing options.

Home Performance also allows for the transition of HES to a market based program while retaining the QA/QC oversight that is required for the U.S. EPA's program. Contractors and vendors that meet the HES certifications and requirements will be eligible to access incentives from the Fund. This path of customer participation allows for a more comprehensive approach rather than the current prescriptive approach for energy efficiency upgrades. Looking at incentives in terms of measure performance and incorporating low interest financing allows Fund resources to be utilized in housing stock that would most benefit from efficiency upgrades with low interest financing.

New Program Issues:

Public Act No. 11-80 sets a goal of weatherizing eighty percent of Connecticut homes by 2030. Based on the age distribution of housing in Connecticut and characterization of the efficiency of existing homes, it is estimated that approximately one-half million homes will need to be weatherized in order to reach this goal. This amounts to approximately 26,000 homes per year for nineteen (19) years to reach

this goal. HES will serve as the gateway for the state to accomplish this goal by 2030. The Companies in coordination with the EEB and DEEP will define weatherization and residential dwellings. Once these definitions are established the services of HES will deliver to Connecticut residents weatherization services and measures that will meet the state's 2030 goal.

Since the program's inception and with the inclusion of the HES-Income Eligible track, the Companies, in consultation with the HES Working Group and the EEB consultants, have developed the infrastructure necessary to fulfill the weatherization goal outlined in Public Act No. 11-80. As such, the Companies have been striving to make HES a comprehensive, whole-home solution that encourages and enables all possible energy efficiency upgrades through a combination of financial incentives and attractive financing. The approach of financial incentives and low-cost, low interest financing will be the recipe to moving Connecticut to its 2030 goal.

Over half, or approximately 700,000 households in Connecticut heat with fuel oil or propane (based on U.S. Department of Energy Data). A disproportionate amount of these homes are large single-family homes and they represent a population that has historically been underserved by conservation program efforts due to the lack of a funding source similar to that of electric and natural gas for fuel oil measures and services. While these customers pay the electric system benefit charge of 3 mils, there is no contribution based on their heating fuel choice. Therefore, the overall cost of non-electric measures is greater than the benefit they provide based on electric savings. Electric rate payers cannot contribute disproportionately to oil use measures such as the blower door test and air sealing, duct test and sealing, and domestic hot water measures. The electric dollars spent on these measures outweigh the electric benefit to the program, even though the overall savings, including savings on oil, is greater than the cost.

Public Act 11-80 sets a statewide limit of \$500,000 which can be used to support oil heating measures. In the 2011 decision in Docket 10-10-03, the DPUC authorized the use of some of the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative funding to support oil heating measures. This level of funding will result in the state failing to reach its weatherization goal. Therefore, oil heating funding of approximately \$17 million dollars annually will be necessary to support the weatherization goal outlined in Public Act No. 11-80. Absent these dollars, the Companies will have to reduce program services to oil heated homes in order to comply with the spending cap. However, a significantly lower level of services will no doubt lead to dramatically lower customer satisfaction and participation in the program.

The avoided costs that are used to screen the Energy Efficiency Fund measures and programs have been updated for 2012 (See Chapter 6) and have changed significantly. Both the electric and natural gas avoided costs have dropped significantly due mainly to reduced assumptions regarding the future cost of natural gas. In particular, electric avoided costs have decreased approximately 19 percent and avoided natural gas avoided costs have decreased approximately 40 percent. The reduction in avoided costs may require higher co-payments for both electric and natural gas homes and/or homes may have to be pre-screened in order to identify higher-use homes that are more likely to have cost effective

savings opportunities. Likewise, homes with lower consumption and less cost effective savings opportunities will either not be served or they will require a higher customer co-payment. Some measures in HES have both electric and fossil fuel savings (e.g., duct sealing). For those measures, electric and fossil fuel cost splits are applied to determine what percentage of those measures' costs are paid for from electric funds and what percentage of the measure is allocated to fossil fuel (natural gas or fuel oil funding). While both the electric and natural gas avoided costs have decreased for 2012, the decrease in natural gas avoided costs (40 percent) is more than double the decrease in electric avoided costs (19 percent). Therefore, the measure cost percentages that are used to allocate the program costs across fuels are updated for 2012 to reflect the new avoided costs.

The long-term goal of HES, and what is meant by market based, is to shift from an efficiency program that is dependent on utility customer funding to a self-sustaining industry that can be leveraged by the Energy Efficiency Fund. Therefore, the future of HES will look more like other efficiency program offerings such as Small Business, Retail Products or the HVAC rebate programs. These Energy Efficiency Fund offerings are built on existing private market channels, but they do not define the market.

In an effort to meet the long-term goals of HES and to help meet the weatherization goal set forth in Public Act 11-80, the Companies, in consultation with the PURA, EEB and the HES Working Group, will be phasing in the following program enhancements for 2012:

- In the 1st Quarter 2012, the Companies plan to pilot with the HES vendors various strategies to target oil heated homes to offer the same HES core services as directed in Public Act 11-80. In order to be cost-effective, oil furnace heated homes with central air conditioning and electric domestic hot water will be targeted. However other approaches will be piloted including an initial visit that could consist of diagnostic tests and providing oil customers with an energy assessment report highlighting areas of the home to be addressed. During this visit CFLs and domestic hot water measures will be installed. Piloting various approaches will need to balance cost effectiveness while not diluting the success of providing direct install measures at the time of the home visit.
- Implementing a comprehensive QA/QC protocol which includes quarterly ranking of vendors based on performance, energy savings and customer satisfaction.
- Increase timely communication to vendors relative to their performance and how the vendors rank relative to their peers.
- Establish partnership with CCEF and the municipal Energy Task Forces and Green Communities to promote HES.
- Increased focus on deeper, more comprehensive “packaged” measures to promote deep and meaningful savings goals (20-25%) through energy efficiency and load management that will help all customers have a real impact on their energy bills, contribute to their carbon footprint, and enhance their awareness of weatherization;

- Achieve large increments of efficiency through High-Performance HVAC system upgrades, advance Air and Duct sealing techniques, along with other weatherization improvement measures
- Support customers in making energy management an integral part of their home practices and promote a behavioral change culture towards conservation
- Multi-touch approach to encouraging upgrades and/or future rebated efficiency measures.
- Increased data gathering for analysis, which will be useful in meeting the PA 11-80 goal of weatherizing eighty (80) percent of homes by 2030.

Public Act 11-80 also calls for programming that allows residents to switch from electric heat to efficient natural gas or fuel oil heating systems to reduce resident's energy costs and lower operating costs. The Companies are poised to collaborate with PURA and DEEP to create programming that would provide financial incentives and cost effective financing to help residents make the switch.

Marketing

As the HES program has matured, the Companies rely more upon contractor-generated marketing to drive customer enrollment. The Companies may augment enrollment with:

- Bill inserts.
- Telemarketing.
- TV, Radio or Print media campaign.
- Targeted direct mail or direct e-mail of program benefits.
- Special-interest publications (print and electronic) such as Company newsletters, legislator's constituent newsletters and government employee newsletters to direct residents to the WISE-USE line or CTEnergyInfo.com for applications.
- Presence at strategically selected consumer shows and residential fairs.
- Promotion through HVAC, insulation and fuel oil delivery companies.
- Web Links from the Companies websites to the approved HES vendors/contractors web sites.
- Leverage and promote the Clean Energy Communities program.

To maximize the benefits of HES services provided and to encourage favorable behavioral changes, the Companies will assist residents through education and support.

This support may include:

- Development and distribution of articles on low-cost or no-cost energy efficiency tips. Placement in newsletters, local media, and associated web sites sponsored by groups such as the EEB, the CCEF, legislators' sites, and conservation sites, etc.
- Write and distribute case studies (also referred to as Success Stories or Testimonials) to the sites listed above and to local media.

- Produce video(s) for HES, post video segments on the Companies' sites and link from other affiliated/appropriate sites. Explore use of Local Access TV.

To help move HES towards a market based program and to reduce program costs, HES vendors are encouraged to market their services to customers. HES vendors are also the primary communications channel for promoting add-on or "non-core" measures such as upgrades to appliances and insulation -- utilizing Fund-supported rebates. The Companies provide the vendors with a variety of collateral pieces that support these measures and also engage in public relation activities that create awareness and a more effective climate for the vendors. HES vendors are also the primary promoter of the residential loan initiative.

The Companies have developed marketing guidelines that vendors must adhere to when marketing Energy Efficiency Fund programs or offerings. The Energy Efficiency Fund encourages its partners and vendors to align their promotional efforts with a campaign that supports awareness of the Energy Efficiency Fund while maintaining established marketing regulations and standards. By using advertising that promotes HES and the Energy Efficiency Fund, vendors can deliver consistent messaging to customers and demonstrate to customers that they offer quality solutions.

As administrators of the programs, the Companies must approve submissions for all advertising in all media including all printed pieces, mailers, television, radio and internet. The Companies provide each partner with the appropriate logos and copy points as requested. Partners must use these logos and copy points in the manner directed by the Company's advertising coordinators. Once the logos are placed in any advertisement, they must be submitted to the advertising coordinator for approval, BEFORE they are released to the media outlet. Any advertisement released without approval will be construed as a misrepresentation of the programs and the Energy Efficiency Fund.

The Companies reserve the right to deny creative execution or any element of advertising/direct marketing containing any utility company logo or the Energy Efficiency Fund's products, logo or name if any element is deemed inappropriate. CL&P and UI reserve the right to reject any advertising if it is found that the vendor is not performing services as directed or intended by Energy Efficiency Fund/Companies as it pertains to HES and or Energy Efficiency Fund programs.

Incentive Strategy:

The incentive strategies for HES are multifaceted due to the various components of the program and the markets served. HES Core Services will resemble the 2010 and 2011 HES program with fixed products and services and established program limits. In 2010 The Companies increased the total number of CFLs to 25 and that limit will remain in 2012. The Companies will continue to monitor whether or not program limits and fees are appropriate and adjust accordingly to ensure cost-effectiveness, maintain sufficient program participation levels, are affordable to customers, sustainable, and deliver energy savings to customers. In 2012, in order to reduce market confusion, the Companies

will continue to require a customer co-pay of \$75 and vendors are not to deviate from the \$75 co-pay for standard HES in-home services.

Home Performance with ENERGY STAR will establish an incentive/rebate structure that will encourage customers to pursue deeper retrofits and increase the penetration rate of insulation and appliance upgrades. This incentive structure supports a whole house approach to achieve greater electric and natural gas savings.

Home Performance with ENERGY STAR will allow the Companies to establish a network of contractors that will operate within HES and receive incentives for customers based on the cost-effectiveness of the scope of work presented. Customers will be eligible to receive HES core services as a bundled project of additional energy efficiency upgrades. Contractors will utilize the Companies HEY Tool to provide a summary of the measures to be installed and upgrades to follow. The Companies will screen these products and provide an incentive to the customer based on energy savings.

The following tables show the funding sources for measures and the incentive amounts for rebates/measures.

HES CORE SERVICES FUNDING SOURCES

Measure	Fuel Source					Incentive Amount
	All Electric	Gas Heat with Central Air	Gas Heat w/o Central Air	Fuel Oil/Propane Heat* with Central Air	Fuel Oil/Propane Heat* w/o Central Air	
Administration	Electric	40/60 Electric/Gas	40/60 Electric/Gas	30/70 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	20/80 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	\$75 co-pay or TBD
Blower Door Test/Air Sealing	Electric	15/85 Electric/Gas	Gas	10/90 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	Measures included with Core service
Air Flow and/or Heat Rise Test	Electric	10/90 Electric/Gas	Gas	10/90 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	
Duct Blaster/Duct Sealing	Electric	60/40 Electric/Gas	35/65 Electric/Gas	50/50 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	20/80 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	
Installation of CFLs	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	
Domestic Hot Water Measures	Electric	Gas or Electric	Gas or Electric	Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	
Pipe Insulation/Hot Water Heater	Electric	Gas or Electric	Gas or Electric	Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	

* Fuel Oil/Propane cost splits assume the availability of Fuel Oil/Propane funding.

CORE SERVICES REBATES FUNDING SOURCES

Incentive	Fuel Source					Incentive Amount
	All Electric	Gas Heat with Central Air	Gas Heat w/o Central Air	Fuel Oil/Propane Heat* with Central Air	Fuel Oil/Propane Heat* w/o Central Air	
Insulation Rebates	Electric	10/90 Electric/Gas	Gas	5/95 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Up to .50/sq.ft. not to exceed 50 percent of install cost
ENERGY STAR Clothes Washer Rebates	Electric	By DHW fuel source Gas or Electric	By DHW fuel source Gas or Electric	By DHW fuel source	By DHW fuel source	\$50 mail in rebate
ENERGY STAR Freezer Rebates	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	\$25 mail in rebate
ENERGY STAR Refrigerator Rebates	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	\$50 mail in rebate
ENERGY STAR Dehumidifier Rebates	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	\$25 mail in rebate
ENERGY STAR Window Rebates	Electric	Gas	Gas	Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	\$50/single pane window not to exceed 50 percent of installed cost

* Fuel Oil/Propane cost splits assume the availability of Fuel Oil/Propane funding.

HVAC REBATES AND FUNDING SOURCES

Measure	Rebate Amount	Funding Source
ENERGY STAR Central Air Conditioner or Heat Pump (8.2 HSPF, 14.5 SEER, 12 EER for split systems; 8.0 HSPF, 14 SEER, 11 EER for single packaged systems)	\$250 per system	Electric
ENERGY STAR QIV Incentive	\$500 per Home for AC or Heat Pump \$100 per Home for Gas Furnace	Electric for AC or Heat Pumps QIV. Natural Gas for furnace QIV.
ENERGY STAR Ductless AC or Heat Pump (8.2 HSPF, 14.5 SEER, 12 EER)	\$250 or \$1,000** (for qualifying ductless heat pumps that will be displacing electric resistance heat)	Electric
Geothermal VIP incentive for units that meet ENERGY STAR 2012 criteria.	\$500 per ton capped at \$1,500	Electric
Natural Gas Furnace Rebate 95 percent AFUE and Air Handler Performance Level E_{EA} of 2 percent or lower.	\$500 per system	40% Electric 60% Natural Gas
Early Retirement of Natural Gas Furnace Rebate 95 percent AFUE and Air Handler Performance Level E_{EA} of 2 percent or lower.	\$800 per system **	25% Electric 75% Natural Gas
Natural Gas Boiler Rebate for 90 percent AFUE with temperature reset or purge control	\$300 per system lost opportunity \$600 per system early retirement	Natural Gas
Propane and Fuel Oil Furnace Rebate for ECM Fan Section 95 percent AFUE and Air Handler Performance Level E_{AE} of 2 percent or lower.	\$200 per System	Electric
Natural Gas Tankless Water Heater ENERGY STAR 82 EF (Energy Factor) or greater with Electronic Ignition	\$100 per system	Natural Gas
Propane and Fuel Oil Furnace and Boiler Rebates TBD based on availability of fuel oil/propane funding	TBD based on availability of fuel oil/propane funding	Fuel Oil/Propane
Package Terminal AC/HP Rebate 10 EER/2.8 COP to 12.5 EER/3.0 COP BTU size dependent	\$150/system**	Electric

* The \$250 Central Air and Heat Pump incentive can be doubled through HES to \$500 for early retirement situations. In order to qualify for the \$500 rebate, the new system must be replacing an existing system which is still operable and the home must receive HES Core Services at which time the HES technician provides verification that the existing system is operable. In addition, the customer must have the new Central Air or Heat Pump installed within 90 days of the HES Core Services initial visit.

** Customers must receive HES Core Services prior to the system installation.

HES-Income Eligible MEASURE FUNDING SOURCES

Measure	Fuel Source					Incentive Amount
	All Electric	Gas Heat with Central Air	Gas Heat w/o Central Air	Fuel Oil/Propane Heat with Central Air	Fuel Oil/Propane Heat w/o Central Air	
Administration	Electric	20/80 Electric/Gas	20/80 Electric/Gas	30/70 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	20/80 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Minimum co-payment of 30% required. Pay only up to cost effective threshold.
Blower Door Test/Air Sealing	Electric	15/85 Electric/Gas	Gas	10/90 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	
Air Flow and/or Heat Rise Test	Electric	5/95 Electric/Gas	Gas	10/90 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	
Duct Blaster/Duct Sealing	Electric	60/40 Electric/Gas	35/65 Electric/Gas	30/70 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	20/80 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	
Installation of CFLs	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	
Domestic Hot Water Measures	Electric	Gas	Gas	Electric	Electric	
Heat Pump Hot Water Heaters	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	Electric	
Pipe Insulation/Hot Water Heater	Electric	Gas	Gas	Electric	Electric	
Insulation	Electric	10/90 Electric/Gas	Gas	5/95 Electric/Fuel Oil-Propane	Fuel Oil-Propane	
Windows	Electric	Gas	Gas	Electric	Electric	
Refrigerator and Freezer Replacement	Electric	Gas	Gas	Electric	Electric	Co-payment of \$100 required for landlords
HVAC including furnace and ductless heat pumps	Electric	Gas	Gas	Electric	Electric	Pay up to cost effective threshold. \$545 furnace replacement co-pay may be provided by the program for ARRA/DOE funded projects.

* Fuel Oil/Propane cost splits assume the availability of Fuel Oil/Propane funding.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, In-Home Services)

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 467	\$ 651	\$ 869	\$ 304	\$ 842	\$ 590	\$ 590
Contractor Staff	\$ 71	\$ 329	\$ -	\$ 147	\$ 300	\$ 350	\$ 350
Total Labor	\$ 538	\$ 980	\$ 869	\$ 452	\$ 1,142	\$ 940	\$ 940
Materials & Supplies	\$ 6	\$ 5	\$ 35	\$ 6	\$ 33	\$ 25	\$ 25
Outside Services	\$ 1,496	\$ 2,009	\$ 2,878	\$ 1,195	\$ 2,736	\$ 364 a)	\$ 363
Incentives	\$ 5,786	\$ 14,597	\$ 13,342	\$ 8,055	\$ 12,668	\$ 9,996 b)	\$ 9,972
Marketing	\$ 66	\$ 182	\$ 480	\$ 66	\$ 465	\$ 325	\$ 324
Administrative Expense	\$ 11	\$ 20	\$ 45	\$ 14	\$ 44	\$ 32	\$ 32
Other	\$ 47	\$ 16	\$ 100	\$ 22	\$ 97	\$ 75	\$ 75
Total	\$ 7,950	\$ 17,809	\$ 17,749	\$ 9,810	\$ 17,184	\$ 11,757	\$ 11,732

a) Implementation: Includes vendor administrative costs and rebate processing fees, CHIF Loan program.

b) Includes rebates for HVAC equipment including ductless split heat pumps and geothermal, appliances plus direct install measures including air sealing, duct sealing, lighting, and water measures.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	2,630.5
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	19,832,316
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	259,148,882
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.548
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.042
Electric b/c Ratio	1.59
Total Resource b/c Ratio	2.25

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, In-Home Services)

Year	<u>Program Costs</u>				
	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	Cost/participant	\$/LT-kWh
2000	\$ -	\$ -	0%	\$0	0.000
2001	\$ 500,000	\$ 262,000	52%	\$488	0.096
2002	\$ 660,000	\$ 760,000	115%	\$321	0.051
2003	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,086,000	72%	\$659	0.101
2004	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,149,000	77%	\$429	0.045
2005 Revised	\$ 3,424,989	\$ 1,686,246	49%	\$456	0.049
2006 Revised	\$ 2,922,000	\$ 3,959,926	136%	\$352	0.065
2007 Revised	\$ 4,900,052	\$ 5,467,875	112%	\$1,071	0.061
2008 Revised	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 7,167,887	102%	\$963	0.066
2009 Revised	\$ 13,914,181	\$ 17,809,102	128%	\$1,453	0.209
2010 Revised	\$ 17,809,102	\$ 17,809,102	100%	\$795	0.067
2011 Revised	\$ 17,749,155	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 9,810,124	55%	\$768	0.106
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 17,749,155	\$ 17,183,815	97%	\$673	0.083
2012	\$ 11,757,050	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Participation</u>		
	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	0	0	0%
2001	1,269	537	42%
2002	1,423	2,366	166%
2003	16,372	1,647	10%
2004	2,029	2,677	132%
2005 Revised	4,525	3,700	82%
2006 Revised	9,341	11,237	120%
2007 Revised	4,877	5,106	105%
2008 Revised	11,584	7,446	64%
2009 Revised	18,991	12,257	65%
2010 Revised	25,958	22,410	86%
2011 Revised	29,737	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	12,766	43%
2011 Y/E Projected	29,737	25,532	86%
2012	21,301	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Lifetime MWh savings</u>			Year	<u>Goal - Installed kW Savings</u>		
	Budget	Actual	% of Budget		Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	0	0	0%	2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	6,034	2,735	45%	2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	8,196	14,846	181%	2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	18,944	10,791	55%	2003	3,371	972	28.8%
2004	16,016	25,460	151%	2004	1,481	2,188	147.7%
2005 Revised	51,967	34,238	64%	2005	5,367	2,856	53.2%
2006 Revised	34,351	60,493	172%	2006 Budget	2,500	3,151	126.0%
2007 Revised	73,564	89,643	122%	2007 Revised	2,579	2,520	97.7%
2008 Revised	109,796	107,856	98%	2008 Revised	3,769	3,261	86.5%
2009 Revised	199,785	85,041	43%	2009 Revised	4,246	2,220	52.3%
2010 Revised	341,045	264,136	77%	2010 Revised	5,661	5,054	89.3%
2011 Revised	306,988	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	5,086	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	92,263	27%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	2,065	36.5%
2011 Y/E Projected	306,988	207,429	61%	11 Y/E Projected	n/a	3,973	70.2%
2012	259,149	n/a	n/a	2012	2,631	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Program ratios</u>			
	\$/Lifetime kWh	Actual	\$/Annualized kW	Actual
2001	0.083	0.096	n/a	1002
2002	0.081	0.051	n/a	698
2003	0.128	0.101	721	1,117
2004	0.094	0.045	1,013	1,182
2005 Revised	0.066	0.049	638	590
2006 Revised	0.085	0.065	1,169	1,257
2007 Revised	0.067	0.061	1,900	2,169
2008 Revised	0.064	0.066	1,857	2,198
2009 Revised	0.085	0.209	3,277	8,023
2010 Revised	0.052	n/a	3,146	n/a
2011 Revised	0.058	n/a	3,490	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.106	n/a	4,750
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.083	n/a	4,325
2012	0.045	n/a	4,469	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, In-Home Services)

Budget/FTE

4.4 FTE for program administration, vendor interaction, field inspections, program support.

Goal

21,301 Units serviced includes 16,571 in-home services jobs and 4,730 HVAC rebates.

Cost/Unit

\$552 Average cost per unit.

Goal Setting Methodology

HVAC
In-home

Metric Changes

None

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Home Energy Solutions

Baseline Assumptions:

Market Residential Customers and the replacement of HVAC equipment < 25 tons

Budget Projections	2010 Act	2011 Revised Bud	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Bud	2013 Bud
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 237,971	\$ 244,896	\$ 138,203	\$ 244,896	\$ 271,894 a)	\$ 285,489
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - b)	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 237,971	\$ 244,896	\$ 138,203	\$ 244,896	\$ 271,894	\$ 285,489
Materials & Supplies	\$ 32,999	\$ 4,759	\$ 20,253	\$ 20,253	\$ 3,500 c)	\$ 3,500
Outside Services	\$ 406,012	\$ 93,899	\$ 144,962	\$ 144,962	\$ 60,452 d)	\$ 60,500
Incentives	\$ 4,558,370	\$ 2,467,248	\$ 1,749,127	\$ 2,416,616	\$ 1,835,212 e)	\$ 1,807,351
Marketing	\$ 92,052	\$ 137,500	\$ 83,104	\$ 83,104	\$ 100,500 f)	\$ 100,500
Other	\$ 12,274	\$ -	\$ 42,950	\$ 42,950	\$ - g)	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 6,820	\$ 12,479	\$ 4,859	\$ 8,000	\$ 10,100 h)	\$ 10,100
Total	\$ 5,346,498	\$ 2,960,781	\$ 2,183,458	\$ 2,960,781	\$ 2,281,658	\$ 2,267,440

#

(1) HES includes Residential Loan Program

- a) 2.65 FTEs
- b) No comment
- c) Printing of program rebate forms, table-top wrap up educational materials, etc.
- d) In-home services audits for 2,468 homes, Processing fees for Program Rebates
- e) In-home services measures for 2,468 homes plus 926 CAC, Geothermal, Heat Pumps and 44 Ductless Heat pumps (electric resistance replacement), appliance and insulation incentives (Clothes Washer, Refrigerator, Dehumidifier, Insulation, and Freezer) QIV subsidies
- f) Seasonal marketing and advertising and public relations, direct mail, and bill insert messaging
- g) No comment
- h) Meals, miles, travel and training

Goals and Metrics Information:

	2012
Savings	
Demand Savings (kW)	734
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	3,515,822
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	41,625,954
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.649
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.055
Cost per kW	\$ 3,108
Electric System B/C Ratio	1.53
Total Resource B/C Ratio	1.99

**The United Illuminating Company
LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement**

Home Energy Solutions

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2001	\$104	\$229	220.2%
2002	\$248	\$286	115.3%
2003	\$366	\$268	73.2%
2004	\$514	\$423	82.3%
2005	\$1,042	\$673	64.6%
2006	\$745	\$784	105.2%
2007	\$1,012	\$1,079	106.6%
2008	\$1,887	\$2,067	109.5%
2009	\$4,891	\$3,090	63.2%
2010	\$2,896	\$3,883	134.1%
2011	\$2,961		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$2,961	\$2,183	73.7%
2011 YE Projected	\$2,961	\$2,961	100.0%
2012	\$2,282		

Goal - Number of Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2001	250	176	70.4%
2002	235	804	342.1%
2003	500	610	122.0%
2004	634	745	117.5%
2005	3,400	1,533	45.1%
2006	840	1,051	125.1%
2007	525	1,025	195.2%
2008	525	2,336	445.0%
2009	4,694	3,252	69.3%
2010	3,073	5,412	176.1%
2011	3,528		
2011 YTD (Jun)	3,528	2,050	58.1%
2011 YE Projected	3,528	3,528	100.0%
2012	3,454		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2001	62	75	121.0%
2002	58	1,216	2096.6%
2003	186	231	124.2%
2004	279	415	148.7%
2005	848	517	61.0%
2006	329	455	138.3%
2007	890	1,063	119.4%
2008	1,789	3,331	186.2%
2009	7,404	2,515	34.0%
2010	4,661	5,134	110.1%
2011	4,147		
2011 YTD (Jun)	4,147	1,818	43.8%
2011 YE Projected	4,147	4,147	100.0%
2012	3,516		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	345	368	106.7%
2004	491	728	148.3%
2005	1,490	1,061	71.2%
2006	595	631	106.1%
2007	528	414	78.4%
2008	1,181	933	79.0%
2009	1,873	984	52.5%
2010	682	1,461	214.2%
2011	861		
2011 YTD (Jun)	861	485	56.3%
2011 YE Projected	861	861	100.0%
2012	734		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2001	932	1,125	120.7%
2002	876	18,240	2082.2%
2003	3,534	4,389	124.2%
2004	5,108	7,839	153.5%
2005	11,076	8,264	74.6%
2006	5,906	5,866	99.3%
2007	9,731	11,997	123.3%
2008	26,767	33,731	126.0%
2009	56,025	31,331	55.9%
2010	45,051	51,377	114.0%
2011	39,636		
2011 YTD (Jun)	39,636	14,640	36.9%
2011 YE Projected	39,636	39,636	100.0%
2012	41,626		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh		\$/LT kWh		\$/kW Target	Actual	Cost/ Unit
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
2001	\$1.677	\$3.053	\$0.112	\$0.204	\$0	\$0	\$1,301
2002	\$4.276	\$0.235	\$0.283	\$0.016	\$0	\$0	\$356
2003	\$1.968	\$1.160	\$0.104	\$0.061	\$1,061	\$728	\$439
2004	\$1.842	\$1.019	\$0.101	\$0.054	\$1,047	\$581	\$568
2005	\$1.229	\$1.302	\$0.094	\$0.081	\$699	\$634	\$439
2006	\$2.264	\$1.723	\$0.126	\$0.134	\$1,252	\$1,242	\$746
2007	\$1.137	\$1.015	\$0.104	\$0.090	\$1,917	\$2,606	\$1,053
2008	\$1.055	\$0.621	\$0.070	\$0.061	\$1,598	\$2,215	\$885
2009	\$0.661	\$1.229	\$0.087	\$0.099	\$2,611	\$3,140	\$950
2010	\$0.621	\$0.756	\$0.064	\$0.076	\$4,246	\$2,658	\$717
2011	\$0.545		\$0.057		\$2,624		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.714	\$1.201	\$0.075	\$0.149	\$3,439	\$4,502	\$1,065
2011 YE Projected	\$0.714	\$0.714	\$0.075	\$0.075	\$3,439	\$3,439	\$839
2012	\$0.649		\$0.055		\$3,108		

Notes

- Starting in 2007 Home Energy Solutions included HVAC program Residential Loan Program
- Starting in 2009 Home Energy Solutions includes Residential Loan Program

The United Illuminating Company

LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - Home Energy Solutions

Budget/FTE:

2.65 FTE for contractor relations/field support, contract administration and data/financial administration

Goal:

Program assumptions include 926 14.5 SEER and 12 EER, and higher 44 Ductless Heat pumps (replace electric resistance heat) and 2,468 comprehensive in-home services participants., Within the in-home services modeling assumptions included CFLs, air and duct sealing diagnostics, and DHW measures.
76% gas customers, 6% deliverable fuels and 18% electric. Appliance incentives for refrigerators, freezers, clothes washers and dehumidifiers and insulation upgrade incentive.

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

Cost rates decreased in 2012 based on focus of deeper savings per home. Cost rates will reduced as add-on measures adoption increases

Goal Setting Methodology

Goals are based on measure mix and historical measure installation quantities. Production levels based on available funds.

Metric Changes:

Increase average HES participant savings by 25% for all fuels
For 10% of HES participants achieve 25% overall reduction in total energy savings

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Home Energy Solutions

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	\$ 22,989	\$ 47,180	\$ 68,131	\$ 105,027	\$ 118,080	\$ 281,960	\$ 66,493	\$ 132,987	\$ 285,600
Outside Service	\$ 30,474	\$ 158,176	\$ 276,457	\$ 90,936	\$ 252,965	\$ 520,960	\$ 153,500	\$ 351,500	\$ 156,874
Materials & Supplies	\$ 424	\$ -	\$ 2,137	\$ 651	\$ 286	\$ 4,800	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000
Incentives	\$ 37,466	\$ 293,384	\$ 438,638	\$ 268,686	\$ 908,398	\$ 762,680	\$ 553,331	\$ 1,275,731	\$ 1,428,366
Marketing	\$ 3,173	\$ 11,560	\$ 9,650	\$ 49,383	\$ 25,058	\$ 24,000	\$ 5,121	\$ 10,802	\$ 20,000
Administrative Expense	\$ 290	\$ 101	\$ 1,033	\$ 1,033	\$ 6,679	\$ 5,600	\$ 2,762	\$ 5,980	\$ 8,160
Total	\$ 94,816	\$ 510,401	\$ 796,046	\$ 515,716	\$ 1,311,467	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 781,207	\$ 1,777,000	\$ 1,904,000

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goal	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	11,295	86,333	98,698	55,728	222,581	243,065	112,858	256,716	303,115
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	213,599	1,324,880	1,770,065	1,172,933	4,768,051	4,532,590	2,107,047	4,792,869	5,488,597
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 8.39	\$ 5.91	\$ 8.07	\$ 9.25	\$ 5.89	\$ 6.58	\$ 6.92	\$ 6.92	\$ 6.28
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 0.44	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.44	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.37	\$ 0.37	\$ 0.35
Total Gas Benefit	\$ 157,867	\$ 970,085	\$ 1,448,317	\$ 1,054,775	\$ 5,126,127	\$ 3,890,819	\$ 1,808,709	\$ 4,114,245	\$ 2,807,196
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.90	\$ 1.82	\$ 2.05	\$ 3.91	\$ 2.43	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.32	\$ 1.47
Homes Served	393	1,351	1,824	798	2,768	2,082	1,181	2,362	2,952
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	544	981	970	1,470	1,723	2,177	1,784	2,029	1,859
Program Cost per Home	\$ 241	\$ 378	\$ 436	\$ 646	\$ 474	\$ 768	\$ 661	\$ 752	\$ 645
Benefit per Home	\$ 402	\$ 718	\$ 794	\$ 1,322	\$ 1,852	\$ 1,869	\$ 1,532	\$ 1,742	\$ 951
	\$ 241.26	\$ 377.79	\$ 436.43	\$ 646.26	\$ 473.80	\$ 768.49	\$ 661.48		\$ 645.05

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	\$ 599,097	\$ 94,816	16%
2007	\$ 600,000	\$ 510,401	85%
2008	\$ 600,000	\$ 796,046	133%
2009	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 515,716	52%
2010	\$ 1,110,652	\$ 1,311,467	118%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 781,207	49%
2011 YE projection	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 1,777,000	111%
2012	\$ 1,904,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	1,378	393	29%
2007	1,524	988	65%
2008	1,554	1,824	117%
2009	2,554	798	31%
2010	2,799	2,768	99%
2011 YTD (June)	2,082	1,181	57%
2011 YE projection	2,082	2,362	113%
2012	2,952	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	110,445	11,295	10%
2007	65,898	57,353	87%
2008	90,954	98,698	109%
2009	176,982	55,728	31%
2010	182,022	222,581	122%
2011 YTD (June)	243,065	112,858	46%
2011 YE projection	243,065	256,716	106%
2012	303,115	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	1,988,010	213,599	11%
2007	1,551,974	902,646	58%
2008	1,524,912	1,770,065	116%
2009	3,462,230	1,172,933	34%
2010	3,776,878	4,768,051	126%
2011 YTD (June)	4,532,590	2,107,047	46%
2011 YE projection	4,532,590	4,792,869	106%
2012	5,488,597	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Home Energy Solutions

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	\$ 5,183	\$ 44,643	\$ 73,633	\$ 87,082	\$ 92,839	\$ 255,360	\$ 71,932	\$ 255,360	\$ 297,920	
Outside Service	\$ 15,732	\$ 119,469	\$ 269,945	\$ 108,035	\$ 289,411	\$ 517,855	\$ 217,370	\$ 517,855	\$ 124,223	
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 268	\$ 231	\$ 218	\$ 4,320	\$ -	\$ 4,320	\$ 5,040	
Incentives	\$ 30,156	\$ 255,330	\$ 443,899	\$ 313,741	\$ 967,045	\$ 705,230	\$ 855,646	\$ 1,387,353	\$ 1,368,054	
Marketing	\$ 967	\$ 7,140	\$ 7,109	\$ 10,307	\$ 14,685	\$ 10,755	\$ 2,510	\$ 10,755	\$ 12,548	
Administrative Expense	\$ -	\$ 960	\$ 361	\$ 235	\$ 3,382	\$ 6,480	\$ 2,250	\$ 6,480	\$ 7,560	
Total	\$ 52,038	\$ 427,542	\$ 795,216	\$ 519,631	\$ 1,367,580	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,149,709	\$ 2,182,123	\$ 1,815,345	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	14163	57,353	104,456	68,203	266,670	231,251	122,717	232,914	242,255	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	213599	902,646	1,970,690	1,418,819	5,414,347	4,325,856	2,277,796	4,323,208	4,776,921	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 3.67	\$ 7.45	\$ 7.61	\$ 7.62	\$ 5.13	\$ 6.49	\$ 9.37	\$ 9.37	\$ 7.49	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 0.24	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.37	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.50	\$ 0.38	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	\$ 166,163	\$ 660,923	\$ 1,017,119	\$ 1,275,891	\$ 5,820,959	\$ 3,708,881	\$ 1,952,925	\$ 3,706,611	\$ 2,429,963	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	\$ 3.19	\$ 1.55	\$ 1.28	\$ 2.46	\$ 4.26	\$ 2.47	\$ 1.70	\$ 1.70	\$ 1.34	g=f/a
Homes Served	366	988	1,918	1,064	3,251	1,963	1,059	2,010	2,029	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	584	914	1,027	1,333	1,665	2,204	2,151	2,151	2,354	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	\$ 142	\$ 433	\$ 415	\$ 488	\$ 421	\$ 764	\$ 1,086	\$ 1,086	\$ 895	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	\$ 454	\$ 669	\$ 530	\$ 1,199	\$ 1,791	\$ 1,889	\$ 1,844	\$ 1,844	\$ 1,198	l=f/h

Program Costs	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
Year			
2006	\$ 430,651	\$ 52,038	12%
2007	\$ 430,000	\$ 427,542	99%
2008	\$ 430,000	\$ 795,216	185%
2009	\$ 700,000	\$ 519,631	74%
2010	\$ 1,087,343	\$ 1,367,580	126%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,149,709	77%
2011 YE projection	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 2,182,123	145%
2012	\$ 1,815,345	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
Year			
2006	957	366	38%
2007	1,070	988	92%
2008	1,092	1,918	176%
2009	1,740	1,064	61%
2010	1,895	3,251	172%
2011 YTD (June)	1,963	1,059	54%
2011 YE projection	1,963	2,010	102%
2012	2,029	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
Year			
2006	76,687	14,163	18%
2007	46,279	57,353	124%
2008	59,495	104,456	176%
2009	120,531	68,203	57%
2010	123,219	266,670	216%
2011 YTD (June)	231,251	122,717	53%
2011 YE projection	231,251	232,914	101%
2012	242,255	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
Year			
2006	1,380,365	213,599	15%
2007	1,089,915	902,646	83%
2008	1,070,910	1,970,690	184%
2009	2,357,898	1,418,819	60%
2010	2,556,743	5,414,347	212%
2011 YTD (June)	4,325,856	2,277,796	53%
2011 YE projection	4,325,856	4,323,208	100%
2012	4,776,921	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Home Energy Solutions

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	\$ 1,845	\$ 37,628	\$ 44,337	\$ 62,391	\$ 62,133	\$ 255,360	\$ 31,793	\$ 255,360	\$ 297,920	
Outside Service	\$ 12,469	\$ 18,076	\$ 41,194	\$ 59,660	\$ 26,373	\$ 514,350	\$ 29,263	\$ 514,350	\$ 124,852	
Materials & Supplies	\$ 184	\$ -	\$ 214	\$ 218	\$ 199	\$ 4,350	\$ -	\$ 4,350	\$ 5,040	
Incentives	\$ 26,456	\$ 133,150	\$ 580,208	\$ 410,760	\$ 1,200,547	\$ 708,950	\$ 562,916	\$ 894,116	\$ 1,376,870	
Marketing	\$ 369	\$ 3,475	\$ 4,195	\$ 7,075	\$ 3,523	\$ 10,540	\$ 5,464	\$ 10,540	\$ 12,548	
Administrative Expense	\$ 184	\$ 448	\$ 293	\$ 184	\$ 3,376	\$ 6,450	\$ 2,250	\$ 6,450	\$ 7,560	
Total	\$ 41,507	\$ 192,777	\$ 670,440	\$ 540,288	\$ 1,296,150	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 631,686	\$ 1,685,166	\$ 1,824,790	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	14,238	31,695	159,470	176,102	319,120	232,898	91,144	243,147	243,767	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	280,421	512,586	2,792,634	3,239,380	5,472,495	3,780,021	1,546,216	4,124,883	4,806,811	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 2.92	\$ 6.08	\$ 4.20	\$ 3.07	\$ 4.06	\$ 6.44	\$ 6.93	\$ 6.93	\$ 7.49	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 0.15	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.24	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.24	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.41	\$ 0.38	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	\$ 206,809	\$ 375,319	\$ 1,070,385	\$ 2,913,053	\$ 5,883,474	\$ 3,342,238	\$ 1,367,141	\$ 3,647,160	\$ 2,445,147	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	\$ 4.98	\$ 1.95	\$ 1.60	\$ 5.39	\$ 4.54	\$ 2.23	\$ 2.16	\$ 2.16	\$ 1.34	g=f/a
Homes Served	88	430	1,149	1,421	2,538	2,006	922	2,460	2,042	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	3,187	1,192	2,430	2,280	2,156	1,884	1,677	1,677	2,354	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	\$ 472	\$ 448	\$ 583	\$ 380	\$ 511	\$ 748	\$ 685	\$ 685	\$ 894	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	\$ 2,350	\$ 873	\$ 932	\$ 2,050	\$ 2,318	\$ 1,666	\$ 1,483	\$ 1,483	\$ 1,197	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	\$ 449,651	\$ 41,507	9%
2007	\$ 450,000	\$ 192,777	43%
2008	\$ 450,000	\$ 670,440	149%
2009	\$ 700,000	\$ 540,288	77%
2010	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,296,150	185%
2011 YTD (June)	\$1,500,000	\$ 631,686	42%
2011 YE projection	\$1,500,000	\$ 1,685,166	112%
2012	\$1,824,790	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	1,004	88	9%
2007	1,127	430	38%
2008	1,149	1,870	163%
2009	1,740	1,421	82%
2010	1,895	2,538	134%
2011 YTD (June)	2,006	922	46%
2011 YE projection	2,006	2,460	123%
2012	2,042	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	80,495	14,238	18%
2007	48,702	31,695	65%
2008	62,611	159,470	255%
2009	120,531	176,102	146%
2010	123,219	319,120	259%
2011 YTD (June)	232,898	91,144	39%
2011 YE projection	232,898	243,147	104%
2012	243,767	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	1,448,905	280,421	19%
2007	1,146,993	512,586	45%
2008	1,126,993	2,792,634	248%
2009	2,357,898	3,239,380	137%
2010	2,556,743	5,472,495	214%
2011 YTD (June)	3,780,021	1,546,216	41%
2011 YE projection	3,780,021	4,124,883	109%
2012	4,806,811	n/a	-

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

HES Income Eligible

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 420	\$ 529	\$ 911	\$ 328	\$ 886	\$ 662	\$ 662
Contractor Staff	\$ 40	\$ 61	\$ -	\$ 93	\$ 200	\$ 442	\$ 442
Total Labor	\$ 459	\$ 590	\$ 911	\$ 422	\$ 1,086	\$ 1,103	\$ 1,103
Material & Supply	\$ 5	\$ 4	\$ 30	\$ 1	\$ 30	\$ 30 a)	\$ 30
Outside Service	\$ 424	\$ 420	\$ 1,204	\$ 254	\$ 1,146	\$ 107	\$ 106
Incentives	\$ 6,827	\$ 8,245	\$ 8,472	\$ 3,616	\$ 8,062	\$ 7,767	\$ 7,716
Marketing	\$ 20	\$ 81	\$ 288	\$ 44	\$ 280	\$ 275	\$ 273
Administrative Expense	\$ 12	\$ 13	\$ 70	\$ 5	\$ 68	\$ 68 b)	\$ 68
Other	\$ 11	\$ 9	\$ 52	\$ 3	\$ 51	\$ 50	\$ 50
Total	\$ 7,758	\$ 9,362	\$ 11,027	\$ 4,345	\$ 10,722	\$ 9,400	\$ 9,346

a) Actual materials and labor done by Community Action Agencies and/or vendor.

b) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	928.7
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	13,728,204
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	116,400,232
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.685
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.081
Electric b/c Ratio	0.93
Total Resource b/c Ratio	2.17

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

HES Income Eligible

Year	Budget	Program Costs			\$/LT-kWh
		Actual	% of Budget	Cost/participant	
2000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 4,406,000	88%	\$653	0.042
2001	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,036,000	101%	\$754	0.040
2002	\$ 4,420,000	\$ 4,716,000	107%	\$783	0.033
2003	\$ 4,024,000	\$ 3,181,815	79%	\$864	0.038
2004	\$ 4,250,000	\$ 4,590,734	108%	\$524	0.034
2005 Revised	\$ 5,891,143	\$ 4,682,547	79%	\$477	0.044
2006 Revised	\$ 5,850,000	\$ 5,298,638	91%	\$506	0.050
2007 Revised	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 7,112,363	117%	\$626	0.064
2008 Revised	\$ 7,575,094	\$ 7,035,693	93%	\$828	0.061
2009 Revised	\$ 9,005,048	\$ 7,758,362	86%	\$755	0.069
2010 Revised	\$ 11,399,500	\$ 9,361,764	82%	\$1,000	0.090
2011 Revised	\$ 11,027,050	n/a	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 4,344,644	38%	\$984	0.098
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 11,027,050	\$ 10,722,061	94%	\$1,214	0.093
2012	\$ 9,400,400	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Goal - Participation			
Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	6,000	6,749	112%
2001	5,866	6,675	114%
2002	4,900	6,022	123%
2003	6,094	3,683	60%
2004	6,694	8,765	131%
2005 Revised	7,517	9,818	131%
2006 Revised	10,192	10,481	103%
2007 Revised	10,636	11,244	106%
2008 Revised	14,509	8,501	59%
2009 Revised	14,038	10,282	73%
2010 Revised	16,566	9,362	57%
2011 Revised	15,243	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	4,415	27%
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	8,830	53%
2012	14,445	n/a	n/a

Goal - Lifetime MWh savings				Goal - Installed kW Savings			
Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	160,261	104,812	65%	2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	107,844	125,527	116%	2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	86,326	144,198	167%	2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	101,614	84,526	83%	2003	531	427	80.4%
2004	115,905	135,997	117%	2004	626	652	104.2%
2005 Revised	113,022	107,224	95%	2005 Revised	828	806	97.3%
2006 Revised	88,603	105,089	119%	2006 Budget	1,299	1,110	85.4%
2007 Revised	94,961	109,864	116%	2007 Revised	1,442	1,067	74.0%
2008 Revised	149,518	115,014	77%	2008 Revised	1,521	1,271	83.6%
2009 Revised	147,661	111,730	76%	2009 Revised	1,455	1,172	80.6%
2010 Revised	128,657	104,256	81%	2010 Revised	1,832	1,146	62.6%
2011 Revised	137,298	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	1,767	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	44,274	34%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	453	24.8%
2011 Y/E Projected	137,298	115,363	90%	1 Y/E Projected	1,767	1,368	74.7%
2012	116,400	n/a	n/a	2012	1,677	n/a	n/a

Program Ratios				
Year	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.031	0.042	n/a	8407
2001	0.046	0.040	n/a	6375
2002	0.051	0.033	n/a	7,452
2003	0.039	0.038	8,176	7,452
2004	0.037 ¹	0.034	6,790	7,041
2005 Revised	0.052	0.044	7,115	5,811
2006 Revised	0.066	0.050	4,503	4,774
2007 Revised	0.063	0.065	4,161	6,664
2008 Revised	0.051	0.061	4,980	5,536
2009 Revised	0.061	0.069	6,790	6,618
2010 Revised	0.089	0.090	6,224	8,171
2011 Revised	0.080	n/a	6,241	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.098	n/a	9,581
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.093	n/a	7,836
2012	0.081	n/a	5,605	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - HES Income Eligible

Budget/FTE		
4.9		FTE for program administration, vendor interaction, sales and field support.
Goal		
14,445		Customers Served
Cost/Unit		
\$651		Average cost per customer.

Goal Setting Methodology
Goal was based on available dollars and average cost per customer.

Metric Changes
None

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

HES Income Eligible

Baseline Assumptions:

Market

Residential customers on limited and fixed income < 60% State Median Income

<u>Budget Projections</u>	2011		2011		2011	
	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>Revised Bud</u>	<u>YTD (June)</u>	<u>YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 171,145	\$ 185,551	\$ 89,279	\$ 185,551	\$ 189,057 a)	\$ 198,510
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - b)	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 171,145	\$ 185,551	\$ 89,279	\$ 185,551	\$ 189,057	\$ 198,510
Materials & Supplies	\$ 14,460	\$ 15,691	\$ 4,023	\$ 15,691	\$ 5,000 c)	\$ 5,000
Outside Services	\$ 45,882	\$ 119,353	\$ 21,566	\$ 119,353	\$ 31,000 d)	\$ 31,000
Incentives	\$ 2,728,560	\$ 2,135,845	\$ 748,604	\$ 2,135,845	\$ 1,851,536 e)	\$ 1,828,884
Marketing	\$ 12,709	\$ 35,000	\$ 22,471	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000 f)	\$ 35,000
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - g)	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 3,402	\$ 7,556	\$ 2,385	\$ 7,556	\$ 6,500 h)	\$ 6,500
Total	\$ 2,976,157	\$ 2,498,996	\$ 888,328	\$ 2,498,996	\$ 2,118,093	\$ 2,104,894

- a) 1.93 FTEs
- b) No comment
- c) Printing of Program forms and educational materials
- d) Services for 3,121 in-home services
- e) Incentives for 3,121 in-home services
incl. appliance replacements refrigerators, ductless heatpumps, and dehumidifiers replacements
- f) Brochure revision, select advertising, public relations, etc.
- g) No comment
- h) Meals, miles, travel and training

Goals and Metrics Information:

Savings	2012
Demand Savings (kW)	210
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	3,070,255
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	40,277,158
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.690
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.053
Cost per kW	\$ 10,100
Electric System B/C Ratio	1.26
Total Resource B/C Ratio	2.20

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

HES Income Eligible

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	\$1,542	\$1,795	116.4%
2001	\$1,519	\$1,500	98.7%
2002	\$1,235	\$1,168	94.6%
2003	\$1,117	\$799	71.5%
2004	\$773	\$803	103.9%
2005	\$1,473	\$1,086	73.7%
2006	\$1,328	\$1,250	94.1%
2007	\$1,224	\$1,107	90.4%
2008	\$1,558	\$939	60.3%
2009	\$3,125	\$3,448	110.3%
2010	\$3,444	\$2,976	86.4%
2011	\$2,498		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$2,498	\$888	35.6%
2011 YE Projected	\$2,498	\$2,499	100.0%
2012	\$2,118		

Goal - Number of Customers Served

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	4,859	6,452	132.8%
2001	6,500	7,720	118.8%
2002	5,000	7,078	141.6%
2003	7,204	5,377	74.6%
2004	4,300	4,722	109.8%
2005	6,500	8,603	132.4%
2006	6,500	6,116	94.1%
2007	5,200	3,660	70.4%
2008	4,200	2,692	64.1%
2009	7,924	4,850	61.2%
2010	4,400	4,550	103.4%
2011	3,106		
2011 YTD (Jun)	3,106	2,041	65.7%
2011 YE Projected	3,106	3,106	100.0%
2012	3,121		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	4,000	5,097	127.4%
2001	5,135	6,086	118.5%
2002	3,877	5,550	143.2%
2003	3,601	2,779	77.2%
2004	2,954	4,053	137.2%
2005	4,327	5,130	118.6%
2006	4,248	4,785	112.6%
2007	3,822	3,498	91.5%
2008	3,822	2,511	65.7%
2009	7,675	3,122	40.7%
2010	6,906	4,204	60.9%
2011	3,577		
2011 YTD (Jun)	3,577	1,452	40.6%
2011 YE Projected	3,577	3,577	100.0%
2012	3,070		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	292	283	96.9%
2004	253	294	116.2%
2005	444	416	93.7%
2006	458	474	103.5%
2007	360	338	93.9%
2008	409	229	56.0%
2009	715	277	38.7%
2010	353	324	91.8%
2011	252		
2011 YTD (Jun)	252	139	55.2%
2011 YE Projected	252	252	100.0%
2012	210		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's kWh)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	40,027	50,971	127.3%
2001	51,350	60,860	118.5%
2002	38,773	55,500	143.1%
2003	31,597	24,412	77.3%
2004	14,700	17,352	118.0%
2005	15,631	36,581	234.0%
2006	31,969	36,749	115.0%
2007	28,126	32,294	114.8%
2008	29,528	20,676	70.0%
2009	56,704	24,879	43.9%
2010	81,275	40,905	50.3%
2011	42,455		
2011 YTD (Jun)	42,455	12,139	28.6%
2011 YE Projected	42,455	42,455	100.0%
2012	40,277		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh		\$/LT kWh		\$/kW Target	Actual	Cost/ Customer
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual			
2000	\$0.386	\$0.352	\$0.039	\$0.035	\$0	\$0	\$278
2001	\$0.296	\$0.246	\$0.030	\$0.025	\$0	\$0	\$194
2002	\$0.319	\$0.210	\$0.032	\$0.021	\$0	\$0	\$165
2003	\$0.310	\$0.288	\$0.035	\$0.033	\$3,825	\$2,823	\$155
2004	\$0.262	\$0.198	\$0.053	\$0.046	\$3,055	\$2,731	\$170
2005	\$0.340	\$0.212	\$0.094	\$0.030	\$3,318	\$2,611	\$126
2006	\$0.313	\$0.261	\$0.042	\$0.034	\$2,900	\$2,638	\$204
2007	\$0.320	\$0.316	\$0.044	\$0.034	\$3,400	\$3,275	\$302
2008	\$0.408	\$0.374	\$0.053	\$0.045	\$3,809	\$4,100	\$349
2009	\$0.407	\$1.104	\$0.055	\$0.139	\$4,371	\$12,448	\$711
2010	\$0.499	\$0.708	\$0.042	\$0.073	\$9,756	\$9,185	\$654
2011	\$0.698		\$0.059		\$9,913		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.698	\$0.612	\$0.059	\$0.073	\$9,913	\$6,391	\$435
2011 YE Projected	\$0.698	\$0.699	\$0.059	\$0.059	\$9,913	\$9,917	\$805
2012	\$0.690		\$0.053		\$10,100		

The United Illuminating Company

LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - HES Income Eligible

Budget/FTE:

1.93 FTE to provide direct contact with community outreach, contract administration/vendor oversight, and financial/data administration

Goal:

Program is designed around 3,121 existing homes
plus appliance replacement refrigerators, dehumidifiers and ductless heatpumps

Cost/kWh (Unit/Cost):

Cost rates increased per customer increase of oil home participation
and focus on comprehensive piggy back services with Gas Co.
Funding of non-electric measures in oil heated homes up to 25% of total budget for such measures

Goal Setting Methodology

Goal is driven program history, measure mix and historical installation quantities
Production levels based on available funds.

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

HES Income Eligible Weatherization

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	\$ 39,223	\$ 70,812	\$ 74,616	\$ 85,041	\$ 107,390	\$ 168,910	\$ 86,372	\$ 172,745	\$ 175,500
Outside Services	\$ 28,379	\$ 32,610	\$ 72,802	\$ 36,830	\$ 45,922	\$ 93,120	\$ 185,953	\$ 324,295	\$ 120,000
Materials & Supplies	\$ 261	\$ -	\$ 331	\$ 607	\$ 678	\$ 2,340	\$ -	\$ 1,170	\$ 2,500
Incentives	\$ 334,759	\$ 343,427	\$ 560,711	\$ 818,189	\$ 887,830	\$ 660,950	\$ 386,939	\$ 1,290,988	\$ 892,000
Marketing	\$ 1,284	\$ 26,453	\$ 2,944	\$ 7,403	\$ 8,985	\$ 2,925	\$ 4,243	\$ 5,064	\$ 7,500
Administrative Expense	\$ 543	\$ 196	\$ 1,398	\$ 3,672	\$ 4,147	\$ 1,755	\$ 552	\$ 822	\$ 2,500
Total	\$ 404,449	\$ 473,498	\$ 712,802	\$ 951,742	\$ 1,054,952	\$ 930,000	\$ 664,059	\$ 1,795,084	\$ 1,200,000 a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goal	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goal
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	45,734	101,407	94,054	195,280	194,946	156,774	131,516	355,514	156,228 b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	941,555	1,396,219	1,617,301	3,534,308	2,616,614	2,394,163	2,228,668	6,024,534	2,927,549 c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 8.84	\$ 4.67	\$ 7.58	\$ 4.87	\$ 5.41	\$ 5.93	\$ 5.05	\$ 5.05	\$ 7.68 d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 0.43	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.44	\$ 0.27	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.41 e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	\$ 664,294	\$ 835,829	\$ 987,487	\$ 3,423,553	\$ 2,924,501	\$ 2,169,027	\$ 2,019,094	\$ 5,863,312	\$ 1,481,815 f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	\$ 1.64	\$ 1.77	\$ 1.39	\$ 3.60	\$ 2.77	\$ 2.33	\$ 3.04	\$ 3.27	\$ 1.23 g=f/a
Homes Served	574	1,238	1,350	1,932	2,497	1,779	765	2,068	1,617 h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	1,640	1,128	1,198	1,829	1,048	1,346	2,913	2,913	1,811 i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	\$ 705	\$ 382	\$ 528	\$ 493	\$ 422	\$ 523	\$ 868	\$ 868	\$ 742 k=a/h
Benefit per Home	\$ 1,157	\$ 675	\$ 731	\$ 1,772	\$ 1,171	\$ 1,219	\$ 2,639	\$ 2,835	\$ 917 l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	\$ 243,933	\$ 404,449	166%
2007	\$ 400,000	\$ 473,498	118%
2008	\$ 400,000	\$ 712,802	178%
2009	\$ 925,000	\$ 951,742	103%
2010	\$ 925,000	\$ 1,054,952	114%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 930,000	\$ 664,059	71%
2011 YE projection	\$ 930,000	\$ 1,795,084	193%
2012	\$ 1,200,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	301	574	191%
2007	660	1,238	188%
2008	1,225	1,350	110%
2009	1,659	1,932	116%
2010	1,147	2,497	218%
2011 YTD (June)	1,779	765	43%
2011 YE projection	1,779	2,068	116%
2012	1,617	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	35,150	45,734	130%
2007	56,432	101,407	180%
2008	74,675	94,054	126%
2009	104,320	195,280	187%
2010	142,173	194,946	137%
2011 YTD (June)	156,774	131,516	84%
2011 YE projection	156,774	355,514	227%
2012	156,228	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	572,388	941,555	164%
2007	1,172,876	1,396,219	119%
2008	970,771	1,617,301	167%
2009	1,599,520	3,534,308	221%
2010	2,536,750	2,616,614	103%
2011 YTD (June)	2,394,163	2,228,668	93%
2011 YE projection	2,394,163	6,024,534	252%
2012	2,927,549	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

HES Income Eligible Weatherization and Heating Systems

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD(June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	
Labor	\$ 33,320	\$ 23,186	\$ 61,239	\$ 93,036	\$ 74,831	\$ 134,995	\$ 34,651	\$ 134,995	\$ 168,744	
Outside Service	\$ 151,163	\$ 26,824	\$ 26,903	\$ 30,860	\$ 46,419	\$ 79,332	\$ 24,693	\$ 79,332	\$ 62,722	
Materials & Supplies	\$ 2,397	\$ -	\$ 24	\$ -	\$ 450	\$ 2,800	\$ -	\$ 2,800	\$ 3,500	
Incentives	\$ 251,308	\$ 332,058	\$ 340,635	\$ 540,010	\$ 676,914	\$ 604,485	\$ 258,459	\$ 955,959	\$ 785,606	
Marketing	\$ 3,596	\$ 19,105	\$ 1,751	\$ 1,738	\$ 6,660	\$ 2,080	\$ 1,588	\$ 2,080	\$ 2,600	
Administrative Expense	\$ 1,678	\$ 14	\$ 307	\$ 2	\$ 25	\$ 2,080	\$ -	\$ 2,080	\$ 2,600	
Total	\$ 443,462	\$ 401,187	\$ 430,859	\$ 665,645	\$ 805,299	\$ 825,772	\$ 319,391	\$ 1,177,246	\$ 1,025,772	a

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Goal</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Goal</u>	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	43,949	62,141	66,843	135,579	149,137	134,146	142,761	526,204	113,054	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	904,811	961,680	889,992	2,160,620	2,062,386	2,180,736	1,903,648	7,016,672	2,025,706	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 10.09	\$ 6.46	\$ 6.45	\$ 4.91	\$ 5.40	\$ 6.16	\$ 2.24	\$ 2.24	\$ 9.07	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.42	\$ 0.48	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.51	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	\$ 638,367	\$ 712,183	\$ 912,488	\$ 2,092,912	\$ 2,305,058	\$ 1,993,137	\$ 1,739,886	\$ 6,413,061	\$ 1,050,153	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	\$ 1.44	\$ 1.78	\$ 2.12	\$ 3.14	\$ 2.86	\$ 2.41	\$ 5.45	\$ 5.45	\$ 1.02	g=f/a
Homes Served	582	531	963	1,492	1,428	1,235	909	1,818	1,661	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	1,555	1,811	924	1,448	1,444	1,765	2,094	3,860	1,220	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	\$ 762	\$ 756	\$ 447	\$ 446	\$ 564	\$ 668	\$ 351	\$ 648	\$ 618	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	\$ 1,097	\$ 1,341	\$ 948	\$ 1,403	\$ 1,614	\$ 1,613	\$ 1,914	\$ 3,528	\$ 632	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
2006	\$ 265,000	\$ 443,462	167%
2007	\$ 370,000	\$ 401,187	108%
2008	\$ 385,000	\$ 430,859	112%
2009	\$ 570,000	\$ 665,645	117%
2010	\$ 699,867	\$ 805,299	115%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 825,772	\$ 319,391	39%
2011 YE projection	\$ 825,772	\$ 1,177,246	143%
2012	\$ 1,025,772	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	333	582	175%
2007	610	531	87%
2008	1,132	963	85%
2009	1,185	1,492	126%
2010	852	1,428	168%
2011 YTD (June)	1,235	909	74%
2011 YE projection	1,235	1,818	147%
2012	1,661	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	38,869	43,949	113%
2007	52,146	62,141	119%
2008	69,003	66,843	97%
2009	74,514	135,579	182%
2010	105,666	149,137	141%
2011 YTD (June)	134,146	142,761	106%
2011 YE projection	134,146	526,204	392%
2012	113,054	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	632,949	904,811	143%
2007	1,042,922	961,680	92%
2008	897,042	889,992	99%
2009	1,142,515	2,160,620	189%
2010	1,885,367	2,062,386	109%
2011 YTD (June)	2,180,736	1,903,648	87%
2011 YE projection	2,180,736	7,016,672	322%
2012	2,025,706	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

HES Income Eligible Weatherization and Heating Systems

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	\$ 19,494	\$ 27,200	\$ 12,629	\$ 11,950	\$ 8,956	\$ 134,995	\$ 5,978	\$ 134,995	\$ 164,994	
Outside Service	\$ 85,169	\$ 118,376	\$ -	\$ 308	\$ 939	\$ 87,903	\$ 914	\$ 87,903	\$ 63,753	
Materials & Supplies	\$ 1,433	\$ -	\$ 24	\$ -	\$ 147	\$ 3,240	\$ -	\$ 3,240	\$ 3,960	
Incentives	\$ 141,593	\$ 197,564	\$ 478,618	\$ 1,335,251	\$ 936,647	\$ 694,805	\$ 925,619	\$ 1,592,018	\$ 887,156	
Marketing	\$ 2,150	\$ 796	\$ 674	\$ 2,366	\$ 834	\$ 2,430	\$ 1,985	\$ 2,430	\$ 2,970	
Administrative Expense	\$ 1,003	\$ 7	\$ 107	\$ -	\$ 11	\$ 2,430	\$ -	\$ 2,430	\$ 2,970	
Total	\$ 250,842	\$ 343,943	\$ 492,052	\$ 1,349,874	\$ 947,533	\$ 925,803	\$ 934,496	\$ 1,823,016	\$ 1,125,803	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2011 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	34,052	71,551	87,541	462,617	214,440	168,213	101,458	197,924	127,667	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	579,135	975,607	956,898	7,964,615	3,551,448	2,765,352	1,502,108	2,930,314	2,287,555	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 7.37	\$ 4.81	\$ 5.62	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.27	\$ 5.50	\$ 9.21	\$ 9.21	\$ 8.82	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	\$ 0.43	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.51	\$ 2.92	\$ 4.42	\$ 0.33	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.49	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	\$ 438,322	\$ 722,497	\$ 727,728	\$ 7,715,026	\$ 3,969,334	\$ 2,411,905	\$ 1,310,120	\$ 2,555,783	\$ 1,185,899	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	\$ 1.75	\$ 2.10	\$ 1.48	\$ 5.72	\$ 4.19	\$ 2.61	\$ 1.40	\$ 1.40	\$ 1.05	g=f/a
Homes Served	253	545	1,910	3,511	2,034	1,483	1,028	2,005	1,875	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	2,289	1,790	501	132	105	1,865	1,461	1,461	1,220	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	\$ 991	\$ 631	\$ 258	\$ 384	\$ 466	\$ 624	\$ 909	\$ 909	\$ 600	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	\$ 1,732	\$ 1,326	\$ 381	\$ 2,197	\$ 1,951	\$ 1,627	\$ 1,274	\$ 1,274	\$ 632	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	\$ 251,934	\$ 250,843	100%
2007	\$ 350,000	\$ 343,943	98%
2008	\$ 365,000	\$ 492,052	135%
2009	\$ 570,000	\$ 1,349,874	237%
2010	\$ 700,569	\$ 947,533	135%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 925,803	\$ 934,496	101%
2011 YE projection	\$ 925,803	\$ 1,823,016	197%
2012	\$1,125,803	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	313	253	81%
2007	574	545	95%
2008	1,067	1,910	179%
2009	1,185	3,511	296%
2010	852	2,034	239%
2011 YTD (June)	1,483	1,028	69%
2011 YE projection	1,483	2,005	135%
2012	1,875	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	36,503	34,052	93%
2007	49,134	71,551	146%
2008	65,017	87,541	135%
2009	74,514	462,617	621%
2010	105,631	214,440	203%
2011 YTD (June)	168,213	101,458	60%
2011 YE projection	168,213	197,924	118%
2012	127,667	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	594,411	579,135	97%
2007	982,670	975,607	99%
2008	845,218	956,898	113%
2009	1,142,515	7,964,615	697%
2010	1,884,754	3,551,448	188%
2011 YTD (June)	2,765,352	1,502,108	54%
2011 YE projection	2,765,352	2,930,314	106%
2012	2,287,555	n/a	-

This page intentionally blank

Residential Water Heating Program (Electric and Natural Gas)

Objective:

The objective of the Companies' Residential Water Heating Program is to encourage customers to purchase and install high-efficiency natural gas water heaters including indirect water heaters, on-demand tankless water heaters, combined boiler and on-demand water heating units. For electric water heating, this program promotes the purchase and installation of electric heat pump water heaters as a high efficiency option.

Target Market:

All residential customers in the Companies' service territories.

Program Description:

Qualified residential customers will receive a \$100 rebate for installing a natural gas ENERGY STAR -qualified indirect, on-demand tankless or combined boiler and water heater unit. Also, qualified electric residential customers will receive a \$400 rebate for installing an ENERGY STAR -qualified electric heat pump water heater. For customers to qualify for a gas rebate, they must submit (along with the completed rebate application) an inspection report signed by the local building inspector indicating that the installation of the gas hot water heater has passed inspection and complies with all building codes and relevant safety regulations. The rebate form must be filled out completely, signed and accompanied by dated sales receipts or invoice.

The following types of technologies qualify:

- Indirect water heating systems that are connected to ENERGY STAR -rated boilers (90 percent AFUE or greater).
- ENERGY STAR -qualified on-demand tankless water heater with an electronic ignition (82 percent Energy Factor or greater).
- Combined High-Efficiency ENERGY STAR -rated boiler and combined heating water units (90 percent AFUE or greater).
- ENERGY STAR -qualified heat pump water heaters with a minimum coefficient of performance (COP) of 2.0.

Marketing Strategy:

The program will be marketed through contractor networks, distributors, home improvement retailers, Companies' websites and call centers, and through the Home Energy Solutions and Residential New Construction programs. The Companies will continue to seek out special retail placement opportunities including point of purchase materials to highlight the benefits of high efficiency products. Cooperative opportunities will be leveraged to create general awareness of the ENERGY STAR brand, generate sales and extend the message to customers. In addition, targeted, direct marketing campaigns (including past and present HES participants who heat with electric hot water) may be used.

Incentives:

A \$300 rebate will be offered to the residential customers who purchase and install either high efficiency indirect water heaters attached to their natural gas ENERGY STAR -rated boiler, or a combined high efficiency ENERGY STAR -qualified boilers and water heating units. A \$100 incentive will be offered for an ENERGY STAR tankless water heater. Also, a \$400 rebate will be offered to residential electric customers who purchase and install ENERGY STAR-qualified heat pump water heaters. The heat pump water heater incentive is only available for customers that have electric hot water heaters, including first generation heat pump water heaters, or for customers that are building all-electric new homes.

Goals:

The budget, savings and benefits of the Companies' Residential Water Heating program are presented in the standard filing requirements. For budget and reporting purposes, electric heat pump water heaters are included in Home Energy Solutions.

New Program Issues:

In 2012, avoided costs for natural gas have dropped by approximately forty percent (See Chapter 6, Cost Benefit Analysis). In addition, savings assumptions for natural gas water heaters decreased in 2012 as a result of updated algorithms used in the Program Savings Documentation ("PSD"). As a result, it was necessary to decrease the incentive for tankless gas water heating equipment in order for the program to remain cost effective. Therefore, the \$300 incentive offered in 2011 for tankless water heaters has been decreased to \$100, and the budget for program has been lowered to reflect lower per unit incentive amounts.

Commercially manufactured heat pump water heaters have recently become available to the general public. This technology gives homeowners with electric water heat an option to greatly improve their water heating efficiency. The Companies are mindful that heat pump water heaters may not always be a suitable replacement for electric resistance water heaters. Heat pump water heaters need to be located in an area which provides sufficient volume so they can "breathe". A below-grade unconditioned

basement is the ideal environment for a heat pump water heater. Anecdotally, many electric water heaters are located in closets and/or within conditioned space. In these situations, a heat pump water heater may not operate efficiently and/or it could cause discomfort issues such as “cold feet” or noise.

In April 2008, ENERGY STAR released its first ever specification for residential heat pump water heaters. While these requirements are important, they did not address some of the key consumer or application issues identified through utility program experience in northern climates. The Companies have been active in a national effort to develop standards that are more applicable to northern tier states. The purpose of the northern tier standards would be to ensure consumer satisfaction and high energy performance in cooler climates. The northern tier standards will attempt to address issues including cold air exhaust, condensate management, cold weather efficiency, freeze protection, and reliability.

Current manufacturer training of heat pump water heater installers focuses primarily on marketing and insufficiently addresses some of the important aforementioned issues. To address this concern, the companies plan to work with manufacturers, contractors and building officials on consumer education and to promote and enforce the proper application and installation of heat pump water heaters. As a follow-up, the Companies will solicit feedback from customers who have installed a heat pump water heater to gauge their satisfaction and to ensure that manufacturer guidelines are being followed.

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Water Heating

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,346	\$ 4,059	\$ 2,972	\$ 26,600	\$ 1,645	\$ 3,291	\$ 3,500	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 8,322	\$ 6,568	\$ 2,844	\$ 8,000	\$ 3,197	\$ 5,470	\$ 4,100	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 256	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 49,728	\$ 92,196	\$ 50,786	\$ 91,300	\$ 22,519	\$ 108,792	\$ 56,917	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,349	\$ 912	\$ 2,967	\$ 8,210	\$ 1,934	\$ 4,138	\$ 4,207	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 114	\$ 355	\$ 1,277	\$ 1,990	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,020	
Total			\$ 62,859	\$ 104,090	\$ 60,847	\$ 136,600	\$ 29,295	\$ 121,690	\$ 70,000	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goal	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	9,728	18,422	10,883	17,043	2,856	11,864	24,361	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	194,560	368,448	217,664	340,855	57,120	237,274	292,328	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.32	\$ 5.65	\$ 5.59	\$ 8.02	\$ 10.26	\$ 10.26	2.87	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.32	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.51	0.24	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 326,881	\$ 308,242	\$ 197,047	\$ 236,740	\$ 39,673	\$ 164,798	\$ 152,765	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 5.20	\$ 2.96	\$ 3.24	\$ 1.73	\$ 1.35	1.35	2.18	g=f/a
Homes Served	n/a	n/a	160	303	179	304	51	212	569	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	n/a	n/a	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,120	1,120	1,120	514	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	n/a	n/a	\$ 393	\$ 344	\$ 340	\$ 449	\$ 574	\$ 574	\$ 123	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,043	\$ 1,017	\$ 1,101	\$ 778	\$ 778	\$ 778	\$ 268	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 136,600	\$ 62,859	46%
2009	\$ 136,600	\$ 104,090	76%
2010	\$ 136,600	\$ 60,847	45%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 136,600	\$ 29,295	21%
2011 YE projection	\$ 136,600	\$ 121,690	89%
2012	\$ 70,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	290	160	55%
2009	359	303	84%
2010	342	179	52%
2011 YTD (June)	304	51	17%
2011 YE projection	304	212	70%
2012	569	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	17,630	9,728	55%
2009	21,807	18,422	84%
2010	20,791	10,883	52%
2011 YTD (June)	17,043	2,856	17%
2011 YE projection	17,043	11,864	70%
2012	24,361	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	352,592	194,560	55%
2009	436,139	368,448	84%
2010	415,811	217,664	52%
2011 YTD (June)	340,855	57,120	17%
2011 YE projection	340,855	237,274	70%
2012	292,328	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Water Heating

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,385	\$ 3,750	\$ 2,338	\$ 22,610	\$ 858	\$ 22,610	\$ 5,000	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,552	\$ 5,297	\$ 2,626	\$ 2,305	\$ 1,767	\$ 2,305	\$ 2,305	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 500	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 26,107	\$ 82,462	\$ 54,072	\$ 71,535	\$ 37,030	\$ 68,230	\$ 23,800	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 794	\$ 253	\$ 426	\$ 6,450	\$ 1,392	\$ 6,450	\$ 6,450	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 242	\$ 355	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000	
Total			\$ 38,080	\$ 92,116	\$ 59,462	\$ 105,400	\$ 41,047	\$ 102,095	\$ 40,055	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	5,107	16,355	11,734	13,353	4,368	10,864	10,186	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	102,144	327,104	234,688	267,064	87,360	217,288	122,237	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 7.46	\$ 5.63	\$ 5.07	\$ 7.89	\$ 9.40	\$ 9.40	\$ 3.93	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.37	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.25	\$ 0.39	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.47	\$ 0.33	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 236,707	\$ 273,653	\$ 212,458	\$ 185,488	\$ 60,675	\$ 150,916	\$ 65,790	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 6.22	\$ 2.97	\$ 3.57	\$ 1.76	\$ 1.48	\$ 1.48	\$ 1.64	g=f/a
Homes Served	n/a	n/a	84	269	193	238	78	194	238	h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	n/a	n/a	1,216	1,216	1,216	1,122	1,120	1,120	514	i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	n/a	n/a	\$ 453	\$ 342	\$ 308	\$ 443	\$ 526	\$ 526	\$ 168	k=a/h
Benefit per Home	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,818	\$ 1,017	\$ 1,101	\$ 779	\$ 778	\$ 778	\$ 276	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 105,400	\$ 38,080	36%
2009	\$ 105,400	\$ 92,116	87%
2010	\$ 105,400	\$ 59,462	56%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 105,400	\$ 41,047	39%
2011 YE projection	\$ 105,400	\$ 102,095	97%
2012	\$ 40,055	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	210	84	40%
2009	274	269	98%
2010	264	193	73%
2011 YTD (June)	238	78	33%
2011 YE projection	238	194	82%
2012	238	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	12,766	5,107	40%
2009	16,648	16,355	98%
2010	16,040	11,734	73%
2011 YTD (June)	13,353	4,368	33%
2011 YE projection	13,353	10,864	81%
2012	10,186	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	255,325	102,144	40%
2009	332,961	327,104	98%
2010	320,801	234,688	73%
2011 YTD (June)	267,064	87,360	33%
2011 YE projection	267,064	217,288	81%
2012	122,237	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Water Heating

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,526	\$ 3,692	\$ 2,188	\$ 22,610	\$ 858	\$ 2,658	\$ 5,000
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 6,756	\$ 5,691	\$ 3,147	\$ 2,638	\$ 1,686	\$ 2,637	\$ 2,638
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 496	\$ -	\$ 496	\$ 496
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 35,120	\$ 81,264	\$ 66,725	\$ 85,780	\$ 31,770	\$ 79,770	\$ 28,600
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 794	\$ -	\$ 1,169	\$ 7,477	\$ 1,474	\$ 6,874	\$ 7,477
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 241	\$ 355	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ -	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000
Total			\$ 48,438	\$ 91,003	\$ 73,228	\$ 121,000	\$ 35,788	\$ 94,435	\$ 46,210 a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	6,627	16,173	14,349	16,012	3,472	9,162	12,241 b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	137,408	323,456	286,976	320,244	69,440	183,234	146,890 c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 7.31	\$ 5.63	\$ 5.10	\$ 7.56	\$ 10.31	\$ 10.31	\$ 3.78 d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.35	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.26	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.52	\$ 0.52	\$ 0.31 e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 281,794	\$ 270,601	\$ 259,793	\$ 222,424	\$ 48,229	\$ 127,264	\$ 79,058 f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 5.82	\$ 2.97	\$ 3.55	\$ 1.84	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.35	\$ 1.71 g=f/a
Homes Served	n/a	n/a	109	266	236	286	62	164	286 h
Lifetime Savings per Home (ccf)	n/a	n/a	1,261	1,216	1,216	1,120	1,120	1,120	514 i=c/h
Program Cost per Home	n/a	n/a	\$ 444	\$ 342	\$ 310	\$ 423	\$ 577	\$ 577	\$ 162 k=a/h
Benefit per Home	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,585	\$ 1,017	\$ 1,101	\$ 778	\$ 778	\$ 778	\$ 276 l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 121,000	\$ 48,438	40%
2009	\$ 121,000	\$ 91,003	75%
2010	\$ 121,000	\$ 73,228	61%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 121,000	\$ 35,788	30%
2011 YE projection	\$ 121,000	\$ 94,435	78%
2012	\$ 46,210	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	250	109	44%
2009	318	266	84%
2010	311	236	76%
2011 YTD (June)	286	62	22%
2011 YE projection	286	164	57%
2012	286	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	15,198	6,627	44%
2009	19,329	16,173	84%
2010	18,924	14,349	76%
2011 YTD (June)	16,012	3,472	22%
2011 YE projection	16,012	9,162	57%
2012	12,241	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	303,958	137,408	45%
2009	386,587	323,456	84%
2010	378,488	286,976	76%
2011 YTD (June)	320,244	69,440	22%
2011 YE projection	320,244	183,234	57%
2012	146,890	n/a	-

CHAPTER THREE: COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL PROGRAMS (Electric and Natural Gas)

C & I Overview

Vision Statement

The EEB C&I Committee, comprised of business, utility and agency representatives, continues to conduct a strategic examination of the C&I programs under the overarching principles defined in the C&I Vision Statement (“Vision”):

The overall Vision for the future evolution of the Energy Efficiency Fund’s C&I programs is to cost-effectively support a sustainable and competitive business climate for Connecticut’s businesses, state and municipal facilities, and industries based on bottom-line solutions for economic competitiveness, environmental stewardship, and social responsibility.

Consistent with this vision, the C&I programs continue to evolve to assist Connecticut business, manufacturing, institutional, state and municipal facilities meet regional and global competitive challenges, while providing energy-system benefits to all of Connecticut’s electric and natural gas customers.

The key themes of the C&I programs are to:

- promote bold and meaningful savings goals (30 - 50 percent +) through energy efficiency, load management and on-site generation that will help all C&I consumers have a real impact on their energy bills, contribute to their productivity, and enhance their competitiveness;
- achieve large increments of efficiency through high-performance buildings, systems and industrial processes. A high-performance building or facility uses less energy, provides superior indoor environmental quality, enhances worker productivity and well-being, and improves the bottom lines of developers, owners and tenants;
- provide comprehensive business energy solutions that integrate energy efficiency, load management, distributed generation, renewable energy systems and designs, and other related initiatives into a cost-effective, comprehensive solution for businesses, and
- support businesses in making energy management an integral part of their business practices and corporate culture.

The EEB and the Companies believe that this vision and accompanying principles are fully consistent with the Administration’s and Legislature’s vision for an energy efficient and prosperous Connecticut.

Innovative technologies, enhanced and competitive building design and operational practices are constantly on the rise. As such, comprehensive whole-building initiatives, education, financing and incentive transformation must also increase. In order to meet the challenges, the C&I portfolio

continues to undergo transformation as well. Since the 2010 Plan, retrofit program incentive designs have successfully encouraged many customers to implement energy-efficiency projects using a comprehensive or “whole-building” approach to obtain deeper reaching savings. Plans call for this successful initiative to be continued in 2012, while being ever-cognizant of incentive cost rates. Additionally, educational offerings continue to evolve to assist our C&I customers and trade allies in meeting their competitive challenges. To that end, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies have continued to research new training opportunities for customers and trade allies on a wide variety of subjects to support the ongoing education process. This includes continued code training for architects and engineers in partnership with the Connecticut Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (“AIA”), the American Council of Engineering Companies (“ACEC”) of Connecticut, (“ASHRAE”), and the Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers (“CSPE”).

With the advances in technology, the C&I programs will begin to focus on efforts to educate customers about real-time feedback using “energy dashboards” on building operations including the options of failure analysis that is beginning to develop as an industry. ECSU, for example, has taken a critical step forward in this effort (Ref: <http://ecsu-facilities.easternct.edu/ECSUEnergyDash/>). This type of energy monitoring system, along with the associated activities in behavioral changes through the Business Sustainability Challenge, will set the foundation for customers to see savings closer to the event of implementation instead of a month or year later. It is anticipated that the “energy dashboards” will facilitate more proactive customer behavior with regards to energy management and building operations.

State Buildings - Legislation to Reduce Energy Consumption

Section 118 of Public Act 11-80 assigns DEEP a two-staged goal: (1) reduce State building energy consumptions by 10 percent by January 1, 2013 and (2) reduce State building energy consumption an additional 10 percent by January 1, 2018. In response to the first goal, the Companies have offered the EEB a proposal which would target many of the state’s smaller, inefficient facilities with a focus on implementing standard energy-saving measures such as (but not limited to) lighting, lighting controls and HVAC retrofits. The Electric Companies propose utilizing their existing network of Small Business Energy Advantage (“SBEA”) program vendors, working under an agreement similar to the previously executed contract in place between CL&P and DAS in December, 2007. Projects would be funded using a combination of incentives and near zero percent financing. The Companies are also currently engaged with officials at DEEP in an effort to develop a plan for funding existing efficiency projects (currently on-hold) through the use of State bonding. The Companies are also helping to coordinate efforts to ramp up efforts on large-scale performance contracting projects for state and municipal facility portfolios. Simultaneously, the EEB has prepared a Green State Buildings Plan that proposes a comprehensive strategy for the State to a) cost-effectively meet its near-term goals through improved building O&M, while b) laying the groundwork for much deeper savings through high performance building upgrades.

Performance Contracting - Evolving Toward Broad Utilization

Energy Performance Contracting is a strategy used to deploy deep and broad-reaching energy efficiency upgrades by allowing the energy cost savings from facility upgrades to pay for those same upgrades. As one of the primary tools utilized by large Energy Services Companies (“ESCOs”), the concept of Energy Savings Performance Contracting (ESPC) has been in practice for many years around the country and the utilities have always played a role in assisting the MUSH market (Municipalities, Universities, Schools and Hospitals) with this process. In addition to the energy savings potential in the MUSH market, Connecticut’s State facilities are another large sector with the potential for large comprehensive energy savings. Energy Performance Contracting encourages these comprehensive upgrades because the associated costs are usually paid through energy savings and/or financing. Efficiency measures typically provided through a performance contract are lighting systems; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems; energy management systems; water use systems; central plant equipment; chillers; boilers; pumps; air compressors; domestic water equipment; and the building envelope including insulation, roofs, and windows. The other benefit of performance contracting is that the project will typically be based on guaranteed savings over time which lends itself to deeper levels of optimization and preventative maintenance.

Recent Activities:

In its decision dated January 6, 2011 in Docket No. 10-10-03, the Department issued Order No. 25 (“Order”) which requires that, “The EDCs shall conduct a workgroup to promote best practices and develop a standardized performance contract to submit in the next annual Plan, as described in Section II.D.2., herein. The EDCs shall report quarterly on the milestones of the workgroup toward the goal of developing a standardized performance contract for the 2012 Plan.”

In May, the EDCs, in collaboration with the EEB, formed a Performance Contracting Working Group. The working group is comprised of individuals representing large nationally recognized energy service companies, a national Energy Services Coalition, municipal government (Fairfield and East Hartford), environmental advocates (Clean Energy Finance Center, Clean Water Action and Woodbridge Clean Energy Initiative Task Force), state government (Department of Construction Services, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, Attorney General), the EDCs and the EEB. These individuals have either direct or indirect experience with ESPC and also share a professional and personal commitment to energy efficiency throughout the State. With the assistance of a dedicated ESPC expert as the facilitator, the working group has developed guidelines, process flows, best management practices, and templates for bid documents, implementation agreements with standardized language and definitions. The resulting recommendations from the working group have been presented to the EEB and have provided the basis for proposed supporting activities through the CEEF programs. The EEB’s C&I Committee will assist, encourage and support the Companies in developing performance contract tools and templates and innovative financing as proposed by the Plan.

Reinforcing the State's commitment to all cost-effective energy efficiency, the Legislature in June explicitly authorized energy savings performance contracting was through Section 118 of Public Act 11-80, creating more opportunities to assist in the planning of energy efficiency upgrades to state agencies throughout Connecticut, and potentially increasing participation in customer-funded energy efficiency programs. These clear and detailed policy objectives have been incorporated into this Plan as they pertain to state facilities.

Follow-Up for the Plan:

As of this filing, the Companies have provided three (3) quarterly reports to the Department on the status of the efforts to convene a workgroup to promote best practices and develop a standardized performance contract. As summarized in these quarterly reports, the Companies worked with Chris Halpin of Celtic Energy, a Connecticut-based expert on performance contracting, to coordinate a workgroup to promote best practices and develop a standardized performance contract. The goal is to ensure the development of a performance contract process that best serves the overall interests of customers, the Department and the Energy Efficiency Fund. More specifically, the intent is to move forward with the development of a standardized performance contract template and resource tools to assist municipalities and the state. The objective is to introduce lessons learned from across the country and here in Connecticut.

The working group's recommendations have been presented to the EEB and have provided the basis for proposed supporting activities through the CEEF programs.

Economic Impacts/Budget Disparity

The C&I budget has had to respond to a variety of economic conditions, legislative actions, and an annual budget approval process that created a "roller coaster" atmosphere resulting in program years with budgets being overspent and in other years, a budget surplus. In both cases, there is a corresponding impact on the following year's budgets and these impacts may be different for each utility. The end result is that a large budget disparity exists throughout the State which has been influenced by not only the diversity and size of the utility service territories, but by a variety of other factors such as the economy and competition for contractor resources with neighboring states that offer significantly higher program incentives.

As a result of these challenges, the need existed for the Companies to deploy different incentive structures and/or cost caps over the course of the program year to effectively manage program budgets and respond to differing market conditions in each of the Companies' service territories. These incentive structures included targeted increased incentives and marketing efforts at one utility, while the other utility may implement cost containment measures such as lower cost caps. Over the years, flexibility has proven to be vital for implementing cost-effective, energy-efficient projects in both service territories.


As a result of last year’s final decision (Docket #10-10-10) the PURA approved the Companies’ plan to simplify program incentive caps and improve transparency. This approval allowed the Companies to utilize published unit incentive cost rate caps. This successful strategy, launched in January 2011, will continue to provide program incentive transparency while continuing to allow for greater flexibility and better project incentive costs management. This strategy will also be continued for the gas program incentive structures as well.

In an effort to facilitate the implementation of energy efficiency improvements within Connecticut’s “state owned or leased” building stock and the realization of DEEP’s energy efficiency goals, the Companies recommend implementing “multi-year” or long range budget planning. This change will also allow State agencies to synchronize their projects with their fiscal year obligations and with the Fund budget cycles, ensuring that funding is available. In addition, “multi-year” planning would help stabilize the market place and customer expectations helping to minimize the “roller-coaster” effect that incentive programs have experienced in the past.

Growth of Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Budgets and Participation

The natural gas elements of the C&I programs have continued to mature and participation in the natural gas programs has steadily increased since their introduction in 2008. Proposed for 2012 is a combined C&I budget of \$7.25 million dollars which is an increase of 10.5 percent relative to the approved 2011 C&I budget. This represents more than a doubling of the C&I natural gas program budgets since 2008.


In concert with the increased gas budgets, the Companies are continually expanding the scope of gas measures to facilitate increased customer participation. As examples, the Companies have added incentives or rebates for high efficiency gas fired heat pumps and both high and low intensity infrared gas heating to the existing portfolio. Please refer to the incentive tables located in the appendix at the back of Chapter 3. The Companies will also be introducing a portfolio of measures specific to the SBEA program (please refer to the SBEA section of Chapter 3 for more information).



Sustainable Energy Management - A Paradigm Shift

Consider the life of a building as a continuum from design and construction to demolition (or major renovation) over an extended period of time (30 - 100+ years.) There are natural events in the building's life that directly affect building systems efficiency. These natural events include design and construction; equipment upgrades and retrofits; major renovations and additions; and tenant improvements or new tenants. Underlying all of these natural events is the operations and maintenance of the energy systems. By being responsive to the natural cycles for building improvements and the ongoing need for high performance facility management, CEEF's C&I programs can be much more effective in achieving deeper and more cost-effective energy savings through both comprehensive building upgrades, sustainable building operations and maintenance, and sustainable practices by building owners, managers and users. The programs will increasingly employ this strategic framework when promoting and delivering the C&I program offerings and services to better meet the customer needs and achieve the intended goals.

Building Life Cycle



(Illustration courtesy of Jim Volkman – Strategic Energy Group)

On the operational front, numerous studies have demonstrated that energy consumption can be reduced by 10-20 percent through building tune-ups, with deeper savings available through the retro-commissioning of commercial buildings. The challenge is how to maintain high performance in both new and upgraded buildings. The answer seems to be through improving building operations and building operator capability, but also by changing the behavior of the building's occupants and facility operators so that they actually "do" what is needed.

When examined from the perspective of optimal building performance, it helps to think of operations as separate from maintenance. While maintenance activities (filter changes, typical preventative maintenance (PMs), painting, window washing, etc.) are usually performed on a regular basis, little thought is typically given to proactive operations, particularly from an energy performance perspective. The result is generally poor building operating performance.

Enhanced operations activities beyond the basic maintenance type mentioned above should include:

- Monitoring, tracking, and reporting building energy use on a regular basis
- Regular review and improvement of building systems documentation
- Monitoring of key performance indicators of equipment and systems to identify when performance is slipping
- Modification and regular review of existing scheduled preventive maintenance activities to maintain building performance
- Developing technical expertise through training and other professional development activities
- Problem solving and root cause analysis in problem or suspicious areas.

Trying to address the enhanced O&M market is difficult at best. The most likely points of engagement by the Companies are the natural events in a building's life. Beginning in 2012, the Companies will focus attention on how to help customers understand the "roadmap" of activities and programs related to building design, construction, operation and maintenance. This roadmap of activities includes coordinating the necessary tools and training along with helping to change the existing culture of the occupants and operators alike.

To better reflect this refocused view of the O&M environment, the 2012 Plan is bringing the existing O&M Services, Retro Commissioning, Business Sustainability Challenge, Process Re-engineering for Increased Manufacturing Efficiency ("PRIME"), and Education and Outreach programs under one umbrella named the **Business and Energy Sustainability Program**.

Energy Conscious Blueprint

The Energy Conscious Blueprint ("ECB") program serves the new construction and equipment replacement markets. Energy Efficiency Program Administrators around the country classify programs like ECB as "lost opportunity" programs. The name lost opportunity implies that without active involvement by program administrators in the marketplace, customers, contractors and design professionals would design and install new buildings to "code" or would replace failed equipment with that having efficiency levels that only meet older, more standard design practices. In their September

2008 white paper entitled, “Lost Opportunities in the Buildings Sector: Energy-Efficiency Analysis and Results¹²,” the authors from Pacific Northwest National Laboratories (PNNL) explain the term as follows:

“... lost opportunities, while a significant increase in effort and impact in the buildings sector, still represent only a small portion of the full technical potential for energy efficiency in buildings. Such national-scale benefits will not be realized without a more aggressive national program, and are thus “lost opportunities” if not captured now. It is much more cost-effective to realize profound improvements in building performance at the time of construction; once a building is constructed, it is not cost effective to realize similar levels of performance, and thus the opportunities are “lost.”

The new construction market continues to be adversely impacted by the ongoing downturn in the economy. As a result, replacement of old equipment and adding new equipment currently comprises the majority of new ECB program activity. In addition, major building renovations and other code regulated events will likely dominate ECB activity in the next few years and offer important opportunities for achieving deeper and more sustainable energy savings through high performance design guidelines, commissioning services and other CEEF supported strategies.

In 2012, the ECB program will continue to focus on achieving results beyond code. As described in the discussion of Connecticut State Code below, codes are becoming ever more stringent and are driving toward whole- building performance. In recognition of the direction codes are moving and being consistent with the overall C&I program vision, the ECB program is being enhanced to assist the marketplace in making this transition. To that end, the ECB program will continue to offer two program tracks for new construction activities in 2012: (1) traditional measure-based and (2) whole-building performance. The traditional measure-based track will offer prescriptive and custom-based installation incentives consistent with existing program design.

The whole-building performance track recognizes the variability in setting code baselines when working to the requirements of design processes for high-performance buildings such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (“LEED”) or Green Globes wherein the whole building is modeled against a baseline set by the design professional and achieves a score based, in part, on overall energy and demand savings. To facilitate this whole-building design approach, the Companies will continue to offer financial assistance helping customers model their projects using hourly simulation programs broadly offered in the market along with cash incentives on a per-square-foot basis on a basic tiered approach. In this way, customers are assisted and incentivized to go beyond code. In addition, when linked with sustainable energy management, the programs work to ensure that buildings are actually performing at high levels while providing meaningful bill reductions.

¹² Lost Opportunities in the Buildings Sector: Energy-Efficiency Analysis and Results, JA Dirks, DB Belzer, DM Anderson, KA Cort, DJ Hostick (September 2008), Pacific Northwest National Laboratories

Connecticut State Code

Building energy codes continue to receive great attention as a cost-effective method to increase efficiency levels in buildings and to reduce carbon emissions. The Department of Energy (DOE) has laid out a path to increase stringencies in energy codes to achieve an 83 percent reduction in carbon emissions by 2050. DOE also recognizes that compliance with the energy code is even more critical than having a code with higher levels of efficiency. Connecticut, as one of the covenants to receiving Federal stimulus funds, has agreed to adopt ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2007 (reference document for the 2009 IECC) for commercial construction and to create a plan to achieve 90 percent compliance with the energy code by December 2017.

Connecticut is planning to adopt the 2012 editions of the International Building Code (IBC), International Existing Building Code (IEBC), International Mechanical Code (IMC), International Plumbing Code (IPC), and the 2011 National Electrical Code (NFPA-70) as the next State Building Code late in 2012 or early 2013. The 2009 IECC and 2009 IRC will be readopted as part of the next State Building Code. Adoption of the 2012 IECC and the 2012 IRC as amendments to the next State Building Code will follow, possibly in late 2013. The proposed energy codes, when adopted, will affect new construction and building renovation projects that participate in the Fund's programs. Besides increasing the stringency, the adoption of the 2012 IECC will have major impacts on the design process and professional practice.

The Companies will continue to support the adoption of the latest model energy code and will continue to work with design and construction community to increase understanding of and compliance with the new energy codes. The Companies will also continue to structure program incentives for new construction to encourage owners, design professionals and contractors to go beyond the code requirements. However, the companies also believe that code compliance is more important than having a more stringent code that is not adhered to in practice.

There are two major questions that need to be answered about code performance. The first is to quantify what is the current rate of compliance. The second is to determine what factors or issues are causing the current compliance rate and ongoing building performance levels. These questions can each be answered by separate baseline and building performance assessment studies, or through a combined study. Current indications from DOE pilot projects is that these studies are complicated, time consuming, and expensive. It is important to emphasize that the ultimate goal of ECB and Connecticut's building code is to ensure that newly constructed or renovated buildings are actually performing at the designed levels and that building owners and users are deriving the intended benefits from high performance design standards.

The first question needs to be answered by the state so that it can plan to meet its 90 percent compliance commitment. However, the state may not have the funds to perform the study. The Companies agree that it would be appropriate to use Fund dollars to improve the robustness of the

state's study or to help the state meet its commitment. This study should be performed as soon as possible so that there is time to take actions to achieve 90 percent compliance by December 2017.

The answers to the second question will provide useful information that is important to the continued successes of the ECB program. The Companies can use the information to plan training and to modify program structure to increase the compliance rate. The information may also be used by the state in the planning process to achieve the 90 percent compliance commitment. Also, building performance information will provide critical guidance to the programs to ensure that actual savings are occurring at the intended levels.

Code compliance is an interactive effort based on the actions of the building owners, building officials, design professionals and building professionals (contractors and trades). The resulting compliance rates are based on the actions or inaction of each entity involved in the design/construction/enforcement process. Then after occupancy, the resulting efficiency level or performance is either negated or enhanced by the knowledge and ability of the facility's team. The Companies will continue to work with all stakeholders to achieve the ultimate goal of increased levels of energy efficiency.

Connecticut is anticipated to adopt the 2009 International Energy Conservation Code ("IECC") as an amendment to the 2005 State Building Code late in 2011. A condition of receiving the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act ("ARRA") stimulus funds is the adoption of the IECC by the governor. Connecticut is also anticipated to adopt the 2009 International Residential Code ("IRC") as an amendment to the 2005 State Building Code in the first half of 2012. The adoption of the IRC is required to coordinate the efficiency requirements of the 2009 IECC for one and two-family homes.

The proposed energy codes, when adopted, will affect new construction and building renovation projects that participate in the Fund's programs. Besides increasing the stringency, the adoption of the 2012 IECC will have major impacts on the design process and professional practices.

There have been many supporting activities in the past year in preparation for the energy code changes. The Companies have taken every opportunity to inform the design and construction communities about the upcoming energy code changes. The State of Connecticut has offered multiple free training sessions on the 2009 IECC and ASHRAE/IESNA Standard 90.1-2007. The Companies have partnered with the American Institute of Architects Connecticut ("AIA-CT"), American Council of Engineering Companies of Connecticut ("ACEC/CT"), Connecticut Society of Professional Engineers and Connecticut Building Officials Association ("CBOA") in sponsoring the "Working Together for Energy Code Compliance" forum. The forum was also used as a platform to announce the placement of sample energy code compliance documentation spreadsheets on the AIA web page. The Companies also have worked with the Office of Education and Data Management, the Institute for Sustainable Energy and the Energy Office to develop energy code and construction practices training for the construction trades.

The Fund programs, over their life spans, have played an essential role in creating the market, political and societal conditions that facilitate code and standards improvements, by working with customers and their vendors to improve underlying practices as they relate to energy use. The Companies will continue developing a transition plan to help the building industry prepare for the adoption of higher building codes and regional standards for a variety of consumer products, including electronics. In addition, the Companies, in collaboration with the EEB, will examine the opportunities to ensure actual high performance in new construction and building renovation projects through innovative strategies such as commissioning and web-based monitoring and tracking services. The description for residential programs and commercial and industrial programs provide more detail concerning this strategy.

Energy Opportunities Program Overview

Comprehensiveness, High-Performance Lighting, and Performance Contracting

In 2011, the Energy Opportunities Program continued with the successful “comprehensive” initiative, increased focus on higher performance lighting technologies (solid state LED and induction lighting) and targeted efforts to eliminate older fluorescent (T12) lighting technologies from customer facilities.

The comprehensive initiative encourages customers, engineers and contractors to look beyond the “low-hanging fruit” to achieve broader and deeper savings. Comprehensive projects are eligible for higher incentives if they are comprised of multiple measures representing at least two or more end uses (i.e., lighting, HVAC, Process) and at least 15 percent of the project’s annual kWh savings and peak summer kW savings is from a non-lighting end use(s). Another benefit of offering a comprehensive initiative is that the projects can include measures that help optimize the specific energy consuming systems, such as chilled water or compressed air systems.

The increased focus on higher-performance lighting technologies provides higher potential incentives for qualifying LED or induction lighting. Qualified LED fixtures must be ENERGY STAR -qualified or approved through the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnership (“NEEP”) Design Lights Consortium or DLC (<http://www.designlights.org/>). The DLC is a collaboration of utility companies and regional energy efficiency organizations (across the country and Canada) and is committed to raising awareness of the benefits of efficient lighting in commercial buildings. Its mission is to help builders, architects, designers, and commercial property owners to implement improved design practices in all areas of the commercial lighting market. Its goal is to ensure that high quality, energy-efficient lighting design becomes commonplace in all lighting installations.

These initiatives will likely be continued in 2012, however the incentive values and capping mechanisms may be adjusted as needed based on available budgets, market conditions and customer response with a published incentive structure. In addition, increased emphasis will be placed on the use of performance contracting; innovative, third-party financing; and other supporting services to achieve greater leveraging of CEEF funds while achieving more comprehensiveness. Finally, there will be increased efforts to promote and deliver EO services and offerings in conjunction with the Sustainable

Energy Management framework in an effort to achieve deeper and more sustainable savings. Please refer to the incentive tables located in the appendix at the back of Chapter 3.

Small Business Energy Advantage Program Overview

In 2011, the Small Business Energy Advantage (“SBEA”) Program also continued with the successful “comprehensive” initiative, with increased focus on higher performance lighting technologies (solid state LED and induction lighting) and targeted efforts to eliminate older fluorescent (T12) lighting technologies from customer facilities.

In addition, the Companies improved the consistency of the statewide program offering with both companies currently utilizing a common program eligibility level of customers up to 200 kW.

In 2012, the Electric Companies will continue to offer the comprehensive initiative encouraging customers to go beyond the “low hanging fruit” and achieve broader and deeper savings, where it is economically feasible. New for 2012, the SBEA Program will plan to incorporate a portfolio of gas saving measures, operating with a specific program budget, and offering zero percent (0%) on-bill repayment financing. In addition, the SBEA program will, in collaboration with the EEB, review current progress and new strategies for reaching under-served, small-business market segments, especially in economically impacted communities.

Energy Project Financing

The 2012 C&LM Plan includes several existing financing options for business of all sizes and will introduce new opportunities including zero percent, on-bill financing of natural gas measures for Small Business Energy Advantage program participants. In addition, increased emphasis will be placed on the use of performance contracting, third-party financing and other supporting services to achieve greater leveraging of CEEF funds while also achieving deeper, more comprehensive savings.

Details of all the existing and new options are detailed in Chapter 5.

C&I NEW CONSTRUCTION

Energy Conscious Blueprint (Electric and Natural Gas)

Objective:

The objective of the Energy Conscious Blueprint (“ECB”) program is to maximize electric and natural gas energy savings for “lost opportunity” projects, at the time of initial construction/major renovation, or when equipment needs to be replaced or added. ECB is structured to minimize these “lost opportunities” by: (1) introducing energy efficiency concepts to customers, architects, engineering firms, contractors, commercial realtors, trade allies, etc., (2) demonstrating the benefits of selecting efficient options during the design stage, and (3) working with the design community to convince customers that more benefits are achievable by designing for whole-building operations and operating conditions.

Target Market:

The ECB program specifically targets C&I customers of all sizes (including municipalities) that are planning projects involving new construction, major renovation, and tenant fit-out and/or major equipment replacement.

Owners and managers of multi-family residential buildings may also participate in the ECB program. They represent a target market that often straddles the eligibility requirements of both C&I and residential program offerings.

ECB will continue to provide both electric and natural gas energy efficiency measures to customers using integrated program delivery. This delivers a simpler and more streamlined experience for the customer and provides a more comprehensive package for achieving greater energy efficiencies within their facilities.

Program Description:

The ECB program promotes energy efficiency for C&I projects involving new construction, major renovation, tenant fit-outs, and equipment replacement and additions. The program seeks to increase the energy efficiency and performance of lighting systems, heating, hot water, ventilation and air conditioning systems, motors, processes, and other energy components of C&I buildings or projects. This program offers a variety of services and incentives, including technical and financial assistance from design through construction. The types of services and incentives are based on the proposed project’s complexity, energy savings potential, scope of work, and the desire of the owner and his/her design team to participate.

The program is evolving towards compliance with high-performance building standards. While this is currently required for state funded buildings, it is still only an option for other customers. For those

required or desiring to use whole-building energy-performance requirements, a minimally compliant design will be treated as “code”. Equipment and systems that generate energy savings and demand reduction above the project-specific code baseline will be eligible for custom ECB incentives.

Marketing Strategy:

While the target of this program is ultimately the customer, enrollment is largely driven by such market actors as architects, contractors, engineers, equipment suppliers, service companies, and other allies of the “building environment” community. As such, a primary strategy is to promote the ECB program directly to these groups using such tactics as:

- paid advertising (print and electronic) in local and regional trade publications (directing audiences to the Electric and Natural Gas Companies’ web sites, CTEnergyInfo.com and the WISE USE number);
- targeted mailing of program literature utilizing association lists, and purchased lists, and
- booth presence at strategically selected trade shows.

Another tactic is to promote ECB to building owners and business owners (who are not necessarily the same people), facilities managers and energy managers -- individuals existing in a different environment than the building community members. Promotion tactics may include:

- paid advertising (radio, print and electronic) in broadcast outlets, local and regional business publications directing audiences to the Electric and Natural Gas Companies’ web sites, CTEnergyInfo.com and the WISE USE number;
- booth presence at strategically selected business expos;
- participation in strategically selected conferences similar to but not limited to the Edison Electric Institute’s National Accounts conferences;
- contacting decision-makers as early as possible in the design or equipment selection stage of their projects when energy efficiency is most cost effective, and
- utilizing construction reports such as Construction Data Company (“CDC”), to monitor upcoming projects throughout the state and to obtain key project contact information.
- In addition to program-specific promotion, marketing efforts will also include actions intended to support C&I customers and the building community, and to further the cause of market transformation. This support may include:

- writing and distributing case studies (also referred to as Success Stories¹³ or Testimonials) to the sites listed above and to local media and national/regional trade publications;
- promoting Fund-sponsored technical training seminars via e-mail and newsletters;
- hosting contractor meetings, and
- participation in associations through memberships and events.

Incentive Strategy:

As the program transitions toward the anticipated 2012 codes and standards and continues the promotion of whole-building performance, incentives will remain in two tracks. The Prescriptive Measure Track will continue to be based on the energy efficiency of a design and incremental costs between less expensive, prescribed code-compliant efficiency equipment and a more expensive, high-efficiency option. Prescriptive, incremental-cost-based equipment incentives will continue to be measured against cost-effectiveness equipment criteria to ensure that enough energy savings are attained to justify the incentive.

Since becoming effective in January 2011, the Whole Building Performance Track has been providing custom incentives to customers and their design teams based on the level of building performance that is designed and installed relative to the building code.

The Prescriptive Measure Track incentives will continue to provide incentives based on a percentage of the incremental equipment cost associated with the installation of efficient systems and equipment, compared to the cost of code-compliant standard design practice. The program includes incentives for the more common energy component standards (lighting, HVAC, VFDs, motors, etc.), as well as any other energy-saving technology where extra costs, relative to established baseline, can be justified by the energy savings. The program encourages customers to go beyond customary standards by recognizing the associated increased difficulties and costs.

The Whole Building Performance Track, on the other hand, will continue to offer the design team members financial assistance (expressed in dollars per square foot) for modeling and integrating multiple qualifying energy-efficient measures into a building's design. Then, upon installation, the Whole Building Performance Track will pay the customer an installation incentive. The installation incentive is based on the criteria that the amount increases commensurate with the percentage of improvement in a whole building's energy efficiency relative to the design team's base plan. This unit incentive is expressed in dollars per square foot and is in the range of \$0.10 - \$2.00 per square foot. Finally, the Whole Building Performance Track pays the customer a fixed amount, based upon a sliding scale,

¹³ One example of a Success Story:

[http://nuwnotes1.nu.com/apps/clp/clpwebcontent.nsf/AR/CNCSoftware/\\$File/CNCSoftware.pdf](http://nuwnotes1.nu.com/apps/clp/clpwebcontent.nsf/AR/CNCSoftware/$File/CNCSoftware.pdf)

(expected range: \$5,000 - \$15,000) if they provide certification of LEED Silver, Gold or Platinum (or 2, 3 or 4 Green Globes).

Also effective in January 2011, the Companies began to implement an incentive cap based, in part, upon customer payback, for custom process equipment measures. The payback incentive cap criteria results in an incentive that limits the customer's net simple payback to no less than 18 months.

The Companies will continue to utilize incentive caps that will impose, where practical, published unit cost rate caps (on a cost-per-annual-energy-saved basis along with a cost-per-peak demand-saved basis). This continuing effort has been very effective in providing a high level of transparency (to the marketplace) while continuing to better manage project incentive costs. In addition, the EDCs may employ a maximum incentive cap either on a per customer Federal Tax ID, per customer account, or per project basis, in order to make ECB funds available to more customers. Regardless of which incentive mechanism is offered to the customer, it will be pro-rated between electric and natural gas ECB budgets, using the percentage split of the customer's energy cost savings between the two energy sources. Please refer to the incentive tables located in the appendix at the back of Chapter 3.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

New Program Issues:

To minimize the impact of large incentive dollar value projects on approved budgets, the Natural Gas Companies will continue to exclude natural gas projects with customer incentives in excess of \$100,000 from 2012 C&LM Plan natural gas budgets and projects with customer incentives in excess of \$100,000 will be submitted to the Department for approval.

It should be noted that the Companies are continually increasing the scope of gas measures to facilitate increased customer participation. As an example, the Companies have added incentives for high efficiency gas fired heat pumps and both high or low intensity infrared gas heaters to the existing portfolio.

Additionally, the lessons and opportunities learned in the Retro Commissioning program projects over the past years will be woven in to the ECB new construction building program through the new building enhanced commissioning opportunity.

CL&P Issues:

UI Issues:

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Conscious Blueprint

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 1,329	\$ 1,024	\$ 1,053	\$ 520	\$ 916	\$ 950	\$ 950
Contractor Staff	\$ 208	\$ 288	\$ 383	\$ 212	\$ 333	\$ 321	\$ 321
Total Labor	\$ 1,537	\$ 1,312	\$ 1,436	\$ 732	\$ 1,249	\$ 1,271	\$ 1,271
Materials & Supplies	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 11	\$ 1	\$ 9	\$ 10	\$ 10
Outside Services	\$ 582	\$ 117	\$ 900	\$ 41	\$ 783	\$ 867 a)	\$ 861
Incentives	\$ 16,228	\$ 6,395	\$ 6,194	\$ 4,486	\$ 5,389	\$ 6,137 b)	\$ 6,097
Marketing	\$ 42	\$ 154	\$ 100	\$ 31	\$ 87	\$ 100 c)	\$ 99
Administration Expenses	\$ 43	\$ 35	\$ 48	\$ 26	\$ 42	\$ 48 d)	\$ 48
Other	\$ 24	\$ 14	\$ 70	\$ 24	\$ 61	\$ 70	\$ 70
Total	\$ 18,461	\$ 8,033	\$ 8,759	\$ 5,342	\$ 7,620	\$ 8,503	\$ 8,456

- a) Services include technical assistance, analysis, quality control, and inspections.
Budget reflects the need for ongoing engineering and design expertise to address building code changes with the design and contractor community and for equipment replacement projects.
- b) Incentives paid directly to customers for the installation of cost effective energy conservation measures.
- c) Includes marketing to customers, trade allies, and professional organizations to maintain program momentum.
Marketing is also through construction reports, direct mail, advertising, associations, and promotional items.
- d) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance, and misc.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

	<u>Program Total</u>	<u>Municipal</u>
Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	4,374.8	568.1
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	20,054,706	2,604,436
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	307,731,964	39,964,095
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.424	\$ 0.424
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.028	\$ 0.028
Electric b/c Ratio	3.21	3.21
Total Resource b/c Ratio	3.95	3.95

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Conscious Blueprint

Year	<u>Program Costs</u>		% of Budget	\$/LT-kWh ¹
	Budget	Actual		
2000	\$ 7,770,000	\$ 6,884,000	89%	0.013
2001	\$ 7,878,000	\$ 8,193,000	104%	0.011
2002	\$ 7,435,000	\$ 8,189,000	110%	0.011
2003	\$ 5,700,000	\$ 5,431,000	95%	0.015
2004	\$ 6,250,000	\$ 7,288,000	117%	0.012
2005 Revised	\$ 8,125,755	\$ 5,980,886	74%	0.010
2006 Revised	\$ 12,316,230	\$ 9,448,615	77%	0.012
2007 Revised	\$ 12,417,000	\$ 13,084,740	105%	0.019
2008 Revised	\$ 18,278,675	\$ 18,460,585	101%	0.024
2009 Revised	\$ 9,920,000	\$ 6,756,126	68%	0.018
2010 Revised	\$ 13,399,500	\$ 8,033,028	60%	0.024
2011 Revised	\$ 8,759,606	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 5,341,989	40%	0.068
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 8,759,606	\$ 7,620,136	57%	0.028
2012	\$ 8,503,250	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Participation</u>		% of Goal
	Goal ²	Actual	
2000	6,174	5,719	93%
2001	6,362	6,986	110%
2002	5,937	6,897	116%
2003	210	111	53%
2004	117	132	113%
2005 Revised	216	216	100%
2006 Revised	676	695	103%
2007 Revised	659	603	92%
2008 Revised	1,105	689	62%
2009 Revised	517	390	75%
2010 Revised	503	509	101%
2011 Revised	444	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	154	35%
2011 Y/E Projected	444	308	69%
2012	484	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Lifetime MWh Savings</u>			<u>Goal - Installed kW Savings</u>			
	Goal (MWh)	Actual (MWh)	% of Goal	Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	412,230	511,001	124%	2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	739,115	712,952	96%	2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	605,194	728,424	120%	2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	582,130	355,076	61%	2003	8,878	4,025	45.3%
2004	357,198	593,271	166%	2004	5,682	10,592	186.4%
2005 Revised	622,846	624,220	100%	2005 Revised	9,579	8,114	84.7%
2006 Revised	991,250	812,823	82%	2006 Revised	9,202	8,771	95.3%
2007 Revised	557,085	704,845	127%	2007 Revised	7,974	9,354	117.3%
2008 Revised	770,793	765,081	99%	2008 Revised	9,868	8,279	83.9%
2009 Revised	434,848	382,538	88%	2009 Revised	6,114	5,331	87.2%
2010 Revised	518,987	330,357	64%	2010 Revised	4,237	4,039	95.3%
2011 Revised	362,214	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	4,237	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	78,708	22%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	1,920	45.3%
2011 Y/E Projected	362,214	276,384	76%	1 Y/E Projected	4,237	3,292	77.7%
2012	307,732	n/a	n/a	2012	4,375	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Program Ratios</u>			
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
Year	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.019	0.013	n/a	1,003
2001	0.011	0.011	n/a	1,083
2002	0.012	0.011	n/a	768
2003	0.013	0.015	870	1,349
2004	0.017	0.012	1,100	688
2005 Revised	0.013	0.010	848	737
2006 Revised	0.012	0.012	1,338	1,077
2007 Revised	0.022	0.019	1,557	1,399
2008 Revised	0.024	0.024	1,852	2,230
2009 Revised	0.017	0.018	1,623	1,267
2010 Revised	0.026	0.024	3,162	1,989
2011 Revised	0.024	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.068	n/a	2,782
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.028	n/a	2,315
2012	0.028	n/a	1,944	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Energy Conscious Blueprint

Budget/FTE

7.0

FTEs for Program administration, site inspection, education of design professionals including State building review with

Goal

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	4,375
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	307,731,964

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

\$/Annualized kW	\$	1,944
\$/Lifetime kWh	\$	0.028

Goal Setting Methodology

The 2012 planning model is based on 2010 actual results from similar projects, program rules and baseline changes.

Metric Changes

None

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Energy Conscious Blueprint ^(1, 2)

Baseline Assumptions:

Market C&I new construction, renovation and tenent fit-out program, all C&I customers

<u>Budget Projections</u>		2011		2011		<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
		<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>Revised Bud</u>	<u>YTD (June)</u>	<u>YE Projected</u>		
Labor							
UI Labor	\$	512,248	\$ 526,753	\$ 268,722	\$ 526,753	\$ 537,396 a)	\$ 564,266
Contractor Staff	\$	-	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ 10,000 b)	\$ 10,000
Total Labor	\$	512,248	\$ 541,753	\$ 268,722	\$ 541,753	\$ 547,396	\$ 574,266
Materials & Supplies							
Materials & Supplies	\$	2,507	\$ 4,500	\$ 4,583	\$ 4,583	\$ 3,000 c)	\$ 3,000
Outside Services	\$	32,453	\$ 165,000	\$ 5,641	\$ 164,917	\$ 96,000 d)	\$ 96,000
Incentives	\$	4,612,881	\$ 2,369,974	\$ 1,735,939	\$ 2,369,974	\$ 1,671,825 e)	\$ 1,630,086
Marketing	\$	53,517	\$ 40,000	\$ 19,886	\$ 40,000	\$ 30,000 f)	\$ 30,000
Other	\$	20,542	\$ 11,000	\$ 4,401	\$ 11,000	\$ 8,000 g)	\$ 8,000
Administrative Expenses	\$	36,128	\$ 42,300	\$ 24,720	\$ 42,300	\$ 30,000 h)	\$ 30,000
Total	\$	5,270,276	\$ 3,174,527	\$ 2,063,892	\$ 3,174,527	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 2,371,352

(1) ECB includes rebate initiatives like Motors and Cool Choice

(2) ECB includes Municipal projects

- a) 4.37 FTEs
- b) temporary contract services
- c) no comment
- d) Consultant / Engineering / audit services
- e) Customer incentives
- f) Brochure revision, selected advertising, public relations, etc.
- g) no comment
- h) Employee training, mileage, etc.

Goals and Metrics Information:

Savings	2012
Demand Savings (kW)	1,093
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	6,738,345
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	103,249,390
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.354
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.023
Cost per kW	\$ 2,183
Electric System B/C Ratio	3.63
Total Resource B/C Ratio	3.67

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Conscious Blueprint (1,2)

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$2,812	\$2,768	98.4%
2001	\$2,313	\$2,304	99.6%
2002	\$2,083	\$2,019	96.9%
2003	\$2,390	\$1,963	82.7%
2004	\$2,347	\$2,021	86.1%
2005	\$4,045	\$3,787	93.6%
2006	\$3,170	\$3,174	100.1%
2007	\$2,922	\$5,051	172.9%
2008	\$2,627	\$3,422	130.3%
2009	\$4,855	\$4,337	89.3%
2010	\$5,156	\$5,270	102.2%
2011	\$3,175		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$3,175	\$2,064	65.0%
2011 YE Projected	\$3,175	\$3,175	100.0%
2012	\$2,386		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	11,022	22,113	200.6%
2001	14,815	25,568	172.6%
2002	12,540	18,731	149.4%
2003	16,908	10,994	65.0%
2004	20,579	22,420	108.9%
2005	24,837	20,122	81.0%
2006	13,628	13,765	101.0%
2007	10,830	15,090	139.3%
2008	11,151	14,302	128.3%
2009	16,512	16,308	98.8%
2010	8,147	11,255	138.1%
2011	9,526		
2011 YTD (Jun)	9,526	649	6.8%
2011 YE Projected	9,526	9,526	100.0%
2012	6,738		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	4,327	3,815	88.2%
2004	5,891	4,180	71.0%
2005	7,102	4,367	61.5%
2006	2,745	4,685	170.7%
2007	2,008	2,622	130.6%
2008	1,975	2,337	118.3%
2009	2,424	2,620	108.1%
2010	988	1,329	134.5%
2011	1,335		
2011 YTD (Jun)	1,335	198	14.8%
2011 YE Projected	1,335	1,335	100.0%
2012	1,093		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	165,338	331,701	200.6%
2001	222,225	383,520	172.6%
2002	188,100	280,965	149.4%
2003	253,620	164,910	65.0%
2004	308,699	336,293	108.9%
2005	424,067	343,568	81.0%
2006	217,936	191,708	88.0%
2007	173,054	224,566	129.8%
2008	179,779	203,135	113.0%
2009	248,326	268,292	108.0%
2010	128,227	177,958	138.8%
2011	154,180		
2011 YTD (Jun)	154,180	10,985	7.1%
2011 YE Projected	154,180	154,180	100.0%
2012	103,249		

Program Ratios

	\$/kWh		\$/LT kWh		\$/kW	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2000	\$0.255	\$0.125	\$0.017	\$0.008	\$0	\$0
2001	\$0.156	\$0.090	\$0.010	\$0.006	\$0	\$0
2002	\$0.166	\$0.108	\$0.011	\$0.007	\$0	\$0
2003	\$0.141	\$0.180	\$0.009	\$0.012	\$552	\$518
2004	\$0.114	\$0.090	\$0.008	\$0.006	\$398	\$484
2005	\$0.163	\$0.188	\$0.010	\$0.011	\$570	\$863
2006	\$0.233	\$0.231	\$0.015	\$0.017	\$1,155	\$677
2007	\$0.236	\$0.335	\$0.015	\$0.022	\$1,455	\$1,926
2008	\$0.236	\$0.239	\$0.015	\$0.017	\$1,330	\$1,464
2009	\$0.294	\$0.266	\$0.020	\$0.016	\$2,003	\$1,655
2010	\$0.633	\$0.468	\$0.040	\$0.030	\$5,219	\$3,965
2011	\$0.333		\$0.021		\$2,378	
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.333	\$3.180	\$0.021	\$0.188	\$2,378	10,424
2011 YE Projected	\$0.333	\$0.333	\$0.021	\$0.021	\$2,378	\$2,378
2012	\$0.354		\$0.023		\$2,183	

Notes

1. Energy Blueprint includes Motors and Cool Choice for 2003 - 2011
2. Energy Blueprint includes Municipal new construction and equipment replacement in 2005 - 2011

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - Energy Conscious Blueprint

Budget/(FTE):

- 1) Budget includes 4.34 FTEs for staffing
- 2) 2012 proposed overall budget is 25% decrease compared to the '11 revised budget
- 3) 2012 incentive structures are basically unchanged; program emphasis will transition to whole building performance
- 4) 2012 custom incentives include transparent re-structured measure caps focusing on cost containment;

Goal:

- 1) 2012 target = 72 projects
- 2) 2012 target of 6,673,593 kWh; a decrease of approx. 30%
- 3) 2012 target of 1,093 kW; a decrease of approx. 20%
- 4) 2012 planning model is based on historical data, program rule changes, baseline changes, and study information
- 5) ECB continues to be negatively impacted by a variety of issues
 - a. adoption of new codes & standards; more stringent baselines; an apparent lack of enforcement for the new code
 - b. economic recession continues to inhibit new construction
- 6) capturing more "lost opportunities" by greater focus on:
 - a. mid-market customers (200-300kW)
 - b. more whole building performance and HE equipment
 - c. process equipment and optimization
 - d. more outreach, training and education
- 7) adopted CL&P gross realization rates to simulate statewide realization rates
- 8) net realization rates capped at 100%

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

- 1) 2012 projected cost rates are slightly increased compared to 2011: annual = \$0.354/ kWh, lifetime = \$.023 / kWh
- 2) 2012 projected \$\$/kW = \$2,183 a slight decrease from 2011
- 3) higher program costs are anticipated due to continued effects of:
 - a. economic recession; negative impacts on the construction market
 - b. adoption of new codes & standards; more stringent baselines (less kWh)
 - c. custom incentives for HE alternatives & whole building performance
 - d. more outreach, training and education
- 4) ECB will continue to experience greater negative kWh and kW impacts due to:
 - a. economic recession; negative impacts on the construction market
 - b. adoption of new codes & standards; more stringent baselines (less kWh)
 - c. measure life changes per recent studies

Metric Changes:

- 1) all savings are reported as net values

Municipal Lost Opportunity Projects (1,2,3)

Year	Inst. Proj.	kWh savings	kW savings	Incentive	\$/ kWh	\$/pk kW
2006	19	3,509,369	888.0	571600	\$ 0.163	\$ 644
2007	7	1,153,974	120.0	254011	\$ 0.220	\$ 2,117
2008	30	3,514,099	683.0	873297	\$ 0.249	\$ 1,279
2009	26	5,457,290	1192.0	1567208	\$ 0.287	\$ 1,315
2010	8	1,946,199	341.6	324859	\$ 0.167	\$ 951
2011 (Jun)	7	865,809	240.2	240811	\$ 0.278	\$ 1,003

(1) kWh and kW savings are net savings

(2) 2011 installed projects are based on installed and signed projects as of 06/30/11

(3) 2011 installed projects include xx gas projects

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Conscious Blueprint

<u>Budget Projections</u>	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 60,129	\$ 99,846	\$ 102,649	\$ 212,800	\$ 67,099	\$ 134,199	\$ 212,800
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 42,888	\$ 23,331	\$ 31,321	\$ 81,764	\$ 4,592	\$ 9,183	\$ 138,232
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ 67	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 494	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,681
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 277,680	\$ 674,014	\$ 852,468	\$ 1,172,020	\$ 896,568	\$ 1,320,188	\$ 1,090,672
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,650	\$ 1,569	\$ 7,094	\$ 4,810	\$ 2,614	\$ 5,229	\$ 16,783
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,914	\$ 5,746	\$ 7,986	\$ 8,112	\$ 1,680	\$ 3,360	\$ 19,832
Total			\$ 390,328	\$ 804,506	\$ 1,001,518	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 972,553	\$ 1,472,159	\$ 1,480,000

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	43,558	112,046	287,670	197,858	86,436	130,839	280,342
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	670,160	1,770,613	4,371,511	3,032,051	1,437,354	2,175,731	4,246,241
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 8.96	\$ 7.18	\$ 3.48	\$ 7.48	\$ 11.25	\$ 11.25	\$ 5.28
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.58	\$ 0.45	\$ 0.23	\$ 0.49	\$ 0.68	\$ 0.68	\$ 0.35
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 534,945	\$ 1,413,366	\$ 3,909,090	\$ 2,374,940	\$ 1,125,848	\$ 1,704,203	\$ 2,229,142
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 1.37	\$ 1.76	\$ 3.90	\$ 1.60	\$ 1.16	\$ 1.16	\$ 1.51
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	14	30	64	52	15	23	73
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	47,869	59,020	68,305	58,309	95,824	95,824	58,397
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 27,881	\$ 26,817	\$ 15,649	\$ 28,462	\$ 64,837	\$ 64,837	\$ 20,354
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 38,210	\$ 47,112	\$ 61,080	\$ 45,672	\$ 75,057	\$ 75,057	\$ 30,657

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 292,668	\$ 390,328	133%
2009	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 804,505	62%
2010	\$ 1,420,000	\$ 1,001,518	71%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 972,553	66%
2011 YE projection	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,472,159	99%
2012	\$ 1,480,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	14	-
2009	31	30	97%
2010	77	64	83%
2011 YTD (June)	52	15	29%
2011 YE projection	52	23	44%
2012	73	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	43,558	-
2009	97,628	112,046	115%
2010	189,646	287,670	152%
2011 YTD (June)	197,858	86,436	44%
2011 YE projection	197,858	130,839	66%
2012	280,342	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	670,160	-
2009	1,464,420	1,770,613	121%
2010	3,012,116	4,371,511	145%
2011 YTD (June)	3,032,051	1,437,354	47%
2011 YE projection	3,032,051	2,175,731	72%
2012	4,246,241	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Conscious Blueprint

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 42,149	\$ 69,173	\$ 80,732	\$ 150,290	\$ 42,195	\$ 147,795	\$ 150,290	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 33,480	\$ 15,629	\$ 18,193	\$ 107,507	\$ 5,486	\$ 5,486	\$ 107,507	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a			\$ -	\$ 3,150	\$ -	\$ 107,508	\$ 3,150	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 162,181	\$ 484,854	\$ 621,552	\$ 870,323	\$ 130,273	\$ 870,325	\$ 970,323	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,952	\$ 831	\$ 4,012	\$ 3,060	\$ 114	\$ 3,060	\$ 3,060	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,144	\$ 1,938	\$ 2,810	\$ 5,670	\$ 725	\$ 5,669	\$ 5,670	
Total			\$ 241,906	\$ 572,425	\$ 727,299	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 178,793	\$ 1,139,843	\$ 1,240,000	a

Energy Savings Information	2007 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	24,169	88,706	106,425	146,926	28,459	181,432	249,408	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	361,044	1,350,926	1,578,228	2,251,551	475,100	3,028,862	3,777,694	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 10.01	\$ 6.45	\$ 6.83	\$ 7.76	\$ 6.28	\$ 6.28	\$ 4.97	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.42	\$ 0.46	\$ 0.51	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.38	\$ 0.33	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 288,198	\$ 1,078,357	\$ 1,411,283	\$ 1,763,591	\$ 372,136	\$ 2,372,442	\$ 1,985,291	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 1.19	\$ 1.88	\$ 1.94	\$ 1.55	\$ 2.08	\$ 2.08	\$ 1.60	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	9	26	33	39	16	102	65	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	40,116	51,959	47,825	57,732	29,694	29,694	58,397	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 26,878	\$ 22,016	\$ 22,039	\$ 29,231	\$ 11,175	\$ 11,175	\$ 19,168	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 32,022	\$ 41,475	\$ 42,766	\$ 45,220	\$ 23,258	\$ 23,258	\$ 30,689	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 200,584	\$ 241,906	121%
2009	\$ 700,000	\$ 572,425	82%
2010	\$ 858,726	\$ 727,299	85%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 178,793	16%
2011 YE projection	\$ 1,140,000	\$ 1,139,843	100%
2012	\$ 1,240,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	9	-
2009	27	26	96%
2010	48	33	69%
2011 YTD (June)	39	16	41%
2011 YE projection	39	102	262%
2012	65	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	24,169	-
2009	86,402	88,706	103%
2010	146,926	106,425	72%
2011 YTD (June)	146,926	28,459	19%
2011 YE projection	146,926	181,432	123%
2012	249,408	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	361,044	-
2009	1,296,024	1,350,926	104%
2010	1,874,444	1,578,228	84%
2011 YTD (June)	2,251,551	475,100	21%
2011 YE projection	2,251,551	3,028,862	135%
2012	3,777,694	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Conscious Blueprint

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD(June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,462	\$ 30,918	\$ 11,385	\$ 150,290	\$ 5,498	\$ 150,290	\$ 145,290	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,210	\$ 149	\$ 4,501	\$ 122,444	\$ 60	\$ 122,444	\$ 106,844	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 324	\$ -	\$ 324	\$ 324	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 647,077	\$ 571,679	\$ 604,050	\$ 767,951	\$ 462,520	\$ 767,951	\$ 887,651	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,952	\$ 1,144	\$ 1,865	\$ 3,213	\$ 225	\$ 3,213	\$ 3,213	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 142	\$ 1,849	\$ 1,737	\$ 5,778	\$ 244	\$ 5,778	\$ 6,678	
Total			\$ 656,843	\$ 605,739	\$ 623,538	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 468,547	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,150,000	a

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Goals</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Goals</u>	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	127,002	132,675	232,842	129,644	5,919	13,264	228,158	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	1,907,123	2,008,951	3,152,235	1,986,711	95,192	213,322	3,455,834	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 5.17	\$ 4.57	\$ 2.68	\$ 8.10	\$ 79.16	\$ 79.16	\$ 5.04	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.34	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.53	\$ 4.92	\$ 4.92	\$ 0.33	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,522,333	\$ 1,603,616	\$ 2,818,790	\$ 1,556,148	\$ 74,562	\$ 167,091	\$ 1,816,144	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.32	\$ 2.65	\$ 4.52	\$ 1.48	\$ 0.16	\$ 0.16	\$ 1.58	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	12	28	45	34	5	11	59	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	158,927	71,748	70,050	58,433	19,038	19,038	58,397	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 54,737	\$ 21,634	\$ 13,856	\$ 30,882	\$ 93,709	\$ 93,709	\$ 19,433	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 126,861	\$ 57,272	\$ 62,640	\$ 45,769	\$ 14,912	\$ 14,912	\$ 30,689	l=i/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 174,509	\$ 656,843	376%
2009	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 605,739	58%
2010	\$ 859,585	\$ 623,538	73%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 468,547	45%
2011 YE projection	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,050,000	100%
2012	\$ 1,150,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	12	-
2009	27	28	104%
2010	48	45	94%
2011 YTD (June)	34	5	15%
2011 YE projection	34	11	33%
2012	59	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	127,002	-
2009	86,402	132,675	154%
2010	118,166	232,842	197%
2011 YTD (June)	129,644	5,919	5%
2011 YE projection	129,644	13,264	10%
2012	228,158	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	1,907,123	-
2009	1,296,024	2,008,951	155%
2010	1,876,804	3,152,235	168%
2011 YTD (June)	1,986,711	95,192	5%
2011 YE projection	1,986,711	213,322	11%
2012	3,455,834	n/a	-

This page intentionally blank

C&I RETROFIT

Energy Opportunities: (Electric and Natural Gas)

Objective:

The Energy Opportunities (“EO”) program encourages customers and their contractors or Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) to save energy in existing commercial, industrial, and municipal facilities by offering incentives, financing and other resources to replace existing, inefficient equipment with energy-saving options. EO offers many options within the program to best address customer issues. EO encourages a “holistic,” comprehensive approach to improve overall building performance to encourage multiple measure, multiple end-use projects where practical.

Target Market:

The EO program commercial, industrial, state, municipal, and institutional customers whose annual average peak demand is 200 kW or greater and who can benefit from both electric and/or natural gas retrofit projects in their facilities. Natural gas customers need to be on a firm gas rate to receive gas measure incentives. Customers utilizing fossil fuels other than natural gas would only be eligible for electric incentives.

Owners and managers of multi-family residential buildings may also participate in the EO program representing a target market that often straddles the eligibility requirements of both C&I and residential program offerings. This customer sector also has opportunities for whole-building-integrated retrofits.

If market or program needs dictate, the EO program also has the flexibility to target customer segments, as well as contractors and ESCOs, with unique characteristics and needs not covered by other program offerings.

Program Description:

As mentioned previously, EO provides many solutions to help customers address energy efficiency in existing facilities. While customers are the ultimate beneficiary of the energy savings, it is important to note that the program is primarily deployed through a robust collaboration with contractors and ESCOs.

In most EO projects a customer voluntarily exchanges or modifies inefficient but functioning equipment with a high-efficiency alternative, resulting in energy savings and improved energy efficiency within a facility. Any such new high-efficiency equipment must meet or exceed efficiency standards where applicable.

The services provided through EO are varied and specifically designed to meet the needs of the individual customer. Working with contractors and ESCOs, the program assists customers with

measure identification, basic rebate programs for more common measures, complete incentive and financing solutions for comprehensive projects, Quality Assurance (QA) of energy savings calculations and analysis, and verification of installed equipment efficiency. Both electric and natural gas saving measures are evaluated in EO. In addition, the Companies may elect to provide a co-funded study to determine the cost effectiveness of a measure or to qualify an emerging technology.

The same programmatic rules apply to state or municipal customers as to other commercial customers. It should be noted that since there are no specific goals for state or municipal projects, the savings are included in the EO goals and cost rates.

Marketing Strategy:

The EO program relies primarily on marketing and direct interaction with contractors, engineers, ESCOs as well as repeat customer participation word-of-mouth to minimize marketing expenses. The EDCS and LDCs may augment enrollment with:

- paid advertising (radio, print and electronic) in broadcast outlets and local and regional business publications targeting building owners, business owners, facility managers and energy managers;
- paid advertising (print and electronic) in local and regional contractor trade journals targeting contractors;
- targeted mailings and e-mail communications of program literature to contractors utilizing association lists, and
- booth presence at strategically selected trade shows.

Where appropriate, the advertising will direct audiences to the Electric and Natural Gas Companies' web sites, the Connecticut's Energy Information web site (CTEnergyInfo.com) and Connecticut's statewide toll-free energy information line (1-877-WISE-USE).

In addition to program-specific promotion, marketing efforts will also include actions intended to support C&I customers and the contractor community, and to further the cause of market transformation. This support may take the form of:

- writing and distributing case studies (also referred to as Success Stories¹⁴ or Testimonials) through various marketing channels;
- promoting Fund-sponsored technical training seminars via e-mail and newsletters;
- hosting contractor meetings, and

¹⁴ A CL&P example of this would be

[http://nuwnotes1.nu.com/apps/clp/clpwebcontent.nsf/AR/MeridenPropertyManagement/\\$File/MeridenPropertyManagement.pdf](http://nuwnotes1.nu.com/apps/clp/clpwebcontent.nsf/AR/MeridenPropertyManagement/$File/MeridenPropertyManagement.pdf)

- participation in associations through memberships and events.

Incentive Strategy:

In 2012, the joint EO program will continue to make use of the most successful retrofit strategies for meeting the needs of the Companies' (EDCs and LDCs) diverse customer base, including a more comprehensive approach to improving the overall performance of facilities. Over the years, flexibility has proven to be vital for implementing cost-effective, energy-efficient projects in both service territories.

As a result of last year's final decision (Docket #10-10-03) the DPUC approved the EDCs plan to simplify program incentive caps and improve transparency. This approval allowed the Companies to utilize published unit incentive cost rate caps. This successful strategy, launched in January 2011, will continue to provide program incentive transparency while continuing to allow for greater flexibility and better project incentive costs management. This strategy will also be continued for the gas program incentive structures as well. Please refer to the incentive tables located in the appendix at the back of Chapter 3.

The EDCs may also employ maximum incentive caps per Federal Tax ID, per customer account, or per project basis, when necessary to ensure Energy Efficiency Fund dollars are available to a greater number of customers and budgets are appropriately managed.

The Companies continue to review all incentive levels to ensure that they are consistent with current and expected market conditions, customer investment options and approved budgets. In addition, the Companies will continue to evaluate market trends and responsiveness, and make adjustments to participation requirements and incentive levels accordingly.

The Companies will continue to offer prescriptive rebates¹⁵ where applicable for smaller and more typical projects. These rebates are intended to pay prescribed dollar amounts for replacing standard efficiency equipment with high-efficiency alternatives. The rebate process is expedited via a simple form filled out by customers or their contractors.

Custom incentives will continue to be offered by the EO program. These incentives will be applicable to a wide, diverse range of energy-saving technologies. Qualifying projects or Energy Conservation Measures ("ECMs") earn incentives that represent a percentage of the project costs up to a maximum dollar value based on the kWh and peak kW savings. The percentage and value per kWh and kW saved are set to influence implementation and may vary from year to year. The incentive calculations are based on the following: (a) energy savings (kWh) and peak demand savings (kW); (b) project or ECM cost; (c) the simple payback for ECM; and (d) the measure life.

¹⁵ This CL&P web page link allows customers to gain quick access to all electric and gas rebates currently offered:
<http://www.cl-p.com/Business/SaveEnergy/BusinessRebates.aspx>

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

New Program Issues:

Over the years Energy Efficiency Fund programming and funding has conformed to the single “calendar” year design and has demonstrated that it is not “in sync” with the fiscal year design of many customers. It is the Companies opinion that a multi-year plan for both budget and programming would greatly facilitate the adoption of performance contracting.

In 2012, the Companies will continue to facilitate the implementation of Performance Contracting as a viable means of implementation and financing, as described in Chapter 3, Overview. The Companies will also be facilitating more comprehensive projects which, in turn, will generate “broader and deeper” opportunities for optimizing the various energy consuming systems within a facility.

The 2012 Plan includes new financing options for EO program participants which are detailed in Chapter 5.

The Natural Gas Companies will continue to submit natural gas projects with incentives in excess of \$100,000 to the Authority for incremental budget approval. This practice has been in effect since March 2010, as a result of Order #4 of Docket No. 08-10-02, in an effort to minimize negative impacts on the gas budgets from just a few very large dollar incentive projects.

CL&P Specific Issues:**UI Specific Issues:**

Comprehensive incentives are very powerful tools for achieving savings, but due to their higher levels of cost, place a heavier burden on the program budget. In 2011, customer demand has continued to cause budgetary constraints despite the restructured lower incentive.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Opportunities

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 1,209	\$ 1,428	\$ 1,813	\$ 641	\$ 1,802	\$ 1,509	\$ 1,509
Contractor Staff	\$ 154	\$ 435	\$ 693	\$ 284	\$ 689	\$ 503	\$ 503
Total Labor	\$ 1,362	\$ 1,863	\$ 2,506	\$ 926	\$ 2,491	\$ 2,012	\$ 2,012
Materials & Supplies	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 23	\$ 8	\$ 23	\$ 20	\$ 20
Outside Services	\$ 137	\$ 344	\$ 694	\$ 80	\$ 689	\$ 377 a)	\$ 375
Incentives	\$ 8,580	\$ 15,221	\$ 22,223	\$ 17,038	\$ 22,082	\$ 10,563	\$ 10,494
Marketing	\$ 23	\$ 149	\$ 305	\$ 31	\$ 303	\$ 160 b)	\$ 159
Administrative Expenses	\$ 75	\$ 60	\$ 135	\$ 28	\$ 134	\$ 80 c)	\$ 79
Other	\$ 50	\$ 26	\$ 50	\$ 24	\$ 50	\$ 30	\$ 30
Total	\$ 10,231	\$ 17,667	\$ 25,936	\$ 18,134	\$ 25,772	\$ 13,242	\$ 13,169

a) Includes consultant fees for focused studies, system modeling and QA/QC.

b) Includes marketing to customers, trade allies and engineering firms through general awareness campaigns, print advertisements, leave-behind brochures and trade shows.

c) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

	<u>Program Total</u>	<u>Municipal</u>
Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	6,027	422
Annual Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	42,198,861	2,957,437
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	521,131,463	36,522,638
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.314	\$ 0.314
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.025	\$ 0.025
Electric b/c Ratio	3.42	3.42
Total Resource b/c Ratio	1.92	1.92

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Opportunities

Year	Budget	Program Costs		% of Budget	\$/LT-kWh
		Actual			
2006 Revised	\$ 8,085,177	\$ 9,081,115		112%	0.005
2007 Revised	\$ 10,009,000	\$ 22,928,130		229%	0.016
2008 Revised	\$ 31,695,999	\$ 29,565,748		93%	0.024
2009 Revised	\$ 11,724,000	\$ 10,231,492		87%	0.017
2010 Revised	\$ 17,666,726	\$ 17,863,695		101%	0.023
2011 Revised	\$ 25,936,175	n/a		n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 18,134,254		70%	0.073
2011 Y/E Projected	25,936,175	\$ 25,771,588		99%	0.027
2012	\$ 13,241,950	n/a		n/a	n/a

Year	Goal - Participation		
	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006 Revised	686	559	81%
2007 Revised	854	637	93%
2008 Revised	1,464	577	84%
2009 Revised	400	670	167%
2010 Revised	483	884	183%
2011 Revised	1,282	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	367	29%
2011 Y/E Projected	1,282	734	57%
2012	590	n/a	n/a

Year	Goal - Lifetime MWh Savings			Goal - Installed kW Savings			
	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006 Revised	1,060,246	1,664,677	157%	2006 Revised	9,277	15,295	165%
2007 Revised	677,071	1,466,673	217%	2007 Revised	7,659	17,675	231%
2008 Revised	1,248,140	1,227,472	98%	2008 Revised	16,892	14,859	88%
2009 Revised	1,054,932	587,158	56%	2009 Revised	10,486	6,017	57%
2010 Revised	1,011,392	769,087	76%	2010 Revised	13,030	8,693	67%
2011 Revised	1,031,073	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	11,045	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	247,865	24%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	2,952	27%
2011 Y/E Projected	1,031,073	958,188	93%	1 Y/E Projected	11,045	10,561	96%
2012	521,131	n/a	n/a	2012	6,027	n/a	n/a

Year	Program Ratios			
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2006 Revised	0.008	0.005	872	594
2007 Revised	0.015	0.016	1,307	1,297
2008 Revised	0.025	0.024	1,876	1,990
2009 Revised	0.011	0.017	1,118	1,700
2010 Revised	0.017	0.023	1,356	2,055
2011 Revised	0.025	n/a	2,348	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.073	n/a	6,143
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.027	n/a	2,440
2012	0.025	n/a	2,197	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Energy Opportunities

Budget/FTE

11.2 FTEs for Program Administration, Inspections, etc.

Goal

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	6,027
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	521,131,463

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

\$/Annualized kW	\$	2,197
\$/Lifetime kWh	\$	0.025

Goal Setting Methodology

The 2012 planning model is based on 2010 actual results from similar projects and program rule changes.

Metric Changes

None

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Energy Opportunities ^(1, 2)

Baseline Assumptions:

Budget Projections	Retrofit program for C&I customers > 200 kW					
	2010 Act	2011 Revised Bud	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Bud	2013 Bud
Market						
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 509,744	\$ 533,287	\$ 250,287	\$ 533,287	\$ 538,015 a)	\$ 564,916
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 15,000	\$ 15,000 b)	\$ 15,000
Total Labor	\$ 509,744	\$ 548,287	\$ 250,287	\$ 548,287	\$ 553,015	\$ 579,916
Materials & Supplies	\$ 2,837	\$ 3,100	\$ 135	\$ 3,100	\$ 3,050 c)	\$ 3,100
Outside Services	\$ 123,977	\$ 135,000	\$ 8,901	\$ 85,061	\$ 102,500 d)	\$ 100,000
Incentives	\$ 4,566,104	\$ 2,950,714	\$ 3,000,153	\$ 4,000,153	\$ 2,160,084 e)	\$ 2,118,875
Marketing	\$ 47,774	\$ 48,000	\$ 19,893	\$ 48,000	\$ 33,000 f)	\$ 32,000
Other	\$ 3,313	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,000 g)	\$ 3,000
Administrative Expenses	\$ 106,870	\$ 172,920	\$ 83,371	\$ 172,920	\$ 152,670 h)	\$ 152,000
Total	\$ 5,360,620	\$ 3,861,021	\$ 3,366,240	\$ 4,861,021	\$ 3,007,319	\$ 2,988,891

- (1) EO includes the C&I Loan Program
(2) EO includes the Express Lighting Rebate

- a) 4.29 FTEs
b) temporary contract services
c) no comment
d) Consultant / engineering / audit services
e) Customer incentives
f) Brochure revision, selected advertising, public relations, etc.
g) no comment
h) Financing interest, employee training, mileage, etc.

Goals and Metrics Information:

Savings	2012
Demand Savings (kW)	1,172
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	8,992,818
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	113,819,163
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.334
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.026
Cost per kW	\$ 2,565
Electric System B/C Ratio	3.22
Total Resource B/C Ratio	1.57

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Opportunities (1)

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	\$2,559	\$3,006	117.5%
2001	\$5,165	\$3,401	66.3%
2002	\$2,350	\$1,271	54.1%
2003	\$2,315	\$1,169	61.5%
2004	\$2,207	\$2,259	102.4%
2005	\$2,800	\$3,917	139.9%
2006	\$2,050	\$2,977	145.2%
2007	\$1,932	\$5,843	302.4%
2008	\$3,172	\$3,119	98.3%
2009	\$5,611	\$4,789	85.4%
2010	\$4,014	\$4,845	120.7%
2011	\$3,861		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$3,861	\$3,366	87.2%
2011 YE Projected	\$3,861	\$4,861	125.9%
2012	\$3,007		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	9,854	19,863	201.6%
2001	29,321	25,592	87.3%
2002	9,897	13,156	132.9%
2003	18,727	11,929	63.7%
2004	17,699	18,591	105.0%
2005	21,785	24,167	110.9%
2006	11,896	20,704	174.0%
2007	11,070	21,574	194.9%
2008	17,028	20,668	121.4%
2009	25,725	18,129	70.5%
2010	14,967	16,948	113.2%
2011	12,758		
2011 YTD (Jun)	12,758	3,542	27.8%
2011 YE Projected	12,758	16,105	126.2%
2012	8,993		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	3,960	2,191	55.3%
2004	4,443	3,180	71.6%
2005	4,966	3,850	77.5%
2006	2,191	3,345	152.7%
2007	1,759	3,993	227.0%
2008	2,661	3,530	132.7%
2009	3,840	2,977	77.5%
2010	2,013	2,302	114.4%
2011	2,057		
2011 YTD (Jun)	2,057	557	27.1%
2011 YE Projected	2,057	2,620	127.4%
2012	1,172		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
			Achieved
2000	147,813	280,874	190.0%
2001	433,695	383,196	88.4%
2002	146,823	190,038	129.4%
2003	280,905	178,935	63.7%
2004	265,488	278,872	105.0%
2005	368,721	409,048	110.9%
2006	183,442	310,557	169.3%
2007	140,313	291,700	207.9%
2008	221,498	272,595	123.1%
2009	345,264	233,761	67.7%
2010	186,728	209,052	112.0%
2011	159,471		
2011 YTD (Jun)	159,471	47,228	29.6%
2011 YE Projected	159,471	200,933	126.0%
2012	113,819		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh		\$/LT kWh		\$/kW	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2000	\$0.260	\$0.151	\$0.017	\$0.011	\$0	\$0
2001	\$0.176	\$0.134	\$0.012	\$0.009	\$0	\$0
2002	\$0.237	\$0.103	\$0.016	\$0.007	\$0	\$0
2003	\$0.124	\$0.119	\$0.008	\$0.008	\$585	\$534
2004	\$0.125	\$0.122	\$0.008	\$0.008	\$497	\$710
2005	\$0.129	\$0.162	\$0.008	\$0.010	\$564	\$1,017
2006	\$0.172	\$0.144	\$0.011	\$0.010	\$936	\$890
2007	\$0.175	\$0.271	\$0.014	\$0.020	\$1,098	\$1,463
2008	\$0.186	\$0.151	\$0.014	\$0.011	\$1,192	\$884
2009	\$0.218	\$0.264	\$0.016	\$0.020	\$1,461	\$1,609
2010	\$0.268	\$0.286	\$0.021	\$0.023	\$1,994	\$2,105
2011	\$0.303		\$0.024		\$1,877	
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.303	\$0.950	\$0.024	\$0.071	\$1,877	\$6,044
2011 YE Projected	\$0.303	\$0.302	\$0.024	\$0.024	\$1,877	\$1,855
2012	\$0.334		\$0.026		\$2,565	

Notes:

- 2000-2002 data from LF-26 filed in 03-01-01
- '03 data reflects budgets approved in 03-01-01
- '04 data represents the revised budget allocations
- '02-'03 Energy Opportunities included RFP and O&M RFP numbers
- '05-'06 EO budget & goal includes potential measures from Retro-Commissioning & other O&M RFP subprograms
- Energy Opportunities includes Municipal retrofit projects in 2006 - 2008
- accelerated chiller carryover projected at 1 projects, accounting for 10% of the expenditures and 3% of the kWh and kW savings
- Starting in 2009 EO includes C&I Loan Program

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - Energy Opportunities

Budget/(FTE):

- 1) Budget includes 4.29 FTEs for staffing
- 2) 2012 proposed overall budget is a 24% decrease compared to the '11 revised budget
- 3) 2012 incentives include transparent re-structured measure caps focusing on cost containment;
- 4) 2012 incentives include a re-structured comprehensive initiative with incentives consistent with the 2011 structure
- 5) Project financing costs reduce available incentive funds
- 6) Customers > 200 kW will be eligible for EO
- 7) 2011 budget was revised after 9/16/11 approval for \$1 M
- 8) Increased budget, kWh and kW goals are reflected in the 2011 projected actuals

Goal:

- 1) 2012 target = 80 installed projects
- 2) 2012 target of 8,992,818 kWh; a decrease of approx. 54%
- 3) 2012 target of 1,172 kW; a decrease of approx. 65%
- 4) 2012 planning model is based on historical data, programmatic rule changes, and evaluation information
- 5) Targets impacted by higher costs of comprehensive projects
- 6) Targets impacted by modified coincidence factors, realization rates, and measure life
- 7) net realization rates capped at 100%
- 8) capture more retrofit opportunities by greater focus on:
 - a. non participants > 200 kW in size
 - b. increased comprehensiveness per project
 - c. process equipment and system optimization
 - d. higher performance alternatives
 - e. more outreach and training

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

- 1) 2012 projected cost rates: annual = \$0.334/ kWh, a 10% over the 2011 projected cost rate; lifetime = \$.026/ kWh;
- 2) 2012 projected \$\$/kW = \$2,565; increase of 36% over 2011 projected cost rate
- 3) program costs will remain elevated due to:
 - a. increased costs to overcome a sluggish economy
 - b. increased costs for emerging technologies
 - c. increased costs from a continued comprehensive effort
 - d. more outreach, training and education
- 4) EO will experience negative kW impacts due to:
 - a. coincidence factors modified per recent studies
 - b. net realization rates applied in accordance with recent studies
 - c. measure life changes per recent studies
 - d. exterior LED/ induction lights / EMS measures
 - e. less kWh generated from older lighting

Metric Changes:

- 1) all savings are reported as net values

Municipal Retrofit Projects (1,2,3,4)

Year	Install Proj.	kWh savings	kW savings	Incentive	\$\$/ kWh	\$\$/pk kW
2006	51	4,508,755	1124	1,219,007	\$ 0.270	\$ 1,085
2007	44	3,393,721	714	773,662	\$ 0.228	\$ 1,084
2008	59	5,155,819	978	1,179,436	\$ 0.229	\$ 1,206
2009	62	5,150,641	975	1,208,149	\$ 0.235	\$ 1,239
2010	40	3,825,244	832	1,903,021	\$ 0.497	\$ 2,287
2011 (Jun)	31	3,175,114	331	913,845	\$ 0.288	\$ 2,758

(1) includes traffic signals installed in 2008

(2) kWh, kW savings, and cost rates are based on net savings

(3) 2011 installed projects are based on installed and signed projects as of 06/30/11

(4) 2011 installed projects include 7 gas projects

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Opportunities

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 23,618	\$ 27,254	\$ 52,521	\$ 107,730	\$ 29,670	\$ 59,340	\$ 107,730	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 17,551	\$ 32,387	\$ 6,225	\$ 52,268	\$ 3,822	\$ 52,268	\$ 95,268	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ 443	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 360	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,159	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,934	\$ 979,355	\$ 414,789	\$ 851,722	\$ 351,448	\$ 1,269,977	\$ 790,608	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,771	\$ 2,796	\$ 13,827	\$ 3,060	\$ 3,378	\$ 6,755	\$ 11,567	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,967	\$ 3,494	\$ 4,537	\$ 4,860	\$ 2,107	\$ 4,214	\$ 13,668	
Total			\$ 49,283	\$ 1,045,286	\$ 491,899	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 390,425	\$ 1,392,554	\$ 1,020,000	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	17,218	639,931	205,653	548,792	59,333	211,627	348,479	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	191,374	9,216,030	2,347,874	7,765,169	630,874	2,250,179	4,008,441	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.86	\$ 1.63	\$ 2.39	\$ 1.86	\$ 6.58	\$ 6.58	\$ 2.93	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.26	\$ 0.11	\$ 0.21	\$ 0.13	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.62	\$ 0.25	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 163,130	\$ 7,855,892	\$ 2,050,248	\$ 6,112,362	\$ 496,593	\$ 1,771,231	\$ 2,233,457	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 3.31	\$ 7.52	\$ 4.17	\$ 5.99	\$ 1.27	\$ 1.27	\$ 2.19	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	2	18	28	31	9	32	60	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	95,687	512,002	83,853	250,489	70,097	70,097	66,375	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 24,642	\$ 58,071	\$ 17,568	\$ 32,903	\$ 43,381	\$ 43,381	\$ 16,890	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 81,565	\$ 436,438	\$ 73,223	\$ 197,173	\$ 55,177	\$ 55,177	\$ 36,983	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 539,535	\$ 49,283	9%
2009	\$ 890,000	\$ 1,045,286	117%
2010	\$ 890,000	\$ 491,899	55%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 390,425	38%
2011 YE projection	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 1,392,554	137%
2012	\$ 1,020,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	2	-
2009	30	18	60%
2010	51	28	55%
2011 YTD (June)	31	9	29%
2011 YE projection	31	32	104%
2012	60	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	17,218	-
2009	158,038	639,931	405%
2010	435,940	205,653	47%
2011 YTD (June)	548,792	59,333	11%
2011 YE projection	548,792	211,627	39%
2012	348,479	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	191,374	-
2009	1,738,420	9,216,030	530%
2010	6,693,658	2,347,874	35%
2011 YTD (June)	7,765,169	630,874	8%
2011 YE projection	7,765,169	2,250,179	29%
2012	4,008,441	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Opportunities

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 6,918	\$ 16,048	\$ 29,058	\$ 71,820	\$ 9,301	\$ 71,821	\$ 103,180	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 8,867	\$ 10,446	\$ 8,020	\$ 66,974	\$ 1,184	\$ 66,974	\$ 51,194	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -		\$ -	\$ 198	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 198	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 400	\$ 113,156	\$ 280,537	\$ 613,028	\$ 46,516	\$ 613,030	\$ 698,948	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 795	\$ 635	\$ 6,896	\$ 1,980	\$ 441	\$ 2,241	\$ 1,980	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 151	\$ 106	\$ 484	\$ 6,000	\$ 44	\$ 6,002	\$ 4,500	
Total			\$ 17,131	\$ 140,392	\$ 324,995	\$ 760,000	\$ 57,486	\$ 760,068	\$ 860,000	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goal	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	5,647	71,813	121,746	394,994	14,865	196,542	308,078	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	56,465	831,786	1,439,073	5,588,992	205,668	2,719,300	3,543,718	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 3.03	\$ 1.95	\$ 2.67	\$ 1.92	\$ 3.87	\$ 3.87	\$ 2.79	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.23	\$ 0.14	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.28	\$ 0.24	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 48,132	\$ 709,028	\$ 1,256,650	\$ 4,399,381	\$ 161,892	\$ 2,140,500	\$ 1,976,132	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.81	\$ 5.05	\$ 3.87	\$ 5.79	\$ 2.82	\$ 2.82	\$ 2.30	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	2	12	23	22	4	53	53	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	28,233	69,316	62,568	254,045	51,417	51,417	66,375	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 8,566	\$ 11,699	\$ 14,130	\$ 34,545	\$ 14,372	\$ 14,372	\$ 16,108	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 24,066	\$ 59,086	\$ 54,637	\$ 199,972	\$ 40,473	\$ 40,473	\$ 37,013	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	400,775	\$ 17,131	4%
2009	\$ 300,000	\$ 140,392	47%
2010	\$ 501,250	\$ 324,995	65%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 760,000	\$ 57,486	8%
2011 YE projection	\$ 760,000	\$ 760,068	100%
2012	\$ 860,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	2	-
2009	17	12	71%
2010	27	23	85%
2011 YTD (June)	22	4	18%
2011 YE projection	22	53	240%
2012	53	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	5,647	-
2009	88,671	71,813	81%
2010	228,129	121,746	53%
2011 YTD (June)	394,994	14,865	4%
2011 YE projection	394,994	196,542	50%
2012	308,078	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	56,465	-
2009	975,385	831,786	85%
2010	3,502,815	1,439,073	41%
2011 YTD (June)	5,588,992	205,668	4%
2011 YE projection	5,588,992	2,719,300	49%
2012	3,543,718	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Energy Opportunities

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 4,113	\$ 4,141	\$ 5,402	\$ 71,820	\$ 2,356	\$ 71,820	\$ 81,820	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,198	\$ 1,236	\$ 527	\$ 84,583	\$ -	\$ 84,583	\$ 63,783	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 228	\$ -	\$ 228	\$ 228	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 54,060	\$ 179,427	\$ 72,281	\$ 534,333	\$ 293,814	\$ 1,095,333	\$ 645,133	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 800	\$ 526	\$ 5,985	\$ 2,256	\$ 552	\$ 2,256	\$ 2,256	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 159	\$ 44	\$ 127	\$ 6,780	\$ 3	\$ 6,780	\$ 6,780	
Total			\$ 60,330	\$ 185,374	\$ 84,322	\$ 700,000	\$ 296,725	\$ 1,261,000	\$ 800,000	a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	13,025	30,977	37,364	344,288	7,534	32,017	284,358	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	195,375	629,418	398,807	4,871,525	113,010	480,262	3,270,872	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 4.63	\$ 5.98	\$ 2.26	\$ 2.03	\$ 39.38	\$ 39.38	\$ 2.81	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.31	\$ 5.98	\$ 2.26	\$ 0.14	\$ 2.63	\$ 2.63	\$ 0.24	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 166,541	\$ 536,526	\$ 348,253	\$ 3,834,626	\$ 88,956	\$ 378,038	\$ 1,823,982	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.76	\$ 2.89	\$ 4.13	\$ 5.48	\$ 0.30	\$ 0.30	\$ 2.28	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	1	2	9	20	1	4	49	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	195,375	\$ 4,917	\$ 3,116	243,576	113,010	113,010	66,375	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 60,330	\$ 1,448	\$ 659	\$ 35,000	\$ 296,725	\$ 296,725	\$ 16,234	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 166,541	\$ 4,192	\$ 2,721	\$ 191,731	\$ 88,956	\$ 88,956	\$ 37,013	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 361,197	\$ 60,330	17%
2009	\$ 300,000	\$ 185,374	62%
2010	\$ 443,750	\$ 84,322	19%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 700,000	\$ 296,725	42%
2011 YE projection	\$ 700,000	\$ 1,261,000	180%
2012	\$ 800,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	1	-
2009	17	2	12%
2010	23	9	39%
2011 YTD (June)	20	1	5%
2011 YE projection	20	4	21%
2012	49	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	13,025	-
2009	88,671	30,977	35%
2010	195,604	37,364	19%
2011 YTD (June)	344,288	7,534	2%
2011 YE projection	344,288	32,017	9%
2012	284,358	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	195,375	-
2009	975,385	629,418	65%
2010	3,003,409	398,807	13%
2011 YTD (June)	4,871,525	113,010	2%
2011 YE projection	4,871,525	480,262	10%
2012	3,270,872	n/a	-

This page intentionally blank

Small Business Energy Advantage (Electric)

Objective:

The objective of the Small Business Energy Advantage (“SBEA”) program is to provide cost-effective, turnkey C&LM services for small business customers.

Target Market:

All Commercial and Industrial (C&I) customers, including some multifamily complexes are eligible for the SBEA program. The program does restrict eligibility based on electric and gas criteria. Any electric customer with a 12-month peak demand average up to 200 kW is eligible for this program. In addition, the customer needs to be a firm gas customer to be eligible for the gas incentives. Customers utilizing fossil fuels other than natural gas would only be eligible for electric incentives.

Program Description:

The Companies, through a network of approved contractors, provide direct or turnkey services to maximize energy-efficiency operations for customers. These direct services include energy assessments and installation of measures.

As financial constraints are one of the primary barriers for this market, usually there are no up-front customer costs. The Electric Companies pay incentives for relevant energy- efficiency measures within cost-effectiveness constraints, and offer an interest-free financing option to credit-qualifying customers for the balance. The financed contract amount appears as a line item on the customer’s electric bill. The loan repayment term, which is determined by the simple payback of the project, is set at a level which normally provides the customer with a positive annual cash flow based upon the estimated energy savings resulting from the installed measures. For 2012, the Companies will be creating an initial portfolio of gas measures and the ability to finance the project with on-bill repayment.

The SBEA program also includes an educational component to inform small business customers of the benefits that can be achieved through energy-efficiency efforts.

Marketing Strategy:

Many of the SBEA contractors have a dedicated sales force prospecting and cold-calling on potential leads. The Electric Companies provide these contractors with marketing collateral such as brochures, cut sheets, and success stories¹⁶ to influence customer enrollment.

The Electric Companies may augment contractor enrollment with:

¹⁶ An example of a case study from CL&P’s website:

[http://nuwnotes1.nu.com/apps/clp/clpwebcontent.nsf/AR/Marandino/\\$File/Marandino.pdf](http://nuwnotes1.nu.com/apps/clp/clpwebcontent.nsf/AR/Marandino/$File/Marandino.pdf)

- paid advertising (radio, print and electronic) in broadcast outlets, local business publications and Chamber of Commerce directories targeting business owners and directing readers to the Electric Companies' web sites and to CTEnergyInfo.com;
- direct mail campaigns to customers who have yet to participate, and;
- presence at strategically selected business expos and trade shows.

In addition to specific program promotion, marketing efforts will also include actions intended to support small business customers and the contractor community, and to facilitate market transformation. This support may take the form of:

- project leave-behinds summarizing what was done so employees at the location will understand the benefits of energy efficiency and can act as ambassadors of change outside of their work environment;
- writing and distributing success stories (See footnote below) to various marketing channels;
- direct mail;
- promotion of Fund-sponsored technical training seminars via e-mail and newsletters;
- hosting quarterly update and training meetings for the SBEA contractors, and;
- participation with Chambers of Commerce, town officials, trade groups and the Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development through memberships, joint projects and events. Additionally, the Companies have or are exploring relationships with a variety of urban initiatives, such as, but not limited to, Empowerment New Haven, the Connecticut Retail Merchants Association (CRMA) and the Spanish American Merchants Association (SAMA) and Operation Fuel, ad channels to promote the SBEA program.

Incentive Strategy:

The Companies will continue its strategy of utilizing a mix of prescriptive and custom style incentives along with paying a modest increase to go after deeper, comprehensive measures. Incentives for lighting and other energy-efficiency measures are prescriptive and capped within cost-effectiveness constraints. Typically, incentives for non-lighting measures are custom-designed and capped within cost-effectiveness constraints of the measure. In addition to the mix of prescriptive and custom style incentives, interest free financing, as described in the C&LM Financing section, is offered with this program to qualified customers, as an additional incentive to facilitate participation.

As a result of last year's final decision (Docket #10-10-10), the PURA approved the EDCs plan to simplify program incentive caps and improve transparency. This approval allowed the Companies to utilize published unit incentive cost rate caps.¹⁷ This successful strategy, launched in January 2011, will

¹⁷ An example of CL&P's published incentive structure for retrofit programs is found here:

continue to provide program incentive transparency while continuing to allow for greater flexibility and better project incentive costs management. This strategy will also be continued for the gas program incentive structures as well. Please refer to the incentive tables located at the appendix at the back of Chapter 3.

The Companies will continue to evaluate market trends and responsiveness, and make adjustments to participation requirements and incentive levels accordingly.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

New Program Issues:

New for 2012, the Small Business Energy Advantage Program will incorporate an initial portfolio of the more common gas saving measures, operating with a specific, limited budget. This initial gas measure portfolio may include measures such as: high efficiency pre-rinse spray valves; food service equipment; low flow showerheads, faucet aerators; low flow salon-style spray heads; programmable thermostats; pipe insulation; duct sealing and duct insulation; indoor boiler reset controls; energy management systems; heating equipment; water heating equipment and envelope measures. The Companies will utilize a mix of prescriptive and custom style incentives and all the measures will be subject to the cost-effective program caps. The Companies have updated their SBEA software to accommodate these new gas measures.

New financing opportunities for SBEA gas measures are detailed in Chapter 5. In addition, alternative third-party financing for customers who do not meet the current eligibility requirements are also being offered in 2012; details can be found in Chapter 5.

The Electric Companies will be launching competitive bid processes in late 2011 for SBEA vendors for the 2012 and 2013 program years. A continued aspect of the process will be evaluating each vendor's ability to produce comprehensive projects.

CL&P Specific Issues

CL&P will launch a competitive bid process in 2011 to select SBEA contractors to provide services for the 2012 and 2013 program. It is expected that a total of 18 to 20 contractors will be selected and CL&P will continue to monitor contractor performance and make adjustments as necessary.

UI Specific Issues:

For 2012, the Company plans on modifying its financing requirements for customers' eligibility. The planned modification will require customers seeking loan amounts greater than \$45,000 and loan terms of 48 months to be verified through an external resource such as Dunn & Bradstreet. This plan will further protect the SBEA program and the fund from increased occurrences of delinquency.

UI has begun partnering with Gateway Community College to develop a training program that will lead to energy auditor certifications for the SBEA vendors similar to the Building Performance Institute certifications that are available to the HES vendors.

As previously noted, the Company will be working to implement "On-Bill Financing" in 2012. The customer billing systems for UI, SCG, and CNG are undergoing modifications so all three systems will be aligned and functioning the same way. Once this is completed (late 2013), the Companies will be able to offer "On-Bill Financing" to all eligible customers within their service territories.

Traditionally, the SBEA vendors gravitate toward customers with greater energy savings opportunities leaving the smallest customers as a drastically "underserved" portion of the SMB customer sector. Therefore by utilizing the partnerships previously mentioned, UI will be proposing to operate a "direct install" pilot to customers who have peak demands less than 10 kW. The primary target of this pilot will be the "struggling" urban businesses found throughout the various "economic development" or "empowerment" zones within UI's service territory.

As discussed previously, UI will conduct a joint competitive bid process in 2011 to select an appropriate number of SBEA contractors to providing services and achieving goals for the 2012 and 2013 program years. The contractors will be closely monitored for production, quality of field work, and overall customer service with adjustments being made as necessary. Increasing the number of inspections will have an overall positive affect on Vendor performance. In addition, UI will explore the possibility of enlisting the services of more "in territory" vendors so our customers can be better served.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Small Business Energy Advantage

All dollar values are in \$000

Customers with a 200kW demand or less or State Building projects.

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 571	\$ 603	\$ 841	\$ 330	\$ 795	\$ 683	\$ 683
Contractor Staff	\$ 71	\$ 156	\$ 200	\$ 82	\$ 189	\$ 274	\$ 274
Total Labor	\$ 642	\$ 759	\$ 1,040	\$ 412	\$ 985	\$ 957	\$ 957
Materials & Supplies	\$ 3	\$ 2	\$ 15	\$ 1	\$ 10	\$ 10	\$ 10
Outside Services	\$ 29	\$ 237	\$ 319	\$ 27	\$ 302	\$ 237 a)	\$ 236
Incentives	\$ 3,211	\$ 9,815	\$ 9,923	\$ 5,660	\$ 9,390	\$ 8,619	\$ 8,573
Marketing	\$ 49	\$ 87	\$ 320	\$ 56	\$ 303	\$ 300 b)	\$ 298
Administrative Expenses	\$ 931	\$ 1,194	\$ 1,800	\$ 913	\$ 1,703	\$ 1,500 c) d)	\$ 1,492
Other	\$ 13	\$ 8	\$ 20	\$ 15	\$ 19	\$ 17	\$ 17
Total	\$ 4,879	\$ 12,101	\$ 13,437	\$ 7,084	\$ 12,712	\$ 11,640	\$ 11,583

- a) Technical analysis and third-party pre/post inspection service.
- b) Market program to customers, trade allies and professional organizations.
- c) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.
- d) Primarily due to interest expense payments on the zero % customer loans.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	4,827.7
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	28,137,781
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	344,348,911
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.414
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.034
Electric b/c Ratio	2.56
Total Resource b/c Ratio	1.66

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Small Business Energy Advantage

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	\$/LT-kWh
2000	\$ 1,525,000	\$ 852,000	56%	0.011
2001	\$ 2,720,000	\$ 2,437,000	90%	0.013
2002	\$ 3,449,000	\$ 2,812,000	82%	0.015
2003	\$ 3,800,000	\$ 2,167,157	57%	0.010
2004	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,263,609	109%	0.010
2005 Revised	\$ 3,456,476	\$ 2,710,538	78%	0.012
2006 Revised	\$ 4,300,000	\$ 7,497,147	174%	0.013
2007 Revised	\$ 3,900,200	\$ 10,204,353	262%	0.022
2008 Revised	\$ 13,537,620	\$ 11,390,772	84%	0.025
2009 Revised	\$ 9,808,000	\$ 4,879,517	50%	0.018
2010 Revised	\$ 10,890,000	\$ 12,100,944	111%	0.032
2011 Revised	\$ 13,437,460	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 7,083,730	53%	0.038
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 13,437,460	\$ 12,711,807	95%	0.036
2012	\$ 11,640,000	n/a	n/a	n/a

Goal - Participation

Year	Goal ²	Actual	% of Goal
2000	924	587	64%
2001	1,860	2,023	109%
2002	2,114	1,961	93%
2003	769	505	66%
2004	561	603	107%
2005 Revised	522	523	100%
2006 Revised	489	955	195%
2007 Revised	514	1,397	272%
2008 Revised	1,647	1,138	69%
2009 Revised	1,197	785	66%
2010 Revised	1,107	1,546	140%
2011 Revised	1,404	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	790	56%
2011 Y/E Projected	1,404	1,580	113%
2012	1,440	n/a	n/a

Goal - Lifetime MWh Savings

Year	Goal (MWh)	Actual (MWh)	% of Goal
2000	107,466	75,624	70%
2001	197,383	189,039	96%
2002	181,333	192,412	106%
2003	261,691	221,042	84%
2004	217,790	328,965	151%
2005 Revised	202,766	233,266	115%
2006 Revised	284,749	561,280	197%
2007 Revised	198,363	468,516	236%
2008 Revised	606,652	457,376	75%
2009 Revised	554,086	275,112	50%
2010 Revised	372,522	376,215	101%
2011 Revised	493,393	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	185,868	38%
2011 Y/E Projected	493,393	349,472	71%
2012	344,349	n/a	n/a

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	3,224	2,430	75.4%
2004	2,552	3,354	131.4%
2005 Revised	2,376	2,349	98.9%
2006 Budget	2,916	8,497	291.4%
2007 Revised	3,022	9,310	308.1%
2008 Revised	10,647	8,287	77.8%
2009 Revised	10,698	4,987	46.6%
2010 Revised	5,402	5,244	97.1%
2010 Revised	6,521	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	2,414	37.0%
2011 Y/E Projected	6,521	5,654	86.7%
2012	4,828	n/a	n/a

Program Ratios

Year	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kWh	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.014	0.011	n/a	1,004
2001	0.014	0.013	n/a	1,066
2002	0.019	0.015	n/a	1,196
2003	0.017	0.010	1,270	892
2004	0.014	0.010	1,175	973
2005 Revised	0.017	0.012	1,455	1,154
2006 Revised	0.015	0.013	1,475	882
2007 Revised	0.020	0.022	1,291	1,096
2008 Revised	0.014	0.025	1,271	1,374
2009 Revised	0.018	0.018	917	978
2010 Revised	0.029	0.032	2,016	2,308
2011 Revised	0.027	n/a	2,061	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.038	n/a	2,934
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.036	2,061	2,248
2012	0.034	n/a	2,411	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Small Business Energy Advantage

Budget / (FTE)

5.1 FTEs for Program administration, inspections, QA/QC, loan collections, etc.

Goal

1440 Customers - installed projects.
4,828 Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)
344,348,911 Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

\$/Annualized kW	\$	2,411
\$/Lifetime kWh	\$	0.034

Goal Setting Methodology

The 2012 planning model is based on 2010 actual results.
Changes were made to incorporate different incentive structure and coincidence factors.

Metric Changes:

None

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Small Business

Baseline Assumptions:

Market	Retrofit program for small C&I customers < 200 kW ⁽¹⁾					
		2011	2011	2011		
<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>Revised Bud</u>	<u>YTD (June)</u>	<u>YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 250,899	\$ 257,077	\$ 116,716	\$ 257,077	\$ 262,536 a)	\$ 275,663
Contractor Staff	-	\$ 10,500	-	\$ 10,500	\$ 10,500 b)	\$ 10,500
Total Labor	\$ 250,899	\$ 267,577	\$ 116,716	\$ 267,577	\$ 273,036	\$ 286,163
Materials & Supplies	\$ 85	\$ 3,266	\$ 29	\$ 3,266	\$ 3,266 c)	\$ 3,266
Outside Services	\$ 121,868	\$ 30,000	\$ 10,330	\$ 30,000	\$ 50,000 d)	\$ 50,000
Incentives	\$ 2,232,614	\$ 2,040,261	\$ 444,388	\$ 2,040,261	\$ 1,559,934 e)	\$ 1,532,925
Marketing	\$ 27,057	\$ 24,000	\$ 1,784	\$ 24,000	\$ 30,000 f)	\$ 30,000
Other	\$ 1,771	\$ 1,200	\$ 542	\$ 1,200	\$ 1,100 g)	\$ 1,100
Administrative Expenses	\$ 338,511	\$ 351,330	\$ 163,303	\$ 351,330	\$ 310,300 h)	\$ 310,300
Total	\$ 2,972,805	\$ 2,717,634	\$ 737,092	\$ 2,717,634	\$ 2,227,636	\$ 2,213,754

(1) Customer eligibility is up to 200 kW

- a) 2.05 FTEs
- b) no comment
- c) no comment
- d) Consultant / engineering / audit services
- e) Customer incentives
- f) Brochure revision, selected advertising, public relations, etc.
- g) no comment
- h) Financing interest, employee training, mileage, etc.

Goals and Metrics Information:

Savings

	<u>2012</u>
Demand Savings (kW)	861
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	5,074,638
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	64,551,988
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.439
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.035
Cost per kW	\$ 2,587
Electric System B/C Ratio	2.56
Total Resource B/C Ratio	1.15

**The United Illuminating Company
LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement**

Small Business Energy Advantage

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$1,514	\$1,203	79.5%
2001	\$1,327	\$1,397	120.2%
2002	\$1,065	\$997	93.6%
2003	\$1,301	\$846	65.0%
2004	\$922	\$844	91.5%
2005	\$1,350	\$1,386	102.7%
2006	\$1,530	\$1,638	107.1%
2007	\$1,411	\$1,842	130.5%
2008	\$2,011	\$2,145	106.7%
2009	\$3,623	\$2,170	59.9%
2010	\$2,701	\$2,973	110.1%
2011	\$2,718		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$2,718	\$737	27.1%
2011 YE Projected	\$2,718	\$2,174	80.0%
2012	\$2,228		

Goal - Number Of Projects

Year	Project Target	Project Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	225	317	140.9%
2001	294	258	87.8%
2002	253	276	109.1%
2003	298	148	49.7%
2004	236	237	100.4%
2005	307	367	119.5%
2006	344	310	90.1%
2007	240	357	148.8%
2008	340	490	144.1%
2009	630	559	88.7%
2010	475	340	71.6%
2011	371		
2011 YTD (Jun)	371	66	17.8%
2011 YE Projected	371	297	80.1%
2012	191		

\$/Project

Year	Target	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$6,729	\$3,795	56.4%
2001	\$4,514	\$6,182	137.0%
2002	\$4,209	\$3,612	85.8%
2003	\$4,366	\$5,716	130.9%
2004	\$3,909	\$3,563	91.1%
2005	\$4,397	\$3,777	85.9%
2006	\$4,448	\$5,284	118.8%
2007	\$5,879	\$5,161	87.8%
2008	\$5,915	\$3,760	63.6%
2009	\$5,751	\$3,881	67.5%
2010	\$5,686	\$8,744	153.8%
2011	\$7,326		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$7,326	\$11,168	152.4%
2011 YE Projected	\$7,326	\$7,320	99.9%
2012	\$11,663		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	6,417	5,274	82.2%
2001	5,761	6,506	112.9%
2002	4,765	6,279	131.8%
2003	6,250	3,578	57.2%
2004	4,930	4,399	89.2%
2005	6,895	7,590	110.1%
2006	6,733	5,830	86.6%
2007	5,670	7,644	134.8%
2008	7,564	9,480	125.3%
2009	14,753	7,914	53.6%
2010	9,251	7,789	84.2%
2011	7,717		
2011 YTD (Jun)	7,717	853	11.1%
2011 YE Projected	7,717	6,173	80.0%
2012	5,075		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	1,429	-	0.0%
2003	1,424	1,031	72.4%
2004	802	1,035	129.1%
2005	1,132	1,963	173.4%
2006	1,466	1,661	113.3%
2007	1,340	2,008	149.8%
2008	1,717	2,149	125.2%
2009	3,095	1,573	50.8%
2010	1,452	1,172	80.7%
2011	1,238		
2011 YTD (Jun)	1,238	131	10.6%
2011 YE Projected	1,238	990	80.0%
2012	861		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	96,300	79,100	82.1%
2001	86,400	97,600	113.0%
2002	71,500	94,200	131.7%
2003	93,750	53,670	57.2%
2004	73,950	65,987	89.2%
2005	108,928	119,909	110.1%
2006	100,997	76,975	76.2%
2007	72,003	92,649	128.7%
2008	96,830	99,684	102.9%
2009	169,777	88,186	51.9%
2010	109,193	97,574	89.4%
2011	92,339		
2011 YTD (Jun)	92,339	10,810	11.7%
2011 YE Projected	92,339	73,871	80.0%
2012	64,552		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh Target	\$/kWh Actual	\$/LT kWh Target	\$/LT kWh Actual	\$/kW Target	\$/kW Actual
2000	\$0.236	\$0.228	\$0.016	\$0.015	\$0	\$0
2001	\$0.230	\$0.245	\$0.015	\$0.016	\$0	\$0
2002	\$0.224	\$0.159	\$0.015	\$0.011	\$745	\$604
2003	\$0.208	\$0.236	\$0.014	\$0.016	\$914	\$821
2004	\$0.187	\$0.192	\$0.012	\$0.013	\$1,150	\$816
2005	\$0.196	\$0.183	\$0.012	\$0.012	\$1,193	\$706
2006	\$0.227	\$0.281	\$0.015	\$0.021	\$1,044	\$986
2007	\$0.249	\$0.241	\$0.020	\$0.020	\$1,053	\$918
2008	\$0.266	\$0.226	\$0.021	\$0.022	\$1,171	\$998
2009	\$0.246	\$0.274	\$0.021	\$0.025	\$1,171	\$1,380
2010	\$0.292	\$0.382	\$0.025	\$0.030	\$1,860	\$2,537
2011	\$0.352		\$0.029		\$2,195	
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.352	\$0.864	\$0.029	\$0.068	\$2,195	\$5,627
2011 YE Projected	\$0.352	\$0.352	\$0.029	\$0.029	\$2,195	\$2,196
2012	\$0.439		\$0.035		\$2,587	

Notes:
 1. 2000-2002 data from LF-26 filed in 03-01-01
 2. 2003 data reflects budgets approved in 03-01-01
 3. 2004 data represents the revised budget allocations

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - Small Business Energy Advantage

Budget/(FTE):

- 1) Budget includes 2.05 FTEs for staffing
- 2) 2012 proposed overall budget is decrease by approx. 18% compared to the '11 revised budget
- 3) 2012 will include more non lighting incentives to increase comprehensiveness
- 4) 2012 incentives include transparent re-structured measure caps focusing on cost containment;
- 5) 2012 incentives include a comprehensive initiative with incentives consistent with the 2011
- 6) Program eligibility will be up to 200 kW consistent across the state
- 7) 2011 has experienced less than 1% default rate YTD.
- 8) Project financing costs reduce available incentive funds

Goal:

- 1) 2012 Target = 191 installed projects with 10% being comprehensive
- 2) 2012 target of 5,074,000 kWh; a decrease of approx. 34%
- 3) 2012 target of 861 kW; a decrease of approx. 30%
- 4) the market continues to need stimulation; 2012 will have similar incentive levels as 2011
- 5) ~87% of projects have come facilities less than 75 kW - limiting the savings opportunity
- 6) applied gross statewide realization rates

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

- 1) 2012 projected cost rates per kWh: annual = \$0.439, lifetime = \$0.035
- 2) 2012 projected \$\$/kW = \$2,587
- 3) project financing costs have been budgeted and increase the \$\$/kWh
- 4) adopted realization rates to be more consistent with CL&P;
- 5) adopted measure life values and coincidence factors to be more consistent with CL&P;
- 6) \$/kW is higher due to refrigeration controls and HVAC conservation measures
small impacts on peak kW
- 7) higher program costs are anticipated due to:
 - a. negative impact from the sluggish economy
 - b. increased costs from larger customers
 - c. increased costs from the comprehensive initiative
 - d. more outreach, training and education
 - e. ongoing marketing strategies to increase inner city & minority participation
 - f. rates from the recent impact evaluation was included in the cost rate calculation
- 8) small project size limits savings opportunity - see table below

Metric Changes:

- 1) all savings are reported as net values

Historical project breakdown by kW size

kW Range	2008 %	2009 %	2010 %	2011* %	projects
0-25 kW	68%	81%	66%	67%	110
26-50 kW	15%	12%	18%	16%	27
51-75 kW	10%	4%	7%	4%	6
76-100 kW	3%	1%	3%	4%	7
101-125 kW	3%	2%	5%	5%	8
126-150 kW	1%	0%	1%	1%	2
151-200 kW			1%	2%	4
totals	100%	100%	100%	100%	164

(* 2011 installed projects are based on installed and signed projects as of 06/30/11)

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Small Business

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 10,660
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,680
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 140
Incentives	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 71,900
Marketing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,000
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 14,620
Total									\$ 100,000 ^a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	31,692 ^b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	364,538 ^c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 3.16 ^{d=a/b}
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.27 ^{e=a/c}
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 203,117 ^f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.03 ^{g=f/a}
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11 ^h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33,187 ^{i=c/h}
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 9,104 ^{k=a/h}
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 18,492 ^{l=f/h}

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	\$ 100,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	11	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	31,692	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	364,538	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Small Business

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 10,664
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,680
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 135
Incentives	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 76,901
Marketing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 996
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 9,624
Total									\$ 100,000 ^a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33,896 ^b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	389,894 ^c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.95 ^{d=a/b}
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.26 ^{e=a/c}
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 217,422 ^f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.17 ^{g=f/a}
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12 ^h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33,187 ^{i=c/h}
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 8,512 ^{k=a/h}
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 18,507 ^{l=f/h}

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	\$ 100,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	12	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	33,896	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	389,894	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Small Business

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD(June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	
Labor	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 10,664	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,680	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 135	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 76,901	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 996	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 9,624	
Total									\$ 100,000	a

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Goals</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Goals</u>	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33,896	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	389,894	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.95	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.26	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 217,422	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.17	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33,188	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 8,512	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 18,507	l=f/h

Program Costs

<u>Year</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	\$ 100,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

<u>Year</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	12	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

<u>Year</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	33,896	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

<u>Year</u>	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	n/a	n/a	-
2010	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YTD (June)	n/a	n/a	-
2011 YE projection	n/a	n/a	-
2012	389,894	n/a	-

This page intentionally blank

Business and Energy Sustainability (formerly Operations & Maintenance) Program

Objective:

The objectives of the Business and Energy Sustainability (“BES”) program are to (1) help customers improve the electrical and thermal efficiency of their building’s infrastructure through operational improvements and adjustment of building controls, rather than capital investments, and to (2) provide customers with the knowledge and the means to maintain equipment and system performance on an ongoing basis. Meeting these objectives includes implementing things such as (1) investigating ways of upgrading functioning but inefficient equipment within the C&I environment; (2) repairing and/or retrofitting existing equipment with better performing control devices; (3) improving a facility’s overall energy performance, and (4) developing long-term, sustainable, energy-saving relationships and plans with customers that includes encouraging participants to benchmark and track their energy consumption over time.

Target Market:

The target market for this program is comprised of all C&I customers including owners and managers of multi-family residential buildings. The multifamily sector represents a target market that often straddles the eligibility requirements of both C&I and Residential program offerings.

Program Description:

As indicated by the program’s objectives, the Business and Energy Sustainability (BES) Program is best characterized as a “programmatically melting pot” that addresses capturing the potential energy savings from a combination of information-based behavioral change and capital investments by the customer. This program was formerly named Operations and Maintenance (or O&M), but the Companies and consultants to the EEB have come to realize that the terminology “O&M” is too vague and does not get to the heart of what the EDCs are trying to accomplish with their customers. BES, on the other hand, attempts to focus on energy savings resulting from changes in individual or organizational behavior and decision-making. For example, BES will strive to use various forms of energy use feedback mechanisms like energy dashboard tools to show the end-user how much energy they have used compared to another point in time. Many efficiency program administrators across the country have begun to focus on this softer, cultural aspect of saving energy.¹⁸ Traditionally, a customer has been willing to make the necessary capital investments to improve their facility’s energy efficiency with assistance from incentive programs. However, once the equipment is installed, little is done to either (a) maintain its operating efficiency or (b) improve the facility’s overall energy performance. The level of

¹⁸ Some examples of information-based, behavioral efficiency programs and collaborative working groups are referenced by the web pages below:

<http://www.bpa.gov/energy/n/behavior.cfm>

http://opower.com/uploads/library/file/10/brattle_mv_principles.pdf

<http://www.becccconference.org/>

commitment for behavioral change that the customer makes has a direct impact on their business's ability to be operationally efficient and sustainable. In addition, BES program markets are complex and are comprised of multiple segments, multiple agents within buildings and facilities, multiple service providers and multiple vendors, each creating various market barriers and opportunities. Therefore, Business and Energy Sustainability is comprised of the following five programmatic components, all of which are described in more detail later:

1. Retro-Commissioning ("RCx")
2. Process Re-engineering for Increased Manufacturing Efficiency ("PRIME")
3. Business Sustainability Challenge ("BSC")
4. Operations & Maintenance Services ("O&M")
5. Training and Outreach

These components are considered the "tools" to facilitate our customers achieving greater levels of efficiency and sustainability. These operational and behavior-based components of the program, coupled with the core C&I programs, provide the opportunity for customers to achieve more sustainable, comprehensive solutions to their energy needs. In 2012, the BES program will continue its transformation to a more detailed, customer-focused approach, which is expected to further enhance energy management behaviors among C&I customers.

Retro-Commissioning

The Retro-Commissioning ("RCx") initiative will continue to be offered by the Electric and Natural Gas Companies as a BES program component with comparable funding and expanded exposure in 2012. The RCx process conducts an in-depth, engineering investigation of a facility's systems operations, which focuses on integrating more efficient and effective instructions for the building management systems. The main objective of RCx is to find low-cost/no cost, non-capital, energy-efficient measures that will quickly and effectively result in energy savings for the owner of the building. The program targets Connecticut's larger customer facilities in the commercial and industrial market segment, and the large institutional segment.

PRIME

PRIME is an acronym for Process Re-engineering for Increased Manufacturing Efficiency. The objective of the PRIME program is to teach manufacturers how to implement "Lean Manufacturing" techniques. Lean manufacturers are able to produce more with existing resources by eliminating non-value-added activities and waste, and by aligning production to meet actual customer demand. In addition, lean manufacturing results in the more efficient use of energy per product produced by reducing non-manufacturing related electricity consumption and by reducing losses in manufacturing equipment consumption. The PRIME program offers eligible customers the opportunity to participate in up to four separate three-and-a-half day, team-based Kaizen events at their facility which teach the fundamentals of lean manufacturing and facilitates the implementation of quick changes to a process in order to eliminate waste and improve efficiency. The first two events are at no cost to the customer. The third and fourth events require the customer to contribute 50 percent of the cost. Events thereafter

are fully funded by the customer. More details on the PRIME program can be found in the PRIME section of this plan.

Business Sustainability Challenge

The Business Sustainability Challenge (“BSC”) is one of the primary components of the customer’s transformation to greater efficiency and sustainability. Initiated as a pilot in 2008, the BSC training and educational initiative is the result of a shared vision of the Energy Efficiency Board’s C&I Committee and the Electric and Natural Gas Companies. It provides an opportunity for customers to not only address their energy management practices and investments, but also their long-term social, environmental and economic sustainability objectives through formal and informal education, plan development and implementation, and continuous improvement practices. The BSC employs a holistic approach to training, educating and working with medium-size to larger customers, with the ultimate goal of integrating sustainability into their business practices and manage energy, carbon, waste and water as valuable resources.

The BSC training and education pilot will continue to be offered in two tracks, A and B. Both tracks will identify prospects and specific targets through customer participation in other Energy Efficiency Fund programs, such as PRIME. Track A is primarily geared for working with individual customers directly to establish a plan, timeline and then implement it. Track B is primarily focused on class room-style education and information for those customers who desire to better understand what their organizations can do to become more sustainable. While each track takes a slightly different approach to working with customers, both will follow the steps outlined below (with minor modifications made by each track), using shared tools and resources (note: steps have been borrowed from the ENERGY STAR Energy Management Process Model):

- Obtain a commitment.
- Assess performance and set goals.
- Create a plan.
- Implement the plan.
- Evaluate the plan’s progress.
- Recognize achievements.
- Re-assess the process.

Track A major components:

- a multi-year commitment coupled with several consultative meetings and the establishment of energy efficiency and sustainability plans and goals
- formation of an energy/sustainability team
- a Sustainability, Energy Management and/or Carbon Inventory Assessment

- a facility walk through and technical scoping which includes review and prioritization of assessments, audits, studies, carbon inventory and ideas from staff and management
- development of a Sustainability and Energy Management Action Plan, and ultimately
- an integrated Sustainability and Energy Management strategy that identifies reduction goals, the specific activities that the customer will engage in with the assistance of the Electric Companies (including energy management activities); sustainability initiatives; investment priorities; educational opportunities; employee training and monitoring and reporting systems for future years.

Track B has, in the past, been comprised of the following class room-style course content, including:

- Sustainable Business Practices;
- Energy-Carbon Footprint Management;
- Creating the Sustainability Playbook;
- Lean to Green Manufacturing Practices;
- Benchmarking - the value and the tools;
- Sustainable Supply Chains;
- Sustaining Sustainability through O&M and Continuous Improvement, and;
- Marketing the Sustainable Business.

The classroom setting encouraged networking and sharing best practices, while receiving training in various subjects. In 2012, the BSC training and education initiative will continue to be managed as Tracks A & B, empowering customers to identify both low-cost and long-term resource solutions specific to their facilities and operations, implement new strategies and behaviors and obtain near term results that are sustainable over the long term. In addition to classroom settings, on-line “webinars” and other methods of training may be incorporated into the Track B experience. Both market data and customer feedback will be used to determine the strengths and weaknesses of each Track’s approach, and how best to combine the most valuable elements of the original pilot approaches to best meet customer needs.

O&M Services

O&M Services offers electric and natural gas incentives and analytical services for C&I customers to improve operation and maintenance of their facilities in order to make them more energy efficient. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies provide O&M evaluations and recommendations upon request, with the C&I customer being responsible for implementing the O&M improvements. Examples of such improvements which are intended to maximize operational efficiency and optimize performance include things like compressed-air system leak studies and repairs, modifications and/or repairs to building management system control components and software programming. The Electric and Natural Gas

Companies will consider piloting and testing promising concepts, technologies and services for eventual inclusion in the program. The results of these efforts may be used to make incremental improvements to what used to be known as the O&M Services program. The O&M Services program features (e.g., commissioning, training, etc.) are being considered for incorporation into other C&I programs as well. This will ensure that as the new energy-saving equipment is installed, facility staff will be provided with appropriate training to maintain equipment at maximum operational efficiency.

Training and Outreach

In 2012, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies will continue to sponsor and provide focused training to help C&I customers improve their building energy management, operations and maintenance and sustainability activities. A variety of training opportunities will again be offered with the emphasis being on facilities and property managers as the target audience. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies have continued to be successful in identifying and providing training in the efficient operation of building systems to help qualify facility operators and maintenance staff for certification. The 2012 training curriculum is expected to incorporate program topics such as:

- Certified Energy Manager, BOC or equivalent;
- K-12 School Facility Maintenance;
- Energy Basics and Energy Action Planning;
- Building Automation Systems;
- Efficiency projects Financing using Energy Star financial tools
- Energy Start Portfolio Manager
- ComCheck
- Boiler & Chiller performance enhancements
- Gas heating and process technologies
- Commissioning; Retro-Commissioning
- Compressed Air Challenges I and II.

In addition, training opportunities will be explored that target improving awareness and energy-efficient management behaviors among C&I customers.

To further the expansion of the training and education component of the program, BES will focus on low cost/no cost opportunities for customers to achieve savings that are sustainable. The program will not include significant capital investments.

Process Reengineering for Increased Manufacturing Efficiency (“PRIME”)

(A complete PRIME program description can be found later in this chapter)

Marketing Strategy:

While the target market for the BES program is the C&I customer, a large percentage of the marketing efforts are directed at the audience that provides the services--the engineering and contractor community. By focusing our promotions on this sector of the community, we are encouraging the development of a market-based energy- efficiency industry. Some of the ways we promote and support the engineering and contractor community may include:

- technical and program-specific training seminars offered throughout the year, which will be promoted using e-mail notices linking users to an on-line registration system;
- participation in strategically selected association events, which may also include submission of technical papers, presentations, etc., and
- writing and distribution of case studies (also referred to as Success Stories or Testimonials) to various relevant marketing and media channels.

To a lesser extent, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies will target building owners, business owners, facility managers and energy managers using some of the tactics above, in addition to:

- targeted mailings to customers (print and e-mail) directing them to the Electric and Natural Gas Companies' web sites and CTEnergyinfo.com;
- presence at strategically-selected business expos/shows;
- articles and notices posted on electronic Electric and Natural Gas Companies' electronic newsletters, and;
- reaching out to BSC participant targets identified through knowledgeable customer managers, e.g., sales engineers and strategic account managers and participation in other Energy Efficiency Fund programs such as PRIME.

It should be noted that marketing for the specific programmatic tools (identified in the Program Description) may vary based on the needs of each program.

Incentive Strategy:

The incentive structures for BES are aligned with those found mostly in the EO program, but are not as extensive. However, incentives may be tailored based upon the specific nature of each proposal. In some cases, portions of the selected customer's project may qualify for incentives under the EO or ECB programs and may be included in the BES Agreement to the customer. In UI's service territory,

customers may receive incentives (based on a co-pay) for evaluations identifying appropriate measures being recommended for implementation from the BES program. Please refer to the incentive tables located in the appendix at the back of Chapter 3.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

New Program Issues:

To further the goal of long-term sustainability for Connecticut's businesses and industries, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies will continue to work on developing, refining and implementing each of the program tools by investing additional fund dollars into the programs, broadening the use of benchmarking and dashboards; broadening the base of technologies eligible for incentives; developing a smaller RCx offering that is applicable to smaller sized customers, and broadening the training and types of courses that are offered.

In 2012, both BSC tracks will incorporate lessons learned from the previous years' pilot initiatives, with a goal of eventually offering a stable portfolio-base program, which will utilize tools, technology, and a train-the-trainer model to take this program to scale and be available to any interested business customer in Connecticut. The BSC will become more of an integrated offering for customers participating in other Fund incentive programs and will showcase best practices and case study examples of sustainable businesses. The vision for this program is to consistently engage and educate customers through a website, e-newsletters, live and e-training seminars and networking events, all of which will provide customers with the information, motivation and support to continuously improve, as well as provide and/or encourage use of the assessment and tracking tools needed to benchmark their progress.

An important goal of the BES program will be to find new ways to encourage and motivate customers to engage in energy and sustainability data collection, tracking and benchmarking, which is one of the key pre-requisites for creating energy and sustainability-related behavioral changes in an organization

Additionally, the lessons and opportunities learned in the RCx program projects over the past years will be woven in to the ECB new construction building program through the new building enhanced commissioning opportunity.

CL&P Issues:

UI Issues:

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

O&M Services (Roll-Up) (includes O&M Services and O&M Retro-Commissioning Extension)

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 192	\$ 361	\$ 806	\$ 185	\$ 516	\$ 517	\$ 517
Contractor Staff	\$ 19	\$ 6	\$ 60	\$ 0	\$ 38	\$ 52	\$ 52
Total Labor	\$ 211	\$ 367	\$ 866	\$ 185	\$ 554	\$ 569	\$ 569
Materials & Supplies	\$ 4	\$ 2	\$ 10	\$ 4	\$ 6	\$ 10	\$ 10
Outside Services	\$ 314	\$ 485	\$ 642	\$ 277	\$ 411	\$ 638 a)	\$ 638
Incentives	\$ 547	\$ 459	\$ 3,094	\$ 299	\$ 1,981	\$ 2,844 b)	\$ 2,843
Marketing	\$ 12	\$ 15	\$ 66	\$ 5	\$ 42	\$ 60 c)	\$ 60
Administrative Expenses	\$ 4	\$ 15	\$ 37	\$ 2	\$ 24	\$ 35 d)	\$ 35
Other	\$ 8	\$ 4	\$ 15	\$ 2	\$ 10	\$ 15	\$ 15
Total	\$ 1,102	\$ 1,347	\$ 4,730	\$ 775	\$ 3,028	\$ 4,171 e)	\$ 4,171

- a) Consultants for focused studies, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) and inspections as necessary.
- b) Incentives paid directly to customers for the installation of cost effective energy conservation measures.
- c) Market program to customers, trade allies and professional organizations.
- d) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance, misc.
- e) Includes O&M Services and Retro commissioning budgets.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	1,871.2
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	16,847,299
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	154,181,561
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.254
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.028
Electric b/c Ratio	3.74
Total Resource b/c Ratio	2.62

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

O&M Services

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 73	\$ 32	\$ 721	\$ 81	\$ 54	\$ 212	\$ 212
Contractor Staff	\$ 19	\$ 6	\$ 54	\$ 0	\$ 4	\$ 43	\$ 43
Total Labor	\$ 92	\$ 37	\$ 775	\$ 81	\$ 58	\$ 255	\$ 255
Materials & Supplies	\$ 4	\$ 2	\$ 9	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 2	\$ 2
Outside Services	\$ 65	\$ 107	\$ 575	\$ 16	\$ 40	\$ 128 a)	\$ 108
Incentives	\$ (11)	\$ 131	\$ 2,769	\$ 35	\$ 208	\$ 569 b)	\$ 483
Marketing	\$ 9	\$ 4	\$ 59	\$ 4	\$ 4	\$ 12 c)	\$ 10
Administrative Expenses	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ 33	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 7 d)	\$ 6
Other	\$ 8	\$ 4	\$ 13	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 3	\$ 3
Total	\$ 170	\$ 285	\$ 4,233	\$ 142	\$ 318	\$ 976	\$ 867

a) Consultants for focused studies, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC), and inspections as necessary. Increase to Outside Services and Labor in 2010 and 2011 for Building Sustainability Challenge (BSC).

b) Incentives paid directly to customers for the installation of cost effective energy conservation measures. Includes \$50K for BSC initiative.

c) Market program to customers, trade allies, and professional organizations.

d) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	377.4
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	6,839,880
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	39,316,057
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.143
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.025
Electric b/c Ratio	3.64
Total Resource b/c Ratio	1.97

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

O&M Services Only (incl. RFP)

Year	<u>Program Costs</u>		% of Budget	\$/LT-kWh
	Budget	Actual		
2000	\$ 3,747,000	\$ 3,662,535	98%	0.015
2001	\$ 2,421,000	\$ 2,822,027	115%	0.015
2002	\$ 1,204,000	\$ 617,000	51%	0.018
2003	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 450,905	35%	0.044
2004	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 933,762	75%	0.024
2005 Revised	\$ 2,646,416	\$ 1,833,005	69%	0.018
2006 Revised	\$ 2,156,000	\$ 1,149,265	53%	0.023
2007 Revised	\$ 1,984,000	\$ 838,615	42%	0.019
2008 Revised	\$ 1,647,521	\$ 1,222,862	74%	0.021
2009 Revised	\$ 295,000	\$ 168,065	57%	0.010
2010 Revised	\$ 814,000	\$ 479,531	59%	0.057
2011 Revised	\$ 1,154,000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 142,420	17%	0.195
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 1,154,000	\$ 317,970	39%	0.048
2012	\$ 975,550	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Participation</u>		
	Goal ²	Actual	% of Goal
2000	3,305	3,093	94%
2001	2,100	2,236	106%
2002	519	306	59%
2003	88	14	16%
2004	151	18	12%
2005 Revised	236	30	13%
2006 Revised	35	21	60%
2007 Revised	25	15	60%
2008 Revised	6	61	1017%
2009 Revised	20	15	75%
2010 Revised	6	12	200%
2011 Revised	17	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	3	18%
2011 Y/E Projected	17	12	71%
2012	18	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Lifetime MWh savings</u>			<u>Goal - Installed kW Savings</u>			
	Goal (MWh)	Actual (MWh)	% of Goal	Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2000	283,896	252,573	89%	2000	n/a	4,428	n/a
2001	185,348	184,295	89%	2001	n/a	2,498	n/a
2002	33,636	33,643	100%	2002	n/a	548	n/a
2003	18,182	10,201	56%	2003	185	142	76.8%
2004	49,534	38,613	72%	2004	801	774	74.8%
2005 Revised	108,025	101,711	96%	2005 Revised	1,741	1,147	69.5%
2006 Revised	67,112	49,970	56%	2006 Revised	971	403	31.1%
2007 Revised	48,970	45,058	92%	2007 Revised	655	405	61.8%
2008 Revised	108,582	59,455	55%	2008 Revised	291	523	179.7%
2009 Revised	43,333	16,364	38%	2009 Revised	190	263	138.2%
2010 Revised	27,980	8,467	30%	2010 Revised	299	82	27.4%
2011 Revised	80,223	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	1,057	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	730	1%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	26	2.5%
2011 Y/E Projected	80,223	6,562	8%	1 Y/E Projected	1,057	270	25.5%
2012	39,316	n/a	n/a	2012	377	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Program Ratios</u>			
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2000	0.013	0.015	n/a	827
2001	0.013	0.015	n/a	1,099
2002	0.036	0.018	n/a	1,125
2003	0.046	0.044	2,781	3,175
2004	0.019	0.024	0	1,206
2005 Revised	0.024	0.018	1,520	1,598
2006 Revised	0.032	0.023	2,220	2,852
2007 Revised	0.041	0.019	3,029	2,071
2008 Revised	0.015	0.021	5,662	2,338
2009 Revised	0.007	0.010	1,553	640
2010 Revised	0.029	0.057	770	5,848
2011 Revised	0.014	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.195	n/a	5,478
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.048	3,058	1,178
2012	0.025	n/a	2,585	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - O&M Services Only (incl. RFP)

Budget / FTE

1.6 FTEs for Program Administration, inspections, etc.

Goal

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	377
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	39,316,057

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

\$/Annualized kW	\$	2,585
\$/Lifetime kWh	\$	0.025

Goal Setting Methodology

The 2011 planning model is based on 2010 actual results.
Savings were adjusted based on new incentive structure.

Metric Changes

None.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

O&M Retro Commissioning

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 119	\$ 330	\$ 85	\$ 104	\$ 462	\$ 305	\$ 305
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 1	\$ 6	\$ 0	\$ 34	\$ 9	\$ 9
Total Labor	\$ 119	\$ 330	\$ 91	\$ 104	\$ 496	\$ 314	\$ 314
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 6	\$ 8	\$ 8
Outside Services	\$ 249	\$ 379	\$ 67	\$ 262	\$ 368	\$ 510 a)	\$ 529
Incentives	\$ 558	\$ 328	\$ 325	\$ 265	\$ 1,773	\$ 2,275 b)	\$ 2,360
Marketing	\$ 3	\$ 10	\$ 7	\$ 1	\$ 38	\$ 48	\$ 50
Administrative Expenses	\$ 1	\$ 15	\$ 4	\$ 1	\$ 21	\$ 28 c)	\$ 29
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 2	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ 12	\$ 12
Total	\$ 932	\$ 1,062	\$ 497	\$ 632	\$ 2,710	\$ 3,196	\$ 3,303

a) Fees to third-party vendors who will perform retrocommissioning services.

b) Incentives paid to customers for Retro Commissioning measures including facility control modifications that will help enable long-term energy savings.

c) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	1,971.9
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	10,510,458
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	105,104,584
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.304
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.030
Electric b/c Ratio	3.22
Total Resource b/c Ratio	1.83

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

O&M Retro Commissioning

Year	<u>Program Costs</u>			
	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	\$/LT-kWh
2005 Revised	\$ 800,000	\$ -	0%	0
2006 Revised	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 286,037	22%	0.023
2007 Revised	\$ 1,300,000	\$ 275,207	21%	0.251
2008 Revised	\$ 908,000	\$ 707,028	78%	0.026
2009 Revised	\$ 1,805,000	\$ 932,000	52%	0.076
2010 Revised	\$ 814,000	\$ 867,710	107%	0.036
2011 Revised	\$ 3,575,740	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 632,009	18%	0.081
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 3,575,740	\$ 2,710,317	76%	0.038
2012	\$ 3,195,700	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Participation</u>		
	Goal ²	Actual	% of Goal
2005 Revised			-
2006 Revised	24	5	21%
2007 Revised	7	3	43%
2008 Revised	7	3	43%
2009 Revised	23	7	30%
2010 Revised	24	8	33%
2011 Revised	69		n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	3	4%
2011 Y/E Projected	69	12	17%
2012	72	72	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Lifetime MWh savings</u>			<u>Goal - Installed kW Savings</u>			
	Goal (MWh)	Actual (MWh)	% of Goal	Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2005 Revised				2005 Revised			
2006 Revised	44,741	12,492	28%	2006 Revised	647	101	15.6%
2007 Revised	32,646	1,096	3%	2007 Revised	436	28	6.4%
2008 Revised	38,150	27,264	71%	2008 Revised	341	188	55.1%
2009 Revised	104,191	12,276	12%	2009 Revised	170	113	66.5%
2010 Revised	148,786	23,935	16%	2010 Revised	1,213	449	37.0%
2011 Revised	96,870	n/a	n/a	2011 Revised	1,066	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	7,851	8%	2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	62	5.8%
2011 Y/E Projected	96,870	70,541	73%	1 Y/E Projected	1,066	640	60.0%
2012	105,105	n/a	n/a	2012	1,972	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Program Ratios</u>			
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2005 Revised	-	-	-	-
2006 Revised	0.029	0.023	2,009	2,832
2007 Revised	0.040	0.251	2,982	9,829
2008 Revised	0.024	0.026	2,663	3,761
2009 Revised	0.017	0.076	10,618	8,248
2010 Revised	0.005	0.036	671	1,933
2011 Revised	0.037	n/a	3,354	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	0.081	n/a	10,194
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	0.038	3,354	4,235
2012	0.030	n/a	1,621	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - O&M Retro Commissioning

Budget /FTE

2.3 FTE for program administration.

Goal

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	1,972
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	105,104,584

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

\$/Annualized kW	\$	1,621
\$/Lifetime kWh	\$	0.030

Goal Setting Methodology

The 2011 planning model is based on 2010 actual results.
Savings were adjusted based on new incentive structure.

Metric Changes

None

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

O&M Services ⁽¹⁾

Baseline Assumptions:

<u>Budget Projections</u>	All C&I customers					
	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Market						
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 44,771	\$ 45,811	\$ 17,187	\$ 45,811	\$ 31,696 a)	\$ 33,281
Contractor Staff	\$ 1,272	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - b)	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 46,043	\$ 45,811	\$ 17,187	\$ 45,811	\$ 31,696	\$ 33,281
Materials & Supplies	\$ 113	\$ 1,000	\$ 498	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000 c)	\$ 1,000
Outside Services	\$ 135,958	\$ 308,000	\$ 137,198	\$ 300,797	\$ 476,400 d)	\$ 476,400
Incentives	\$ 740	\$ 145,000	\$ (2,000)	\$ 145,000	\$ 214,000 e)	\$ 207,850
Marketing	\$ 459	\$ 8,000	\$ 400	\$ 8,000	\$ 15,000 f)	\$ 15,000
Other	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ -	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,250 g)	\$ 1,250
Administrative Expenses	\$ 4,601	\$ 6,864	\$ 14,067	\$ 14,067	\$ 8,093 h)	\$ 8,000
Total	\$ 187,914	\$ 515,675	\$ 167,350	\$ 515,675	\$ 747,439	\$ 742,781

(1) Includes O&M Svcs, RetroCx, BSC, PRIME and K-12 Pilot

- a) .27 FTE
- b) no comment
- c) expenses shared by O&M, BSC, Training, RetroCx, and K-12 Pilot
- d) expenses shared by O&M, BSC, Training, RetroCx, and K-12 Pilot
- e) no comment
- f) expenses shared by O&M, BSC, Training, RetroCx, and K-12 Pilot
- g) no comment
- h) expenses shared by O&M, BSC, Training, RetroCx, and K-12 Pilot

Goals and Metrics Information:

	<u>2012</u>
Savings	
Demand Savings (kW)	176
Annual Energy Savings (kWh)	1,922,785
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh)	13,903,656
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.389
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.054
Cost per kW	\$ 4,244
Electric System B/C Ratio	1.65
Total Resource B/C Ratio	1.57

**The United Illuminating Company
LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement**

O&M Services

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$0	\$0	0.0%
2001	\$100	\$0	0.0%
2002	\$235	\$0	0.0%
2003	\$167	\$70	42.2%
2004	\$182	\$184	101.1%
2005	\$182	\$108	59.3%
2006	\$352	\$72	20.5%
2007	\$322	\$141	43.8%
2008	\$322	\$17	5.3%
2009	\$658	\$133	20.2%
2010	\$530	\$188	35.5%
2011	\$516		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$516	\$167	32.4%
2011 YE Projected	\$516	\$258	50.0%
2012	\$747		

Goal - Installed kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	200	-	0.0%
2004	200	-	0.0%
2005	200	2,206	1103.0%
2006	2,000	1,453	72.7%
2007	2,000	2,386	119.3%
2008	1,300	-	0.0%
2009	3,712	498	13.4%
2010	2,196	453	20.6%
2011	1,186		
2011 YTD (Jun)	1,186	8	0.7%
2011 YE Projected	1,186	593	50.0%
2012	1,923		

Goal - Installed kW Savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	34	-	0.0%
2004	23	-	0.0%
2005	23	674	2930.4%
2006	210	237	112.8%
2007	210	55	26.0%
2008	100	-	0.0%
2009	90	27	30.0%
2010	70	-	0.0%
2011	168		
2011 YTD (Jun)	168	-	0.0%
2011 YE Projected	168	84	50.0%
2012	176		

Goal - Lifetime kWh Savings (000's)

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	-	-	0.0%
2003	3,000	-	0.0%
2004	2,000	-	0.0%
2005	2,000	22,061	1103.1%
2006	20,000	21,790	109.0%
2007	20,000	35,790	179.0%
2008	13,000	-	0.0%
2009	18,562	3,640	19.6%
2010	10,980	2,855	26.0%
2011	7,276		
2011 YTD (Jun)	7,276	40	0.5%
2011 YE Projected	7,276	3,638	50.0%
2012	13,904		

Program Ratios

Year	\$/kWh		\$/LT kWh		\$/kW	
	Target	Actual	Target	Actual	Target	Actual
2000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0	\$0
2001	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0	\$0
2002	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0	\$0
2003	\$0.835	\$0.000	\$0.056	\$0.000	\$4,912	\$0
2004	\$0.910	\$0.000	\$0.091	\$0.000	\$7,913	\$0
2005	\$0.910	\$0.049	\$0.091	\$0.005	\$7,913	\$160
2006	\$0.176	\$0.050	\$0.018	\$0.003	\$1,676	\$455
2007	\$0.161	\$0.059	\$0.016	\$0.004	\$1,533	\$2,578
2008	\$0.248		\$0.025		\$3,220	\$0
2009	\$0.177	\$0.267	\$0.035	\$0.037	\$7,311	\$4,926
2010	\$0.241	\$0.415	\$0.048	\$0.066	\$7,571	\$0
2011	\$0.435		\$0.071		\$3,071	
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$0.435	\$20.919	\$0.071	\$4.184	\$3,071	
2011 YE Projected	\$0.435	\$0.435	\$0.071	\$0.071	\$3,071	\$3,071
2012	\$0.389		\$0.054		\$4,244	

Notes

- 2000-2002 data from LF-26 filed in 03-01-01
- 2003 data reflects budgets approved in 03-01-01
- 2004 data represents the revised budget allocations
- Program jointly operated with CL&P
- O&M RFP contains Administrative costs for RetroCX, BOC, Envinta, and BSC
- 2011 \$\$/kW is calculated with the total budget. Only O&M contributes to peak demand savings; see notes for more information.

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - O&M Services

Budget/(FTE):

- 1) budget includes .27 FTEs for staffing
- 2) 2012 proposed overall budget is within 144% of the '11 revised (04/2011) budget
- 3) 2012 budget houses administrative costs for O&M, BSC, RetroCx, and Prime
- 4) incentives offered for RetroCx and O&M type measures based on EO incentive structure
- 5) budget includes specialized training costs
- 6) Business Sustainability Challenge (BSC) is approximately 8% of the overall O&M budget
- 7) K-12 pilot is approximately 5% of the overall O&M budget
- 8) Prime program is approximately 17% of the overall O&M budget
- 9) RetroCx program is approximately 58% of the overall O&M budget
- 10) O&M Services is approximately 12% of the overall O&M budget

Goal:

- 1) 2012 target of 1,922,785 kWh; a increase of approx. 62%
- 2) 2012 target of 176 kW; significantly increased to account for RetroCx impacts
- 3) any direct savings from Business Sustainability implementation are included this program
- 4) any direct savings from Prime implementation are included this program
- 5) goals impacted by the overall over-expenditure in other programs
- 6) marketing focus continues throughout UI territory
- 7) adopted CL&P gross realization rates to simulate statewide realization rates

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit):

- 1) 2012 kWh and kW projections reflect the uncertainty of RetroCx, Prime & BSC.
 - a. program initiatives such as BSC, Prime will produce no peak kW savings.
- 2) 2012 total projected cost rates: annual = \$0.389/ kWh, lifetime = \$.054/ kWh
- 3) 2012 projected \$\$/kW = \$4,244 for O&M & RCx. Prime and BSC do not contribute to kW savings
- 4) estimated RetroCx cost rates based on historical data
- 5) The component cost rate breakdown for O&M Services is as follows:

	Budget	kWh	kW	\$/ kWh	\$/ kW	\$/ LkWh
O&M Svcs	86	246	72	\$ 0.350	\$ 1.194	\$ 0.0699
RetroCx	445	1,176	104	\$ 0.378	\$ 4.279	\$ 0.0378
Prime	116	425	0	\$ 0.273	n/a	\$ 0.0546
BSC	60	76	0	\$ 0.784	n/a	\$ 0.1568
K-12	40	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Metric Changes:

- 1) all savings are reported as net values

YGS Standard Filing Requirement

Operations & Maintenance

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,317	\$ 10,775	\$ 5,006	\$ 65,170	\$ 1,587	\$ 34,173	\$ 65,170
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,090	\$ 3,431	\$ 618	\$ 5,500	\$ 60	\$ 132	\$ 5,500
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ 101	\$ -	\$ 517	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ 3,250	\$ 116,347	\$ 125,930	\$ -	\$ 39,072	\$ 125,930
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 742	\$ 430	\$ 828	\$ 2,600	\$ 527	\$ 1,054	\$ 2,600
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 21	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300
Total			\$ 8,249	\$ 17,885	\$ 123,338	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,174	\$ 74,432	\$ 200,000

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	6,683	66,979	81,669	-	57,168	81,938
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	66,830	669,798	653,353	-	457,347	819,390
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 2.68	\$ 1.84	\$ 2.45	-	\$ 1.30	\$ 2.44
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.27	\$ 0.18	\$ 0.31	-	\$ 0.16	\$ 0.24
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 60,492	\$ 616,062	\$ 600,936	\$ -	\$ 420,655	\$ 489,969
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 3.38	\$ 4.99	\$ 3.00	\$ -	\$ 5.65	\$ 2.45
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	3	23	-	14	5
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	66,830	223,266	28,407	-	1.09	156,152
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 17,885	\$ 41,113	\$ 8,696	-	\$ 13,170	\$ 38,114
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 60,492	\$ 205,354	\$ 26,128	-	\$ 0.09	\$ 93,374

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 136,969	\$ 8,249	6%
2009	\$ 100,000	\$ 17,885	18%
2010	\$ 100,000	\$ 123,338	123%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,174	2%
2011 YE projection	\$ 200,000	\$ 74,432	74%
2012	\$ 200,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	6	1	17%
2010	12	3	25%
2011 YTD (June)	23	0	0%
2011 YE projection	23	14	60%
2012	5	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	29,042	6,683	23%
2010	17,973	66,979	373%
2011 YTD (June)	81,669	0	0%
2011 YE projection	81,669	57,168	70%
2012	81,938	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	232,339	66,830	29%
2010	179,732	669,798	373%
2011 YTD (June)	653,353	0	0%
2011 YE projection	653,353	457,347	70%
2012	819,390	n/a	-

CNG Standard Filing Requirement

Operations & Maintenance

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD(June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 2,643	\$ 7,821	\$ 5,785	\$ 61,180	\$ 1,374	\$ 61,182	\$ 33,180	
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ 21	\$ 1,388	\$ 9,000	\$ 819	\$ 8,619	\$ 5,000	
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 502	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50	
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,927	\$ 28,970	\$ 3,314	\$ 57,314	\$ 60,970	
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 570	\$ 167	\$ 641	\$ 300	\$ 164	\$ 347	\$ 300	
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ 7	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ 7	\$ 487	\$ 500	
Total			\$ 3,220	\$ 8,008	\$ 14,242	\$ 100,000	\$ 5,678	\$ 127,949	\$ 100,000	a

<u>Energy Savings Information</u>	<u>2006 Actuals</u>	<u>2007 Actuals</u>	<u>2008 Actuals</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>2011 Goals</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projection</u>	<u>2012 Goals</u>	
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	8,350	18,788	1,915	43,153	39,671	b
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	83,500	150,303	10,270	231,426	396,714	c
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1.71	\$ 5.32	\$ 2.97	\$ 2.97	\$ 2.52	d=a/b
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.17	\$ 0.67	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.55	\$ 0.25	e=a/c
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 86,434	\$ 138,244	\$ 9,446	\$ 212,858	\$ 237,400	f
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 6.07	\$ 1.38	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.66	\$ 2.37	g=f/a
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	5	1	23	3	h
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	83,500	30,061	10,270	10,270	156,152	i=c/h
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 14,242	\$ 20,000	\$ 5,678	\$ 5,678	\$ 39,361	k=a/h
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 86,434	\$ 27,649	\$ 9,446	\$ 9,446	\$ 93,443	l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	\$ 8,008	n/a	-
2010	\$ 50,000	\$ 14,242	28%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 100,000	\$ 5,678	6%
2011 YE projection	\$ 100,000	\$ 127,949	128%
2012	\$ 100,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	3	n/a	-
2010	6	1	17%
2011 YTD (June)	5	1	20%
2011 YE projection	5	23	451%
2012	3	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	14,540	n/a	-
2010	9,691	8350	86%
2011 YTD (June)	18,788	1,915	10%
2011 YE projection	18,788	43,153	230%
2012	39,671	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	<u>Goal</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>% of Goal</u>
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	n/a	-
2009	116,318	n/a	-
2010	96,912	83,500	86%
2011 YTD (June)	150,303	10,270	7%
2011 YE projection	150,303	231,426	154%
2012	396,714	n/a	-

SCG Standard Filing Requirement

Operations & Maintenance

Budget Projections	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Budget	2011 YTD(June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Budget
Labor	n/a	n/a	\$ 3,175	\$ 2,770	\$ 2,141	\$ 61,180	\$ 839	\$ 1,439	\$ 25,180
Outside Service	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ 21	\$ 502	\$ 9,000	\$ 45	\$ 45	\$ 10,000
Materials & Supplies	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 618	\$ 50	\$ -	\$ 50	\$ 100
Incentives	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,538	\$ -	\$ 4,876	\$ 28,970	\$ 122,755	\$ 122,755	\$ 63,220
Marketing	n/a	n/a	\$ 570	\$ 167	\$ 252	\$ 300	\$ 160	\$ 160	\$ 500
Administrative Expense	n/a	n/a	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,000
Total			\$ 9,283	\$ 2,957	\$ 8,389	\$ 100,000	\$ 123,799	\$ 124,449	\$ 100,000

a

Energy Savings Information	2006 Actuals	2007 Actuals	2008 Actuals	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	2011 Goals	2011 YTD (June)	2011 YE Projection	2012 Goals
Annual Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	1,377	-	2,746	18,788	7,146	7,184	41,135
Lifetime Energy Savings (ccf Reduction Goal)	n/a	n/a	13,770	-	27,460	150,303	71,460	71,835	411,354
Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 6.74	n/a	\$ 3.06	\$ 5.32	\$ 17.32	\$ 17.32	\$ 2.43
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	n/a	n/a	\$ 0.67	n/a	\$ 0.31	\$ 0.67	\$ 1.73	\$ 1.73	\$ 0.24
Total Gas Benefit	n/a	n/a	\$ 12,665	n/a	\$ 25,257	\$ 138,244	\$ 65,727	\$ 66,072	\$ 246,160
Total Gas System Benefit-Cost Ratio	n/a	n/a	\$ 1.36	n/a	\$ 3.01	\$ 1.38	\$ 0.53	\$ 0.53	\$ 2.46
Customers Served	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	1	5	1	1	3
Lifetime Savings per Customer (ccf)	n/a	n/a	13,770	n/a	27,460	30,061	71,460	71,460	156,152
Program Cost per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 9,283	n/a	\$ 8,389	\$ 20,000	\$ 123,799	\$ 123,799	\$ 37,960
Benefit per Customer	n/a	n/a	\$ 12,665	n/a	\$ 25,257	\$ 27,649	\$ 65,727	\$ 65,727	\$ 93,443

b

c

d=a/b

e=a/c

f

g=f/a

h

i=c/h

k=a/h

l=f/h

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	\$ 82,146	9,283	11%
2009	\$ 100,000	\$ 2,957	3%
2010	\$ 50,000	\$ 8,389	17%
2011 YTD (June)	\$ 100,000	\$ 123,799	124%
2011 YE projection	\$ 100,000	\$ 124,449	124%
2012	\$ 100,000	n/a	-

Goal - Participation/Units

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	1	-
2009	3	n/a	-
2010	6	1	17%
2011 YTD (June)	5	1	20%
2011 YE projection	5	1	20%
2012	3	n/a	-

Goal - Annual ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	1,377	-
2009	41,135	0	0%
2010	9,691	2,746	28%
2011 YTD (June)	18,788	7,146	38%
2011 YE projection	18,788	7,184	38%
2012	41,135	n/a	-

Goal - Lifetime ccf savings

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2006	n/a	n/a	-
2007	n/a	n/a	-
2008	n/a	13,770	-
2009	116,318	0	0%
2010	96,912	27,460	28%
2011 YTD (June)	150,303	71,460	48%
2011 YE projection	150,303	71,835	48%
2012	411,354	n/a	-

Process Reengineering for Increased Manufacturing Efficiency (“PRIME”) (Electric)

Objective:

The objective of the PRIME program is to teach manufacturers how to implement “Lean Manufacturing” techniques, which result in the more efficient use of energy as well as reduced inventory and delivery times, improved quality and increased production capacity. Utilizing these techniques, manufacturers are able to produce more with existing resources by eliminating non-value-added activities and waste, reducing energy consumption per product and aligning production to meet actual customer demand.

Target Market:

The PRIME program specifically targets industrial customers of all sizes that are currently using traditional manufacturing techniques and are interested in fostering a “Lean” culture of continuous improvement. The program is available to all manufacturing customers, but is best suited to those with a minimum of 500,000 kWh/year of electric usage.

Program Description:

The PRIME program moves manufacturers away from traditional batch-based production toward production aligned with customer demand or “pull”. A company that employs Lean principles is focused on excellence through “Kaizen” (continuous improvement) and the relentless elimination of waste. In addition, lean manufacturing results in the more efficient use of energy per product produced by reducing non-manufacturing related electricity consumption and by reducing losses in manufacturing equipment consumption.

The PRIME program offers eligible customers the opportunity to participate in up to four separate three-and-a-half day, team-based Kaizen events at their facility which teach the fundamentals of lean manufacturing and facilitates the implementation of changes to a process in order to eliminate waste and improve efficiency. The first two events are at no cost to the customer. The third and fourth events require the customer to contribute 50 percent of the cost. Events thereafter are fully funded by the customer.

Each event involves the assembly of a Kaizen team of participants from various departments within the company to address specific areas for improvement. Vendors under contract with the Electric Companies (EDCs) are responsible for working with the customer to identify and quantify the projected productivity improvement and corresponding savings potential and to provide coaching and training to the team. Projects chosen are selected on the basis of potential electric energy savings and overall impact (improvement) to specific processes and/or product lines.

Each event begins with roughly a half-day of team training on Lean Manufacturing principles and techniques, followed by three days of implementation of the selected improvement project. There is

also a follow-up review conducted approximately 90 days after the conclusion of the event to determine the final improvements and to assure that the improvements persist. The EDCs' Program Administrator attends this follow-up to review the process improvements and to conduct a brief walkthrough of the plant to identify other potential energy efficiency opportunities.

Marketing Strategy:

Marketing efforts are conducted predominantly by program vendors but also by utility staff, who identify targets through customer knowledge. Program vendors are selected by means of a Request for Proposal ("RFP") involving a bid and qualification process. Vendors for the 2011 - 2012 program years were selected during the last quarter of 2010 through a competitive RFP process. Selected vendors agree to perform the required services at a standard price determined by this process. These services include marketing and promotion of the program to potential participants, obtaining signed contracts between the vendor and customer, and providing an estimate of energy savings to the Electric Companies' Program Administrator in order to assess the cost-effectiveness of the project to meet program parameters. The EDCs provide the vendors with the customer's electric usage information for savings calculations.

The Electric Companies will augment enrollment with strategies that may include:

- program promotion to customers via in-person meetings
- writing and distribution of case studies (also referred to as Success Stories or Testimonials) to various relevant marketing channels;
- targeted mailings to customers (print and e-mail) directing them to the two Company web sites and CTEnergyinfo.com, and;
- articles and notices posted in electronic Electric Companies' newsletters.

Incentive Strategy:

While there are no incentives paid directly to the customer, the cost of the vendor's services is paid by the Electric Companies in the manner previously described.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

New Program Issues:

Given that PRIME participants learn the value of continuous process improvement, they will be a target customer segment for participating in the BSC being developed and conducted under the O&M program.

For the 2011-2012 the 3.5 day event vendor cost increased to \$7000 per event causing the qualifying \$\$/kWh cost rate to be reduced to a more aggressive level. Each project will need to possess greater productivity improvements therefore greater energy savings. In order to potentially increase the cost-effectiveness of the program, the Companies are exploring the value of 5 day events.

CL&P Issues:

UI Program Issues:

UI requires all of its vendors (their employees or sub - contractors) to go through a third party screening and verification process before being able to work in its service territory. This complex policy created significant obstacles for the PRIME initiative in 2011 due to the small dollar value of the vendor contracts.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Prime

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor							
NU Labor	\$ 27	\$ 37	\$ 60	\$ 16	\$ 56	\$ 45	\$ 45
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 2
Total Labor	\$ 27	\$ 37	\$ 60	\$ 17	\$ 56	\$ 46	\$ 46
Materials & Supplies	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 2	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2
Outside Services	\$ -	\$ 28	\$ 10	\$ (8)	\$ 9	\$ 10	\$ 10
Incentives	\$ 365	\$ 409	\$ 383	\$ 208	\$ 360	\$ 394	\$ 394
Marketing	\$ 1	\$ 0	\$ 20	\$ 0	\$ 19	\$ 20	\$ 20
Administrative Expenses	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 10	\$ 1	\$ 9	\$ 10	\$ 10
Other	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 3	\$ 0	\$ 3	\$ 3	\$ 3
Total	\$ 394	\$ 477	\$ 488	\$ 217	\$ 458	\$ 485	\$ 485

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	-
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	1,895,775
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	9,479,141
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.256
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	\$ 0.051
Electric b/c Ratio	1.66
Total Resource b/c Ratio	29.46

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Prime

Budget /FTE

0.3 FTE for Program Administration

Goal

Customers	50
Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	0
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	9,479,141

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

\$/Annualized kW	n/a
\$/Lifetime kWh	\$ 0.051

Goal Setting Methodology

The 2012 planning model is based on 2010 actual results.
Savings were adjusted based on new incentive

Metric Changes

None

This page intentionally blank

Appendix: C&I Incentive Tables

2011 Project Caps and Incentive Levels for CL&P

Effective 3/28/2011



RETROFIT MEASURES

Retrofit Measures	Energy Opportunities (EO) & Small Business Energy Advantage (SBEA)	Operations & Maintenance (O&M) (Includes Retro Commissioning where applicable)
Cumulative Cap per Federal Tax ID	\$400,000	\$400,000
Program Caps per metered site	\$100,000	\$100,000
Municipal Finance Cap (project /cumulative total per municipality)	\$100,000 / \$500,000	N/A
Lighting Measures		
Interior & Exterior Lighting Measures (the lesser of) % of installed cost Measure Cap (greater of)	30% \$0.20 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	N/A N/A
High Performance Lighting - LED, Daylighting or Induction Lighting Measures; Advanced Lighting Controls (the lesser of) % of installed cost Measure Cap (greater of)	30% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	N/A N/A
Express Lighting Rebate (includes LEDs) Refer to Website	\$10 - \$50 / fixture	N/A
Non-Lighting Measures		
Custom Measures (the lesser of) % of installed cost Measure Cap (greater of) Prescriptive Values - if applicable	30% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW \$\$/unit	30% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW \$\$/unit
EMS System (the lesser of) % of installed cost Measure Cap (greater of) cap per point EMS incentives will be prorated based on energy savings by fuel	30% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW \$500 / pt	30% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW \$500 / pt
Comprehensive Project Initiative Project must contain at least 2 End Uses (Heating, Cooling, Lighting, Process, Refrigeration, Motors and EMS) No one End Use can exceed % of installed cost Comprehensive Project Cap for all measures (greater of) buydown	85% of the energy savings values using the caps below 35% \$0.20 / kWh OR \$800 per summer peak kW 3 yr. payback	85% of the energy savings values using the caps below 35% \$0.20 / kWh OR \$800 per summer peak kW 3 yr. payback
Other Prescriptive Caps to be evaluated against the energy & demand caps above (the lesser of): Pool Covers - automated Window Film PC Network Controls	\$12 / sf \$2.00 /sf \$20 / PC controlled	N/A \$2.00 /sf \$20 / PC controlled
PRIME (Events per customer over 2 years) Events 1 & 2 Events 3 & 4	N/A N/A	100% 50%
Retro Commissioning will use the same Measure Caps as EO and O&M Scoping Study Investigative Study Custom Non-Lighting Measures (the lesser of) % of installed cost Measure Cap (greater of)	N/A N/A N/A	\$1,000 50% 30% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW

NOTES:

1. All references to kWh savings shall refer to annual savings
2. Electric Distribution Company shall have final determination of Annual Energy Savings
3. Summer Peak kW reduction shall be coincident with: Mon - Fri, non-Holiday from 1pm -5 pm, June-July-August

2011 Project Caps and Incentive Levels for CL&P

Effective 2/1/2011



LOST OPPORTUNITY MEASURES

Lost Opportunity Measures	Energy Conscious Blueprint
Cumulative Cap per Federal Tax ID	\$750,000
Program Caps per metered site	\$300,000
Municipal Finance Cap (project /cumulative total per municipality)	N/A
Gas Projects requiring DPUC Approval	≥ \$100,000
Lighting Measures	
Lighting Measures	
Lighting Power Density - Tier 1: (>10% above Code) & Tier 2: (> 30% above Code)	\$0.15/sf & \$0.50 /sf
Fixture Cap	\$50/Fixture
Occupancy Sensors (beyond Code requirements for Lighting Controls)	\$20/fixture controlled
Custom - Lighting; Advanced Lighting Controls, etc. (the lesser of)	
Incremental Cost	75%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.50 / kWh OR \$1,100 per peak kW
Non- Lighting Measures	
HVAC	
Unitary / splits / ductless units (units ≤ 30 tons) Refer to Web Site -Rebate	\$50 to \$120 per ton
Unitary / splits / ductless units (> 30 tons)	custom
Chillers & VFDs	custom
Air Compressors (lesser of)	
Incremental Cost	75%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.30 / kWh OR \$1,000 per summer peak kW
Prescriptive	
0 - 5 hp	\$0
≥ 5 hp < 40 hp	\$310
≥ 40hp < 50 hp	\$240
≥ 50hp ≤ 100 hp	\$205
> 100 hp	See Custom - Process Equip
Custom - Process Equipment New or Replacement (the lesser of) See Note 4	
Incremental Cost	75%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.50 / kWh OR \$1,100 per summer peak kW
buydown	1.5 yr. payback
Custom - Equipment Replacement non-process (the lesser of)	
Incremental Cost	75%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.50 / kWh OR \$1,100 per summer peak kW
Custom - New Construction (non-Whole Building Performance)	
Incremental Cost	95%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.35 / kWh OR \$1,100 per summer peak kW
Whole Building Performance	
Model Subsidy	
Base or "Code" building model (paid when received)	\$1,000
High Performance building model (paid upon final construction)	\$5,000
Building / System Compliance (Installation)	
Whole Building Incentive (% better than code)	10% - \$0.15 / sf
Note: Incentive prorated for fossil fuel based on modeled \$savings	11% -15% - \$0.30 / sf
	16% -20% - \$0.60 / sf
	21% - 25% - \$1.00 / sf
	26% - 29% - \$1.50 / sf
	> 30% - \$2.00 / sf
Certification Bonus	
LEED Silver or 2 Green Globes	\$5,000
LEED Gold or 3 Green Globes	\$10,000
LEED Platinum or 4 Green Globes	\$15,000
Enhanced Commissioning	TBD
Other Prescriptive Caps to be evaluated against the energy caps above (the lesser of):	
Cool Roofs	\$0.20 /sf
EMS	\$500 / point
High Performance Glazing	\$2.00 / sf

NOTES:

- All references to kWh savings shall refer to annual savings
- Electric Distribution Company shall have final determination of Annual Energy Savings
- Summer Peak kW reduction shall be coincident with: Mon - Fri, non-Holiday from 1pm -5 pm, June-July-August
- Process definition: Any measure that saves energy related to producing a product. Typical examples include, but are not limited to, compressed air systems, plastic injection molding machines, process chilled water systems, making ice-cream, commercial milk processing, water- and waste-water treatment plants.

2011 Project Caps and Incentive Levels

Effective 6/20/2011

GAS MEASURES



Measures	Energy Opportunities (EO)	Operations & Maintenance (O&M) (includes RetroCx where applicable)	Energy Conscious Blueprint
Cumulative Cap per Federal Tax ID	N/A	N/A	N/A
Program Caps per metered site	N/A	N/A	N/A
Municipal Finance Cap (project /cumulative total per municipality)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gas Projects requiring DPUC Approval	≥ \$100,000	≥ \$100,000	≥ \$100,000
Retrofit			
Gas Measures - Space Heating (lesser of)			
% of installed Cost	40% (30% SCG only)	40% (30% SCG only)	N/A
Measure Cap	\$3.50 / CCF	\$3.50 / CCF	N/A
Prescriptive Values - if applicable	\$\$/unit	\$\$/unit	N/A
Gas Measures - Non-Space Heating (lesser of)			
% of installed Cost	40% (30% SCG only)	40% (30% SCG only)	N/A
Measure Cap	\$3.50 / CCF	\$3.50 / CCF	N/A
Prescriptive Values - if applicable	\$\$/unit	\$\$/unit	N/A
Lost Opportunity			
Custom - Process Equipment New or Replacement (the lesser of). See Note 4			
Incremental Cost	N/A	N/A	75%
Measure Cap	N/A	N/A	\$6.00 CCF
buydown	N/A	N/A	1.5 yr. payback
Custom - Non Process Equipment New or Replacement (the lesser of)			
Incremental Cost	N/A	N/A	75%
Measure Cap	N/A	N/A	\$6.00 CCF
Gas - New Construction (non whole Building Performance)			
Incremental Cost	N/A	N/A	95%
Measure Cap - space heating	N/A	N/A	\$6.00 CCF
Measure Cap - non-space heating	N/A	N/A	\$5.00 CCF
Gas Food Service Fixed Rebates			
Gas Energy Star ® Fryers	\$750 / unit	N/A	\$750 / unit
Gas Energy Star ® Steamers	\$750 / unit	N/A	\$750 / unit
Gas Energy Star ® Convection Ovens	\$500 / unit	N/A	\$500 / unit
Other Prescriptive Caps to be evaluated against the energy & demand caps above (the lesser of):			
Pool Covers (automated)	\$12 / sf	N/A	N/A
Window Film	\$2.00 /sf	N/A	N/A
EMS systems	\$500 / pt	N/A	\$500 / pt
High Performance Glazing	N/A	N/A	\$2.00 / sf
Gas Boilers (non-condensing)	N/A	N/A	\$4.00 / input MBH
Gas Boilers (condensing)	N/A	N/A	\$8.00 / input MBH
Gas Storage Water Heaters (Thermal Eff. ≥ 90%)	N/A	N/A	Varies by Input BTU
Gas IR Heater fixed Rebates (low & high intensity)	N/A	N/A	Varies by Input BTU (see below)
Up to 50,000 BTU /hr	N/A	N/A	\$500/unit
≥ 50,000 BTU/hr up to 150,000 BTU/hr	N/A	N/A	\$550/unit
≥ 150,000 BTU/hr up to 175,000 BTU/hr	N/A	N/A	\$650/unit
≥ 175,000 BTU/hr	N/A	N/A	\$850/unit

NOTES:

- All references to CCF savings shall refer to annual savings
- Gas Distribution Company shall have final determination of Annual Energy Savings
- Gas measures integrated into an Electric Comprehensive Project may be eligible for a 10% adder applied to the gas program incentive.
- Process definition: Any measure that saves energy related to producing a product. Typical examples include, but are not limited to, heat treating, process heating & drying, cleaning & sterilizing, commercial milk processing.

2011 Project Caps & Incentive Structure for UI (Effective 6/20/2011)

Retrofit Measures	Energy Opportunities (EO)	Small Business Energy Advantage (SBEA)	Operations & Maintenance (O&M) (includes RetroCx where applicable)
Cumulative Cap per Federal Tax ID	\$750,000	\$750,000	\$750,000
Program Caps per metered site	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$150,000
Municipal Finance Cap (project /cumulative total per municipality)	\$100,000 / \$400,000	\$100,000 / \$400,000	N/A
Lighting Measures			
Interior & Exterior Lighting Measures (the lesser of)			
% of installed cost	30%	40%	N/A
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.20 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	\$0.20 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	N/A
High Performance Lighting - LED, Daylighting or Induction Lighting Measures; Advanced Lighting Controls (the lesser of)			
% of installed cost	30%	40%	N/A
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.20 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	\$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	N/A
Express Lighting Rebate (includes LEDs) Refer to Website	\$10 - \$50 / fixture	\$10 - \$50 / fixture	N/A
Non-Lighting Measures			
Custom Measures (the lesser of)			
% of installed cost	30%	40%	40%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.20 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	\$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	\$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW
Prescriptive Values - if applicable	\$5/unit	\$5/unit	\$5/unit
EMS System (the lesser of)			
% of installed cost	30%	40%	40%
Measure Cap (greater of)	\$0.20 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	\$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW	\$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW
cap per point	\$500 / pt	\$500 / pt	\$500 / pt
EMS incentives will be prorated based on energy savings by fuel			
Comprehensive Project Initiative			
Project must contain at least 2 End Uses (Heating, Cooling, Lighting, Process, Refrigeration, Motors and EMS)			
No one End Use can exceed	85% of the energy savings values using the caps below	85% of the energy savings values using the caps below	85% of the energy savings values using the caps below
% of installed cost	35%	50%	50%
Comprehensive 'Project' Cap for all measures (greater of)	\$0.20 / kWh OR \$800 per summer peak kW	\$0.35 / kWh OR \$1,000 per summer peak kW	\$0.35 / kWh OR \$1,000 per summer peak kW
buydown	3 yr. payback	2 yr. payback	2 yr. payback
Other Prescriptive Caps to be evaluated against the energy & demand caps above (the lesser of):			
Pool Covers - automated	\$12 / sf	\$12 / sf	N/A
Window Film	\$2.00 /sf	\$2.00 /sf	\$2.00 /sf
PC Network Controls	\$20 / PC controlled	\$20 / PC controlled	\$20 / PC controlled
PRIME (Events per customer over 2 years)			
Events 1 & 2	N/A	N/A	100%
Events 3 & 4	N/A	N/A	50%
RetroCx will use the same Measure Caps as EO and O&M			
Scoping Study	N/A	N/A	\$1,000
Investigative Study	N/A	N/A	50%
Custom Non-Lighting Measures (the lesser of)			
% of installed cost	N/A	N/A	40%
Measure Cap (greater of)	N/A	N/A	\$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW

NOTES:

All references to kWh savings shall refer to annual savings

Electric Distribution Company shall have final determination of Annual Energy Savings

Summer Peak kW reduction shall be coincident with: Mon - Fri, non-Holiday from 1pm -5 pm, June-July-August

2011 Project Caps & Incentive Structure for UI (Effective 1/13/2011)

Lost Opportunity Measures	Energy Conscious Blueprint
Cumulative Cap per Federal Tax ID	\$750,000
Program Caps per metered site	\$150,000
Municipal Finance Cap (project /cumulative total per municipality)	N/A
Lighting Measures	
Lighting Measures Lighting Power Density - Tier 1: (>10% above Code) & Tier 2: (> 30% above Code) Fixture Cap Occupancy Sensors (beyond Code requirements for Lighting Controls)	\$0.15/sf & \$0.50 /sf \$50/Fixture \$20/fixture controlled
Custom - Lighting; Advanced Lighting Controls, etc. (the lesser of) Incremental Cost Measure Cap (greater of)	75% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per peak kW
Non- Lighting Measures	
HVAC Unitary / splits / ductless units (units ≤ 30 tons) Refer to Web Site -Rebate Unitary / splits / ductless units (> 30 tons) Chillers & VFDs	\$50 to \$120 per ton custom custom
Air Compressors (lesser of) Incremental Cost Measure Cap (greater of) Prescriptive 0 - 5 hp ≥ 5 hp < 40 hp ≥ 40hp < 50 hp ≥ 50hp ≤ 100 hp ≥ 100 hp	75% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW \$0 \$310 \$240 \$205 See Custom - Process Equip
Custom - Process Equipment New or Replacement (the lesser of) See Note 4 Incremental Cost Measure Cap (greater of) buydown	75% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW 1.5 yr. payback
Custom - Equipment Replacement non-process (the lesser of) Incremental Cost Measure Cap (greater of)	75% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW
Custom - New Construction (non-Whole Building Performance) Incremental Cost Measure Cap (greater of)	95% \$0.25 / kWh OR \$700 per summer peak kW
Whole Building Performance	
Model Subsidy Base or "Code" building model (paid when received) High Performance building model (pd upon final construction)	\$1,000 \$5,000
Building / System Compliance (Installation) Whole Building Incentive (% better than code) Note: Incentive prorated for fossil fuel based on modeled \$savings	10% - \$0.15 / sf 11% -15% - \$0.30 / sf 16% -20% - \$0.60 / sf 21% - 25% - \$1.00 / sf 26% - 29% - \$1.50 / sf > 30% - \$2.00 / sf
Certification Bonus LEED Silver / 2 Green Globes LEED Gold / 3 Green Globes LEED Platinum / 4 Green Globes	\$5,000 \$10,000 \$15,000
Enhanced Commissioning	TBD
Other Prescriptive Caps to be evaluated against the energy caps above (the lesser of): Cool Roofs EMS High Performance Glazing	\$0.20 /sf \$500 / point \$2.00 / sf

NOTES:

1. All references to kWh savings shall refer to annual savings
2. Electric Distribution Company shall have final determination of Annual Energy Savings
3. Summer Peak kW reduction shall be coincident with: Mon - Fri, non-Holiday from 1pm -5 pm, June-July-August
4. Process definition: Any measure that saves energy related to producing a product. Typical examples include, but are not limited to, compressed air systems, plastic injection molding machines, process chilled water systems, making ice-cream, commercial milk processing, water- and waste-water treatment plants.

CHAPTER FOUR: EDUCATION and OUTREACH

Overview

Advance the Efficient Use of Energy.
Mitigate Environmental Impacts of Energy Generation.
Promote Economic Development & Provide Energy Security.

These three main objectives of the Energy Efficiency Fund are combined with a mandate to educate and inform Connecticut's businesses, municipalities, residents and schoolchildren on the importance of using energy efficiently. The Energy Efficiency Fund and The Companies meet and surpass this educational mandate through a variety of programs including school-based programs (kindergarten through college), public forums, technical training and seminars, educational exhibits and centers, trade shows and community and grassroots outreach.

Connecticut's youth need access to energy curriculum that instills in them an energy-efficient ethic. The state's teachers require inquiry-based professional development regarding efficient and clean energy technologies. Businesses and facility managers demand the training and technical expertise to take control of energy consumption and rising energy costs and concerned Connecticut citizens clamor for the knowledge and tools needed to combat global warming. And municipalities, clean energy task forces and grassroots groups—environmental and faith-based—need guidance on how to reduce energy consumption in their community and to receive rewards for increasing Energy Efficiency Fund program participation.

Connecticut's energy education programs and initiatives are necessary to provide individuals with the knowledge, skills and power needed to use energy efficiently. Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund's educational programs are diverse in audience and delivery but share one common goal—educate, empower and energize the state's businesses, municipalities, residents and school children to use energy wisely.

eesmarts™

eesmarts is an energy efficiency and clean, renewable learning initiative. Created in 2002, the program's goal is to facilitate students' understanding of math, science and technology related to energy conservation, renewable energy resources and electricity in order to create an energy-efficient ethic among Connecticut's school-age students. ***eesmarts*** offers teacher training workshops, curriculum materials, essay contest, sponsors sustainable resources category at the CT Science Fair, lights for learning fundraiser, on-site program, outreach and educational resources.

In 2012, the ***eesmarts*** program will continue to focus on conducting educator training focused on science concepts related to energy, energy-efficient technologies and energy conservation. Additionally, ***eesmarts*** will continue to reach out directly to schoolchildren through the eeEvents

initiative, including in-classroom activities, book readings, Earth Day presentations, Girl Scouts Forums and various other school assemblies.

SmartLiving™ Center and Museum Partnerships

The objective of both the SmartLiving Center and Museum Partnerships program is to educate Connecticut residents about the importance of energy efficiency through exhibits at educational centers and partnerships with museums.

Connecticut Science Center

In 2012, the Museum Partnerships program will again work with the Connecticut Science Center in Hartford, Conn. to upgrade the existing Energy City Gallery exhibits and Climate Change Theater. This upgrade will ensure the content reflects the latest technological advancements and scientific knowledge associated with clean and efficient energy technologies. Funding will include upgrades to the Climate Change Theater, the “In Your Community” exhibit, and the establishment of an “Energy Review” panel, including scientists from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, to complete a technical review of the Energy City Gallery exhibits and work with the Connecticut Science Center’s exhibit team to develop recommendations for making upgrades to the exhibits.

SmartLiving Center

UI will continue to lease the SmartLiving Center property at 297 Boston Post Road, Orange for its continued operation until March 31, 2013. Connecticut customers would benefit from the continued expansion of SmartLiving Center exhibits - in particular, a remodeled Center tailored to further engage the benefits of the Fund’s residential programs, including HES, HVAC, and Heat Pump Water Heaters, would create an experience similar to walking through a home using tools such as a blower door test, duct sealing, cross sections of insulation, efficient windows, and caulking showing residents how to save energy.

Clean Energy Communities (formerly named eeCommunities)

The purpose of the Clean Energy Communities program is to develop a sustainable and energy-efficiency ethic with Connecticut’s residents, businesses and municipalities. The program encourages communities in Connecticut’s towns and cities to invest in energy efficiency in buildings – schools, town halls, libraries, businesses, homes and apartments.

In 2012, the Energy Efficiency Fund and the Clean Energy Finance & Investment Authority will formally launch the new Clean Energy Communities program. This program will complete the energy puzzle for communities by connecting the two separate entities’ objectives into one: promoting clean and efficient energy use in Connecticut’s towns and cities. With this new program, program administrators will track municipalities’ program participation rates (residential, business and municipal) and reward them for

their participation and reduction in energy consumption. A goal of the Energy Efficiency Track of the Clean Energy Communities program will be to reduce municipal building energy consumption by 20 percent by 2015.

Additionally, in 2012, the Energy Efficiency Fund will work with community and grassroots organizations to promote program participation. The Energy Efficiency Fund will directly fund and support grassroots efforts by the following groups: the Interreligious Eco-Justice Network's Cool Congregations Challenge, the Northwest Conservation District and its 34 towns, and the Spanish American Merchants Association. The communities program will evaluate funding other organizations' efforts on a case-by-case basis.

This page intentionally blank

Clean Energy Communities Program (Electric)

Objective:

The purpose of the Clean Energy Communities program is to develop a clean and energy-efficiency ethic with Connecticut's residents, businesses and municipalities. The program encourages communities in Connecticut's towns and cities to invest in energy efficiency and clean, renewable energy sources in buildings—schools, town halls, libraries, businesses, homes and apartments.

The objective of this marketing and educational outreach program is to utilize locally organized efforts to help advance the message of energy efficiency and to raise awareness of and promote Energy Efficiency Fund programs. The Clean Energy Communities program's Energy Efficiency Track is designed to promote participation in all of the Energy Efficiency Fund's residential, business and municipal programs through technical, financial, educational and marketing assistance.

In 2011, the Energy Efficiency Fund began collaborating with the Connecticut Clean Energy Finance & Investment Authority to create an umbrella communities initiative. This initiative—the new Clean Energy Communities Program—will jointly promote Connecticut's efficiency and renewable programs to residents, businesses and municipalities. The impact of this joint collaboration will result in:

Alignment with national/state policies promoting both energy efficiency and renewable energy sources:

- Promotion of holistic energy strategies
- Utilization of existing infrastructure
- Avoidance of duplicate efforts
- Elimination of confusion among communities
- Conservation of ratepayer dollars
- Leveraged funding
- Enhanced program performance

Target Market:

This program educates and provides outreach to residential, business and municipal energy consumers through local community groups and organizations that promote energy efficiency, clean energy and environmental advocacy. Clean Energy Communities Program Partners include: Clean Energy Task Forces, Green/Sustainable Teams, Green Towns, Spanish American Merchants Association, Interreligious Environmental Justice Network, Northwest Conservation District and Connecticut Regional Planning Organizations. The program incorporates support from municipal officials, town facility managers, and boards of education.

Program Description:

In 2012, the Clean Energy Communities program will continue to work with its Program Partners statewide to encourage participation in Energy Efficiency Fund programs. The 2012 program structure consists of three steps that include the Clean Energy Fund's goals and incentive points:



Step 1: Make the Municipal Energy-Saving Pledge

This step is required and includes a pledge by a municipal official to reduce municipal energy consumption 20% by 2015. Municipalities will be asked to reduce their consumption in 5 percent increments by the end of 2012, 2013, 2014 and 2015. Part of the pledge includes the creation of a Municipal Action Plan (MAP) detailing planned energy-saving and clean, renewable energy measures. Municipalities will be asked to benchmark town buildings utilizing EPA Portfolio Manager or other utility-approved benchmarking software. Training and technical assistance will be offered through the utilities and entities such as the Northwest Conservation District. Though this is a key Step for the 2012 program, municipalities will not be penalized or restricted from receiving Bright Idea Grants (see Step 3b) in order for program administrators to work out tracking and reporting issues.

Step 2: Make the Municipal Clean Energy Pledge

This step is required and includes a pledge from the town government to obtain 30 percent of the electricity used at municipal facilities from clean energy sources by 2015 with minimum purchase

requirements. Annual reporting is required. The Clean Energy Finance & Investment Authority tracks and funds Step 2.

Municipalities may choose Step 3a, Step 3b or both.

Step 3a: Earn Clean Energy Points

Communities earn points for every CT CleanEnergyOptions sign up, independent RECs from residential and commercial sales and clean energy systems funded by the Clean Energy Finance & Investment Authority, as well as independently funded systems. **100 sign ups = 100 points = 1 kW solar panel.** The Clean Energy Finance & Investment Authority tracks and funds Step 3a.

Step 3b: Earn Energy Efficiency Points

Communities earn points for Energy Efficiency Fund program sign ups and rebates used as outlined below. **100 points = Bright Ideas Grant.** These grants are to be used for energy efficiency or non-renewable carbon reducing projects. The program will offer an online catalog of suggested Bright Ideas. Some approved projects will include: LED solar-powered street/parking lights, Electric Vehicle car charging stations, smart power strips purchased for work stations/computer labs, LED/CFL lighting retrofits, energy consulting services, etc. The Energy Efficiency Fund tracks and funds Step 3b.

Bright Ideas Grants will range from \$5,000 to \$15,000. The following 26 towns will be eligible for \$15,000 grants due to their population size: Bridgeport, Bristol, Danbury, East Hartford, Enfield, Fairfield, Greenwich, Hamden, Hartford, Manchester, Meriden, Middletown, Milford, New Britain, New Haven, Norwalk, Norwich, Shelton, Southington, Stamford, Stratford, Torrington, Wallingford, Waterbury, West Hartford and West Haven.

In order to earn the initial Bright Ideas Grant, the following milestones must be reached:

1. *Residential Program Participation:* 10 percent of households participate in Residential New Construction, Multi-Family and Home Energy Solutions (both core services and HES-IE included). This earns the community 60 points toward their first 100 points.

Communities can interchangeably use the other program participation rates listed below to attain the additional 40 points:

2. *Residential Rebates/Home Performance:* Households who utilize Home Energy Solutions rebates (appliances and insulation), HVAC rebates or hot water rebates or participate in the Home Energy Solutions - Home Performance program. For every 1 percent of residents that utilize a rebate or participate in Home Energy Solutions - Home Performance, the community earns 8 points.
3. *Commercial, Industrial & Municipal Program Participation:* Community can earn points for town's commercial, industrial and municipal accounts who participate in Small Business Energy Advantage, Energy Opportunities, Energy Conscious Blueprint, Operations & Maintenance,

PRIME or the Business Sustainability Challenge. For every 1 percent of businesses and municipal buildings that participate, the community earns 4 points.

4. Special Initiatives: Municipality can earn points for special energy conservation and energy efficiency projects, such as conservation challenges, behavioral-based campaigns (ex., Turn Off Lights!, Energy Awareness Month and Earth Day events). These special initiatives can be reviewed by program administrators on a case-by-case basis. *Only* programs that support energy conservation and energy efficiency will be considered. Municipality can earn up to 10 points in Special Incentives points.

Please note that the Energy Efficiency Track will award each municipality points retroactive to January 1, 2010. All households, businesses and municipal buildings that have participated in Energy Efficiency Fund programs since then will be included in tracking program participation rates. Additional Bright Ideas Grants may be earned once the initial milestones and grant have been achieved.

2012 Major Initiatives with Communities, Vendors and Stakeholder Partners

Clean Energy Communities Resources

- Online, downloadable Energy Efficiency Fund Program Guidebook & Community Toolkit;
- A website that will feature;
 - an interactive map of Connecticut and its individual municipalities;
 - information showcasing the progress of each municipality toward Bright Ideas Grants and solar panels;
 - whether the municipality has signed up for the EPA Community Energy Challenge;
 - whether the community has energy benchmarked its municipal buildings;
 - the municipal contact for the utility account;
 - a list of Energy Efficiency Fund incentives for municipal buildings;
 - Links to communities' clean energy task force web sites/calendar of events;
 - a general overview of energy conservation;
 - tips on promoting programs, blank sign-up forms and a link to request Community Tool Kits;
 - information about the CFL fundraising program and participating schools, non-profits and organizations;
 - a link to the www.ctenergyinfo.com event calendar;
 - a link to the EPA's Community Energy Challenge web site and its free webinars; and
 - a link to the Companies social networking communities Facebook and Twitter.

Business Outreach

The 2012 Clean Energy Communities program will work with local chambers of commerce, utility account executives or account managers, trade associations, farmers' markets and cultural entities to promote business, municipal and large commercial Energy Efficiency Fund programs within its territory. Such assistance will include speaking engagements and promotion of the Clean Energy Communities program.

Resources to Increase Outreach

In 2012, the Clean Energy Communities program will attempt to involve additional utility resources to increase outreach. These resources include account executives and employees involved in community relations efforts. Implanting resources in town activities will offer the program the benefit of a credible, trusted source in most town Energy Task Forces, Rotary Clubs, etc. This group liaison would be expected to spread awareness of our programs to the group and encourage use of our resources. The group would be expected to utilize this source to gain access to information and Clean Energy Communities resources.

2012 Outreach Initiatives

Clean Energy Communities Leadership Series

The feasibility of conducting a series of Leadership Series forums across the state on best practices for promoting Energy Efficiency Fund programs, energy conservation and energy-efficient technologies will be researched. These forums and the ideas they produce would be made available on the Clean Energy Communities web site.

Student Clean Energy Communities Ambassadors

The 2012 Clean Energy Communities program will research the possibility of working with students in elementary, middle and high schools across the state, as well as colleges and universities, to develop and train Student Clean Energy Communities Ambassadors.

Such training and development would include a stint at a Student Clean Energy Communities Ambassador Institute, similar to the **eEsmarts** program's Summer Institute. The institute would be conducted for elementary, middle and high school participants and would include hands-on training in conducting a school energy audit and school conservation challenges. The Institute would also review the basics of how to promote other school sustainability initiatives (e.g., recycling, riding the bus, CFL fundraisers, school community gardens, etc.). Clean Energy Communities program would partner with non-profit, grassroots organizations to conduct these sessions.

A similar Student Clean Energy Communities Ambassador Institute will be investigated for undergraduate and graduate-level students enrolled at Connecticut universities.

Home Energy Reports Pilot


As directed by PURA, the Companies kicked-off their information-based energy conservation pilot in September of 2010 to gauge customer behavior/engagement when a customer receives a Home Energy Report, which compares their energy usage with “virtual neighbors”. These virtual neighbors have similar characteristics to home owners, including: square footage, proximity (90 percent live within 2 miles), heating/cooling systems , weather and number of occupants.

In a two-page report, customers can view their monthly/quarterly energy consumption, see their historical electrical usage, are ranked on an energy usage scale from 1 (best) to 100 (need improvement) with their virtual neighbors, and receive energy-saving tips customized for their home. Additionally, all participating customers have access to online websites where they can track the same data online, but also have the ability to set their own energy-saving goals, view more energy-saving tips and get insight into what everyone else is doing to save energy (Top Energy-Saving Tips). In addition, programs and initiatives available from the Energy Efficiency Fund are promoted through the Home Energy Reports.

In 2010, the Energy Efficiency Fund, CL&P and UI initiated a Round of Inquiry, and ultimately a Request for Proposal, to initiate a statewide information-based energy conservation pilot. In January 2011, CL&P and UI launched separate energy conservation pilots with the same vendor: OPOWER.

CL&P

In CL&P’s service territory, 24,000 residential customers were selected to receive monthly or quarterly reports about their energy usage and tips on how they could save energy. Pilot program administrators designed the pilot to test the incremental conservation impacts of reporting frequency, channel and duration.



Preliminary results from the first three months of the pilot indicate CL&P’s Pilot customers have reduced their energy consumption by 1.7 percent as compared to the 24,000 customers in the Control Group.

Program administrators have implemented additional customer engagement projects, including Home Energy Solutions program promotions, postcards encouraging online account creation/participation, and targeted tips regarding Energy Efficiency Fund programs.

Example: Home Energy Solutions Program Promotion (August 2011)

Want to outperform your neighbors this winter?

Gain a professional advantage. For just \$75, receive a comprehensive Home Energy Solutions assessment.

A CL&P-authorized energy specialist will:

- Seal drafts
- Install energy-saving light bulbs & water-saving devices
- Analyze appliances and insulation

Benefits include:

- Estimated \$700 in services
- Instant energy savings
- Rebates for additional upgrades

To learn more, call **877.WISE.USE** and reference code RPT0811

Limited or fixed-income? Ask about the free Income Eligible Program.

In an effort to gather more data to evaluate the effectiveness of behavioral-based energy programs, CL&P has determined that it will extend the current Pilot for a Year II (February 2012-February 2013) to the remaining 20,000 Pilot customers and expand it to include an additional 10,000 customers (Expansion Year I: February 2012-February 2013). Year II will include more online engagement, including social media applications (Facebook and Twitter) and 1-2 special coupons to promote LED bulbs and Home Energy Solutions program/rebates.

In addition, CL&P will look into conducting other behavior-based pilots, including working with Yankee Gas to develop a separate natural gas pilot for residential customers. In an effort to study how small business owners react to behavioral-based energy programs, CL&P will conduct a Round of Inquiry and coordinate several focus groups with small business owners and CL&P account executives to determine the need, make-up and requirements to conduct a Small Business pilot.

CL&P's Year I Pilot with OPOWER is currently undergoing a quantitative and qualitative evaluation by Nexus Market Research through the Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) process. This evaluation may be extended to study the energy savings and customer response during Year II.

UI

In UI's service territory, a hybrid approach was utilized with 419 voluntary participants and 5,581 selected customers. These customers received monthly reports detailing their energy usage and suggesting energy-saving tips, as well as encouraging participation in energy efficiency programs offered through the Fund.

6K Customers (Hybrid Opt-in/Opt-Out)



Preliminary results from the first three months of the pilot indicate UI's Pilot customers have reduced their energy consumption by 2.1 percent as compared to the 10,000 customers in the Control Group. Program administrators have implemented additional customer engagement projects including Home Energy Solutions program promotions, email reminders of report mailings and a coupon redemption program planned for January 2012.

The current pilot does not include Southern Connecticut Gas or Connecticut Natural Gas; however, if PURA approved the continuation of the customer engagement, SCG and CNG customer engagement program could be offered in the 3rd or 4th quarter of 2012. In addition, Small Business and Municipal Customers could be enrolled in the Program pending PURA approval.

UI's 2011 Pilot with OPOWER is currently undergoing a customer satisfaction evaluation by Nexus Market Research. In 2012, UI will continue to evaluate the effectiveness of information-based energy conservation pilots

Neighbor To Neighbor Energy Challenge

Home Energy Solutions and Home Performance Contractor Services ("Contractor Services") are a key component of the *Neighbor to Neighbor Energy Challenge* ("N2NEC"), an innovative community-based initiative in 14 towns across Connecticut, supported by the U.S. Department of Energy ("DOE") through the competitive Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant Program known as the BetterBuildings program. N2NEC was one of about 20 initiatives selected from applications by smaller municipalities across the country. The program's focus is achieving 20% residential energy reductions in 10% of homes in designated towns.

The Neighbor to Neighbor (N2N) Energy Challenge is a partnership of nine entities including the Clean Energy Fund that received an US Department of Energy Efficiency Conservation Block Grant under Funding Opportunity Announcement DE-FOA-0000148. N2N engages households in fourteen towns to set specific and measurable goals for energy efficiency, conservation, and renewable energy. CL&P is working in partnership with N2N to provide comprehensive technical support to the program. Customer

privacy and information security is a priority for CL&P. CL&P and N2N have negotiated a security agreement to ensure customer privacy and information is transferred and stored in a secure environment. Aggregated and individual participant customer usage data is supplied on an ongoing basis to the N2N data processing subcontractor. CL&P technical staff continues to conduct monthly update meetings with N2N to ensure uninterrupted data flow to the program over its projected 3 year term.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Clean Energy Communities/Behavioral Pilot

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 33	\$ 138	\$ 146	\$ 190	\$ 380	\$ 305 a)	\$ 305
Contractor Staff	\$ 3	\$ 31	\$ -	\$ 21	\$ 42	\$ 15	\$ 15
Total Labor	\$ 37	\$ 169	\$ 146	\$ 211	\$ 422	\$ 320 a)	\$ 320
Materials & Supplies	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ 3	\$ 614	\$ 620	\$ 78	\$ 423	\$ 656 b)	\$ 557
Marketing	\$ 4	\$ 174	\$ 80	\$ 6	\$ 50	\$ 20	\$ 17
Administrative Expense	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 0	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2
Other	\$ 1	\$ 0	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2
Total	\$ 46	\$ 960	\$ 850	\$ 297	\$ 900	\$ 1,000	\$ 898

a) Includes \$150K Behavioral Based Pilot (labor only); \$40K for Neighbor-to-Neighbor(NU IT Labor).

b) Includes \$300k for Clean Energy Communities rewards and incentives for meeting Energy Efficiency Track goals; \$70k for Cool Congregations Challenge led by Interreligious Eco-Justice Network; \$60k for Neighbor-to-Neighbor community awards; \$50k for funding Northwest Conservation District grassroots organization of 34 Northwest towns.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Design/Conduct behavioral pilot.

Market - Not for profit energy efficiency organizations.
Work with local and municipal 'green' organizations.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Clean Energy Communities / Behavioral Pilot

Baseline Assumptions:

Market

Not for profit energy efficiency organizations. Municipal "green" organizations

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 20,966	\$ 26,822	\$ 14,917	\$ 26,822	\$ 28,297	\$ 29,712
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 20,966	\$ 26,822	\$ 14,917	\$ 26,822	\$ 28,297	\$ 29,712
Materials & Supplies	\$ 20,629	\$ 6,000	\$ 1,371	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000
Outside Services	\$ 110,462	\$ 132,000	\$ 12,436	\$ 131,975	\$ 253,703	\$ 252,288
Incentives	\$ 1,900	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 17,125	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 1,418	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 172,500	\$ 176,822	\$ 28,749	\$ 176,822	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000

Goals and Metrics Information:

2012

Outreach to Energy task force to create local energy efficiency goals and objectives

8

This page intentionally blank

SmartLiving Center & Museum Partnerships (Electric)

Objective:

The objective of both the SmartLiving Center and Museum Partnerships program is to educate Connecticut residents about the importance of energy efficiency through an educational center, exhibits and partnerships with museums. For several years, the Fund's strategic partnerships with learning centers and museums have created a cohesive branding and educational opportunity for the Fund throughout Connecticut. The effort has three approaches that are used:

1. Educational Centers

SmartLiving Center, Orange, Conn.

An energy education learning center, open since 2001, serving all ages

2. Museum Partnerships

Developing energy education exhibits through strategic partnerships with museums

Connecticut Science Center, Hartford, Conn.

Energy City Gallery, open since June 2009, serving ages 10 to adult

The Discovery Museum, Bridgeport, Conn.

Permanent energy gallery, open since fall 2009, serving children ages 6-13

Stepping Stones Museum for Children, Norwalk, Conn.

Permanent energy gallery opening in December 2010 serving children ages 3-10

Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority

Trash Museum, Hartford, Conn.

Permanent energy & recycling exhibits opening in 2011 serving children of all ages

3. Traveling Exhibits

Stepping Stones Museum for Children, Statewide

Conservation Quest™ Mini-Exhibit

Traveling energy exhibit touring nature centers, schools and municipalities available since Fall 2009.

Serving children ages 3-10

Semi-permanent Displays, Statewide

Refurbished energy exhibits that can be installed on semi-permanent basis at nature centers, schools and municipalities serving children ages 3-10

Target Market:

The target market for the SmartLiving Center and Museum Partnerships programs is: architects, builders, designers, schoolteachers, educators, students, homeowners, homebuyers, residential and business customers, trade allies and not for profit organizations.

Program Description:

The Fund and Electric Companies have developed very successful partnership exhibits at museums and centers across Connecticut. In an effort to support existing partnerships, the programs' focus will be on supporting programming, events and workshops to be held at Fund-sponsored exhibits and centers. This focus will allow Program Administrators to advance the efficient use of energy by encouraging Connecticut residents, schoolchildren, teachers and businesses to visit the centers and museums.

SmartLiving Center, Orange, Conn.

Energy Education Learning Center

The SmartLiving Center is an interactive, professionally staffed facility that serves as a high-profile resource for promoting energy-efficient products, services and ideas to educate customers about energy efficiency. It is an educational facility featuring training sessions and seminars, special events and tours; all geared toward teaching customers that they can use energy wisely while keeping an eye on the environment and not sacrificing comfort or style.

Displays

The SmartLiving Center features hands-on displays and demonstrations of energy efficient appliances; lighting technologies, weatherization and new construction practices. The SmartLiving Center's knowledgeable staff provides technical assistance and advice related to energy efficiency and conservation. The SmartLiving Center exists as a resource to cross-promote a variety of Fund programs, efforts of the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority (CEFIA), water and natural gas efficiency activities. It also complements the local retail marketplace and includes those retailers in promotions and displays at the Center.

In 2011 and continuing in 2012, the SmartLiving Center will make enhancements to the existing displays including lighting replacements and upgrades to include all varieties of CFLs and LEDs. By engaging existing relationships with partner organizations, vendors and Energy Efficiency Fund residential and commercial programs, the SmartLiving Center exhibits are maintained and upgraded at little to no cost.

Seminars

The SmartLiving Center offers educational seminars to adults after work and on weekends with topics regarding residential and commercial energy efficiency and renewable energy. Presenters discuss concepts, technology and installation practices of a particular energy topic and attendees are encouraged to share specific home improvement questions and concerns.

Meeting Space

The SmartLiving Center is available at no cost to contractors, nonprofits, civic organizations and groups for meeting space. The SmartLiving Center will open early or remain open after hours and on weekends to accommodate the needs of the organization. The meeting space can accommodate up to 40 adults in either a lecture or table/chairs set-up.

Educational Tours

Working in conjunction with the **eesmarts** program, the SmartLiving Center offers educational tours to promote energy efficiency measures to students in elementary, middle, high and technical schools as well as college and university students. Educational tours are available to all age groups including Kindergarten to adult, schools, classes and after-school groups (i.e., boy scouts, girl scouts, civic organizations, etc). Themes for the tours include the origins of energy, energy efficiency, energy conservation and alternate sources of energy. The tours make use of the SmartLiving Center's interactive displays as well as lecture and question and answer sessions.

Events

The SmartLiving Center hosts two events per year including Earth Day (April), and Family Science Day (October). The events are opportunities for adults and children to learn about energy-saving activities and home improvement opportunities in an effort to protect the environment while incorporating fun for the whole family.

Staff

In December 2010, UI issued a Request for Proposals for staffing at the SmartLiving Center. In early 2011, UI selected the Capitol Region Education Council, one of the six Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) in Connecticut. CREC provides a rich background in school operations management, professional development for classroom management, strategic planning skills and relationships with energy and energy efficiency partners to provide an expert staff and tools for continued development and the strategic future of the SmartLiving Center offerings. The CREC staff began in April 2011 and has already provided a wealth of new ideas and organizational management without any noticeable interruption to customers.

Museum Partnerships

Connecticut Science Center, Hartford, Conn.

Energy City Gallery

In June 2005, the Fund and the CCEF entered into a \$2 million partnership with the Connecticut Science Center to fund the Energy City Gallery - a model sustainable city that showcases exhibits on energy-efficient and clean, renewable energy technologies.

The Energy City Gallery contains a Climate Change Theater, an interactive 20-minute presentation on climate change and its relationship to the way humans use energy. Exiting the theater, visitors can

make their way through the model sustainable city - Greenslope - where they can observe and interact with technologies and learn about behaviors that can mitigate their negative environmental impacts.

Greenslope is laid out as a typical metropolis with residential dwellings, school, office space, manufacturing facility and a town hall. Greenslope residents and businesses have learned to live sustainably - meeting their current needs without sacrificing the ability to meet the needs of future generations. Inefficient technologies have been replaced with compact fluorescent light bulbs, ENERGY STAR refrigerators, windows and occupancy sensors. Buildings still use electricity to power computers, machines and lights; however, their electricity comes from photovoltaic panels, wind turbines and biomass facilities instead of polluting fossil fuels.

The Energy City Gallery features exhibits on sustainability, energy-efficient windows, passive solar design, residential solar PV installations, energy-efficient appliances/lights, wind power, biomass, hydropower, fuel cells, and real-time energy monitoring systems, day lighting and occupancy sensors and LED traffic lights.

Since opening in 2009, more than 550,000 people have visited the Connecticut Science Center including nearly 100,000 students. More than 70,000 individuals have participated in energy-related programming. Preliminary results (first year) of a three-year evaluation of the Energy City Gallery have noted significant increases in public understanding of energy efficiency and renewable energy sources as a result of their exposure to the exhibit.

Since 2009 and continuing through 2012, the Fund offers Connecticut Science Center yearlong passes to educators upon completion of an **eesmarts** professional development workshop.

Starting in 2012, the Fund will enter into a two-year partnership with the Connecticut Science Center to support the upgrade of the Climate Change Theater and Energy City Gallery exhibits to ensure that content reflects the latest technological advancements and scientific knowledge associated with clean and efficient energy technologies. This includes:

- Funding in the amount of \$15,000 to upgrade the “In Your Community” exhibit in the Energy City Gallery to support CPTV videos on student energy-related projects. Includes new touch monitor, supporting programming and student project display component.
- Funding in the amount of \$15,000 to support the establishment of an “Energy Review” panel, including scientists from the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, to complete a technical review of the Energy City Gallery exhibits and work with the Connecticut Science Center’s exhibit team to develop recommendations for making upgrades to the exhibits.
- Funding in the amount of \$192,500 toward upgrading the Climate Change Theater, including both the video content and associated theater props.

The Fund will look toward its initial funding partner, the Connecticut Clean Energy Finance & Investment Authority; to assist with the remaining funds (\$192,500) needed to upgrade the Climate Change Theater.

Stepping Stones Museum for Children, Norwalk, Conn.

Energy Lab Gallery

In January 2009, the EEB approved funding for a permanent energy gallery, Energy Lab, at Stepping Stones Museum for Children (“Stepping Stones”) that opened in November 2010. The 1,300 square foot Energy Lab Gallery is an immersive, solar, wind and water environment that sets the stage for children to learn about the science of energy - sources, uses, and emerging alternatives.

Energy Lab Gallery exhibits include:

- An energy wall focuses on potential/kinetic energy, energy transformations and renewable/nonrenewable energy sources.
- A water lab allows visitors to explore the water cycle and learn about hydropower.
- A giant wind tunnel offers children a chance to feel the force of wind, manipulate wind turbine blades to find the most efficient configurations and invent new designs.
- A solar lab shows how energy from the sun grows plants, heats homes and powers cars.
- A nonrenewable lab allows visitors to crawl below the surface of the earth to see where fossil fuels come from.

As part of the Fund’s sponsorship of the Energy Lab Gallery, Stepping Stones is utilizing **eEsMarts** lessons in conjunction with educational outreach, workshops and conservation nights. Several of Stepping Stones’ educators and docents have attended 2010 and 2011 **eEsMarts** Summer Institute workshops held on-site at the museum to enhance the museum’s energy-related programming.

Beginning in 2010 and continuing into 2012, the Fund offers Stepping Stones year-long passes to educators upon completion of an **eEsMarts** professional development workshop. This encourages educators to utilize their **eEsMarts** lessons and training.

In October 2011, the Fund will sponsor Energy Conservation Month activities and programming at Stepping Stones. Month-long activities will include **eEsMarts** book readings, Conservation Quest™ mini-exhibit, hands-on activities and demonstrations.

Stepping Stones Museum for Children, Statewide

Conservation Quest™ Mini-Exhibit and Tour

In January 2009, the EEB approved funding for a four-year partnership between the Fund and Stepping Stones to create the Conservation Quest mini-exhibit to be recreated from Stepping Stones’ popular *Conservation Quest* that debuted at Governor M. Jodi Rell’s One Thing Expo in 2008. Stepping Stones

developed a smaller, more portable tour to travel to schools throughout the state, setting the stage for school children to learn about energy conservation through direct, hands-on experiences.

In 2011, Stepping Stones educators traveled statewide to schools to introduce the content, lead initial programs and then let various grade levels enjoy the exhibits at their own pace. The mini-exhibit and tour reinforce the energy efficiency and clean energy components that align with the Fund's mission. In 2011, the Conservation Quest mini-exhibit traveled to approximately 40 schools and community centers, reaching more than 100,000 Connecticut residents. The mini-exhibit has had bookings more than a year in advance, and 2012 is scheduled to be another successful year.

The Discovery Museum, Bridgeport, Conn.

Energy Gallery

The PURA and the EEB approved the 2009 C&LM Plan to develop an Energy Gallery at The Discovery Museum that would incorporate hands-on, interactive, permanent exhibits to promote energy efficiency and renewable technologies and cross-promote the SmartLiving Center and **eEsmarts** while recognizing the mission of the Fund.

The exhibit highlights four main sources of energy: fossil fuels, wind power, hydropower and solar. Each energy source starts from a different point in the exhibit, connecting to a grid, a substation, a transformer and ultimately to the home. Inside the exhibit's home, visitors can choose between efficient and inefficient appliances while watching the electric demand change on the house's meter.

Since 2010 and continuing in 2012, the Fund will offer Discovery Museum year-long passes to educators upon completion of an **eEsmarts** professional development workshop.

Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority

The Trash Museum, Hartford, Conn.

Permanent Exhibits

The PURA and the EEB approved the 2010 C&LM Plan to provide funding for exhibit upgrades at the Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority's Trash Museum in order to add an energy conservation component to the concepts of reduce, reuse, and recycle.

In 2010 and 2011, the Companies, on behalf of the Fund, worked with the Educational Outreach Staff of the Trash Museum to ensure milestones were met pertaining to the following exhibit components:

- Incorporating conservation and energy efficiency components to the existing 90-minute educational programs offered to school children statewide.
- Development of the Recycl-O-Meter, a physical exhibit and online web tool for visiting school children to calculate the amount of recycled materials into kWh savings.

- Development of exhibit upgrades at the Museums to incorporate energy and energy efficiency components.

In 2012, the Companies will continue to work with the Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority's Trash Museum to ensure all milestones are met in an effort to offer school children and visitors a complete education in recycling, including an energy conservation and energy efficiency component.

Semi-permanent Displays, Statewide

Energy Exhibits

In 2005, the Fund sponsored three permanent energy efficiency exhibits at the Stepping Stones Museum for Children in Norwalk. As the museum has undergone extensive renovations and has created the new permanent Energy Lab Gallery that opened in 2010, there was no longer room for the 2005 exhibits. The museum gave the exhibits back to CL&P and the Fund in the Fall of 2009, and they have been refurbished/updated to address new technologies, i.e., LEDs.

The exhibits include a What's Your Wattage exhibit comparing lighting technologies, and Energy Stacker game comparing inefficient vs. ENERGY STAR technologies, a Connect the Circuit display and Energy House video display. In July 2011, the refurbished displays were showcased at the DEEP's offices in celebration of Take-Your-Child-to-Work Day.

Marketing Strategy:

Promotion of the Museum Partnerships program is primarily accomplished through advertising and public relations, generated by the individual museum. The SmartLiving Center employs promotions specific to its calendar of events. The Electric Companies may augment museum promotional efforts using a variety of public relations tactics that may include:

- Development of special events or workshops held to spotlight Fund exhibits, programs, energy efficiency trends and community collaborations. These events include Earth Day events, Family Science Days, home shows and eco-festivals.
- Cross-promotion of museum exhibits and SmartLiving Center events through other Fund programs and partnerships, such as **eeSmarts** and eeCommunities.
- Articles and notices via electronic newsletters, CTEnergyInfo.com and Electric Companies' websites.
- Direct mail regarding **eeSmarts** bus reimbursements to the SmartLiving Center and **eeSmarts** season passes to the Connecticut Science Center, The Discovery Museum and Stepping Stones Museum for Children.
- Tie-ins with weatherization and conservation campaigns and special events.
- Weatherization and conservation campaigns.

- On-going seminars and meetings.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

New Program Issues:

In the Department of Public Utility Control (DPUC) final decision dated March 17, 2010 in reference to Docket No. 09-10-03 on pages 47-48, the Electric Companies, in concert with the Energy Efficiency Board, were ordered to submit an evaluation and recommendation regarding the future of the SmartLiving Center on or before July 21, 2010.

In compliance with the Department's directive, the EEB and the Electric Companies explored the following options for the future of the SmartLiving Center. Of the twelve votes submitted at the June 9, 2010 ECMB meeting, five voted for Option 1, six voted for Option 2, and two voted for Option 3.

Option 1: Close the SmartLiving Center in Orange, Conn., and continue the Museum Partnerships Program.

Option 2: Renew the lease of the SmartLiving Center in Orange, Conn. and open a SLC-Hartford location. Continue to fund the Museum Partnerships program.

Option 3: Close the current SmartLiving Center in Orange, Conn., and open two new SmartLiving Centers in Greater Bridgeport and Greater Hartford.

On August 31, 2010, the DPUC submitted a letter to the Electric Companies stating that based on the June 9, 2010 EEB vote, it is clear that the Board is divided on this issue. Therefore, absent clear direction from the EEB, it would be inappropriate for the Department to rule on this significant issue or to extend the current lease for an additional five years without a more comprehensive review of the matter.

Based on the foregoing, the Department authorized UI to extend the current lease for up to two years. UI signed a two year lease with the property of 297 Boston Post Road, Orange commencing on April 1, 2011 for the continued operation of the SmartLiving Center until March 31, 2013.

Connecticut customers would benefit from the continued expansion of SmartLiving Center exhibits - in particular, a remodeled Center tailored to further engage the benefits of the Fund's residential programs, including HES, HVAC, and Heat Pump Water Heaters, would create an experience similar to walking through a home using tools such as a blower door test, duct sealing, cross sections of insulation, efficient windows, and caulking showing residents how to save energy.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

SmartLiving Center and Museum Partnerships

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 22	\$ 17	\$ 21	\$ 6	\$ 21	\$ 28 a)	\$ 28
Contractor Staff	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 22	\$ 18	\$ 21	\$ 6	\$ 21	\$ 28	\$ 28
Materials & Supplies	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 10 c)	\$ 10
Outside Services	\$ 51	\$ 95	\$ 354	\$ 46	\$ 350	\$ 347 b)	\$ 347
Fees & Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 20	\$ 19	\$ 15	\$ 0	\$ 15	\$ 15 d)	\$ 15
Administrative Expense	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 92	\$ 132	\$ 400	\$ 53	\$ 396	\$ 400	\$ 400

- a) Includes CL&P Administration of Science Center and Stepping Stones Museum projects.
- b) Creative support for museum projects. Includes \$150k Stepping Stones Museum exhibit payments. Includes sponsorships for museum/public facilities exhibits and workshops.
- c) Includes printing/design costs for educational materials.
- d) Includes direct mail/collateral and grassroots/PR.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

The SLC and Museum Partnerships program do not have any kW or kWh savings metrics

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Electric b/c Ratio	N/A
Total Resource b/c Ratio	N/A

Metrics
None

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - SmartLiving Center- Museum Partnerships

Budget/FTE

0.2 FTEs for program administration

Goal

Not applicable.

Cost/Unit

Not applicable.

Goal Setting Methodology

Not applicable.

Metric Changes

Establish a long-term presence at museums, schools and educational centers.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Science Center

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ 206	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166	\$ 166
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 206 a)	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166 b)	\$ 166

a) This represents an annual \$200k paid to the CTCSE over the five-year \$1M Contract time period (2005-2009) for an energy efficiency exhibit.

b) This represents CL&P's share over a two year period for upgrades to the Climate Change Theater and review team led by N&I Renewable Energy Laboratory staff to evaluate exiting exhibits.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Electric b/c Ratio	N/A
Total Resource b/c Ratio	N/A

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

SmartLiving Center®

Baseline Assumptions:

Market

UI residential customers, appliance retailers, builders, developers, realtors

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 57,750	\$ 61,916	\$ 32,646	\$ 61,916	\$ 65,395 a)	\$ 68,665
Contractor Staff	\$ 185,183	\$ 171,814	\$ 34,145	\$ 132,236	\$ 171,814 b)	\$ 171,814
Total Labor	\$ 242,933	\$ 233,730	\$ 66,791	\$ 194,152	\$ 237,209	\$ 240,479
Materials & Supplies	\$ 18,291	\$ 10,000	\$ 4,293	\$ 10,000	\$ 6,521 c)	\$ 6,500
Outside Services	\$ 8,446	\$ 4,500	\$ 44,078	\$ 44,078	\$ 27,000 d)	\$ 27,000
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - e)	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 47,407	\$ 35,000	\$ 8,027	\$ 35,000	\$ 35,000 f)	\$ 31,767
Other	\$ 170,505	\$ 174,016	\$ 109,361	\$ 174,016	\$ 174,016 g)	\$ 174,000
Administrative Expenses	\$ 2,193	\$ 2,000	\$ 636	\$ 2,000	\$ 2,000 h)	\$ 2,000
Total	\$ 489,775	\$ 459,246	\$ 233,186	\$ 459,246	\$ 481,746	\$ 481,746

a) .58 FTE

b) Day-to-day contract staffing of Center

c) Tours and seminar supplies, office supplies

d) Display Maintenance and updates

e) No comment

f) Marketing of specific events (Earth, Conservation and Family Science Days) Seminars and General Awareness

g) Stepping Stone Museum mobile display, Rent, utilities, trade services (HVAC, phone, internet, dumpster etc.)

h) Meals, miles, travel and training

Goals and Metrics Information:

of Visitors

2012
15,000

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

SmartLiving Center®

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$300	\$307	102.3%
2001	\$524	\$836	159.5%
2002	\$423	\$392	92.7%
2003	\$531	\$345	65.0%
2004	\$478	\$370	77.4%
2005	\$428	\$410	95.8%
2006	\$286	\$294	102.8%
2007	\$335	\$353	105.4%
2008	\$334	\$347	103.9%
2009	\$534	\$476	89.1%
2010	\$459	\$490	106.8%
2011	\$459		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$459	\$233	50.8%
2011 YE Projected	\$459	\$459	100.1%
2012	\$482		

Goal - Number of Customers Served

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	5,000	7,977	159.5%
2003	11,340	6,221	54.9%
2004	8,500	7,565	89.0%
2005	10,000	11,141	111.4%
2006	10,000	10,392	103.9%
2007	10,000	12,523	125.2%
2008	10,000	12,940	129.4%
2009	15,379	12,944	84.2%
2010	15,000	14,555	97.0%
2011	15,000		
2011 YTD (Jun)	15,000	5,212	34.7%
2011 YE Projected	15,000	15,000	100.0%
2012	15,000		

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes - SmartLiving Center

Budget/FTE:

.58 FTE for contract administration, financial administration and strategic oversight

Goal:

15,000 customer goal

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Science Center

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000

This page intentionally blank

eesmarts[™] (Electric)

Objective:

The purpose of the ***eesmarts*** program is to develop an energy-efficient ethic among all school age students in Connecticut, encouraging them to incorporate energy-efficient practices and behaviors into their lives at home and at school.

For 2012, the ***eesmarts*** program has four primary objectives:

Objective 1: ***eesmarts*** will continue to emphasize and promote professional development workshops. Educator training will focus on science concepts related to energy, as well as applications of ***eesmarts***, energy conservation habits and energy-efficient technologies.

Objective 2: ***eesmarts*** program material distribution will continue to be limited to decision makers within the school district: administrators, curriculum directors, and educators who have participated in ***eesmarts*** professional development workshops. ***eesmarts*** Take-Home Worksheets will be made available online to all Connecticut educators, students, environmental organizations and energy task forces.

Objective 3: Program lesson material will continue to be fully aligned with the Connecticut State Department of Education science and mathematics frameworks and inquiry-based teaching methods.

Objective 4: ***eesmarts*** will implement a concerted effort to reach out directly to schoolchildren through the eeEvents initiative, including in-classroom activities, book readings, Earth Day presentations, and various other school assemblies

Target Market:

For 2012, the ***eesmarts*** program will continue to target its efforts to educating K-12 Connecticut classroom educators and schoolchildren about the importance of energy-efficient behaviors.

The Electric Companies will continue to target all K-12 public, private, magnet, and charter school districts and classroom educators statewide. The Companies will also continue and expand their partnership with Connecticut's Technical High School system, now in its sixth consecutive year.

Program Description:

eesmarts is an energy-efficiency and clean-energy learning initiative. The ***eesmarts*** mission and program offerings are distributed statewide in the form of:

- Professional Development Workshops for Educators;

- Teachers guides and lesson materials; and
- Outreach and partnerships.

Professional Development Workshops for Educators

eEsmarts offers two types of educator training opportunities: custom workshops for school districts in Professional Development (PD) workshops and general training for individual educators in Continuing Education Unit (CEU) workshops.

PD Workshops are offered to school districts and educational organizations. They are specifically tailored to align with city/town/district curriculum plans, and are designed to improve an educator's understanding of science and how to incorporate ***eEsmarts'*** lessons and activities into the city/town/district's curriculum framework and the Connecticut State Department of Education Framework.

CEU Workshops are offered to individual educators but are not specifically tailored to each individual educator's city/town/district's curriculum plans. These workshops are designed to improve an educator's understanding of science and how to teach it in the classroom. Lessons and hands-on activities are demonstrated that support the Connecticut State Department of Education Framework. As a result of CEU workshops being held after-hours and during the summertime, ***eEsmarts*** administrators have implemented a stipend to educators to compensate them for their time and travel to these workshops.

In 2011, ***eEsmarts*** provided custom professional development workshops for Colchester, Glastonbury, Newington, Rocky Hill and UCONN Pre-service teachers.

In July 2007, the ***eEsmarts*** program initiated a pilot Summer Institute for 31 grade 3-5 teachers at Wesleyan University. In subsequent years, the Summer Institute has grown to include three weeks of instruction in basic, advanced and topical workshops covering topics related to energy, energy efficiency, conservation and clean/renewable resources.

In 2011, ***eEsmarts*** offered the Summer Institute in two locations to better serve educators statewide and to celebrate the Museum Partnerships program. The 2011 Summer Institute was offered at Stepping Stones Museum for Children in Norwalk and Wesleyan University in Middletown. Since 2010 and again in 2011, the ***eEsmarts*** team partnered with the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority at the Summer Institute to engage the upper middle- and high school-level teachers in more advanced clean, renewable energy-source topical-workshop instruction. Increasing in popularity each year, the 2011 workshops welcomed a total of 134 teachers. Throughout the past three years, the ***eEsmarts*** Summer Institute has trained more than 500 educators in grades pre-K through 9.

At the culmination of an ***eEsmarts*** workshop, educators must submit an information contract, known as a Curriculum Request Agreement ("CRA"). The CRA must be signed by the participating educator and

a school administrator (e.g., principal, assistant principal, or district curriculum director). By signing the CRA, the educator agrees to utilize the **eeSmarts** program materials, administer student assessments and return their teacher evaluation. All educators must submit a signed CRA to obtain lesson materials.

Teachers Guides and Lesson Materials

The **eeSmarts** program materials consist of two major elements: Teacher Guides and Lessons.

The **eeSmarts** Teacher Guides are grouped according to grade level: Grades Pre-K - 2, Grades 3 -5 and Levels I, II & III for middle and high school educators. The Teacher Guides provide educators with detailed lessons, experiments, background information on energy, energy efficiency and clean renewable energy sources and alignment with the Connecticut State Science and Mathematics frameworks.

In 2008, a third-party evaluation of the **eeSmarts** program concluded that the **eeSmarts** Program Administrators had made the recommended changes of a 2005 third-party evaluation, including the alignment of all **eeSmarts** lessons with the Connecticut State Science Framework Content Standards and Grade Level Expectations.

In 2009, updated **eeSmarts** curriculum materials for Grades 2-3 were developed, and in January 2010 were distributed to Connecticut's classrooms, complete with changes in content and design formats and updates of the comprehensive teacher guidebooks with new lessons and information. **eeSmarts** program administrators worked with steering committee members from the Connecticut Department of Education, the Electric Companies, the Connecticut Clean Energy Fund, and the Institute for Sustainable Energy, as well as grades 2-3 pilot educators to ensure that the updates and changes were consistent with the state's educational inquiry and science and mathematics standards.

In 2010 and 2011, the **eeSmarts** program developed Take-Home Worksheets and Fuel-to-Home Cards. The Take-Home Worksheets celebrated the first **eeSmarts** curriculum units to be bilingual (English and Spanish). These include:

- Your Electric Environment Worksheet includes an overview of where electricity comes from and an opportunity for student to trace how electricity gets to their home.
- Becoming Energy Efficiency Smart (**eeSmarts**) Worksheet includes a home light bulb audit, Energy Guide and phantom power overview and a home energy conservation score/pledge.

These Take-Home Worksheets will be offered to all Connecticut educators attending **eeSmarts** professional development workshops. In addition, the **eeSmarts** program will post these Worksheets online to offer all Connecticut educators, students, environmental organizations and energy task forces an opportunity for parental and community involvement.

The Fuel-to-Home Cards have been a part of the **eeSmarts** lesson material offerings for many years. The old Cards trace the path of electricity generation from fossil fuels. In 2011, in response to **eeSmarts** educators' feedback, the Cards were revitalized to include concepts of renewable energy sources (large scale to home PVs), conservation and energy efficiency. **eeSmarts**-trained educators can now receive four decks of Fuel-to-Home Cards, as well as a Teacher's Guide complete with 13 prompts for ways in which electricity is generated, transmitted, distributed and consumed in the home.

Outreach & Partnerships

The **eeSmarts** program has developed select partnerships to engage in outreach to educators, schools, community organizations and students to further the mission of the program. Below is a list of partners and initiatives the **eeSmarts** program has established and will continue to cultivate and offer in 2012.

eeEvents: The objective of **eeSmarts** is to educate educators, but throughout the years, **eeSmarts** program administrators have received an increasing number of requests to visit schools, assemblies and classrooms throughout the state to conduct in-classroom interactive and inquiry-based activities directly with students. In 2010, as a result of the eeEvents initiative being piloted statewide, **eeSmarts** program administrators and partners have visited elementary and middle school classrooms, school assemblies, environmental club meetings, Boy/Girl Scout meetings and Earth Day events. Team members provide presentations about energy efficiency and hands-on activities for students or tailor an event to the needs of the school in order to engage and educate the community in energy efficiency, conservation and clean, renewable energy programs, practices and technologies. All visits are conducted in accordance with the needs of the students, teacher, class size and grade levels. In 2011, the **eeSmarts** program offered eeEvents in Branford, Bridgeport, Cheshire, Easton, Glastonbury, Hartford, New Haven, New London, Norwalk, Orange and Plainville. The **eeSmarts** program will offer the eeEvents program again in 2012.

eeSmarts Student Contest: The Energy Efficiency Fund sponsors an annual **eeSmarts** energy-efficiency contest that invites students to enhance their skills in science, writing and technology. Students are asked to answer grade-level-specific prompts regarding efficient and renewable technologies in a variety of formats including a poster project, an essay project and a community services project. The lower elementary grades (K - 3) compete by submitting drawings, illustrations and a narrative about how to save energy in their school or community. The upper elementary and middle school level (Grades 4 - 8) submit essays in response to grade-specific prompts about energy, energy efficiency and clean, renewable energy sources in students' homes, schools and communities. High-school level (Grades 9 - 12) students submit formal plans, procedures and expected results and outcomes for community service projects relating to energy, energy efficiency, conservation and clean renewable energy as it relates to their home, school or community.

The **eeSmarts** program provides technical and financial assistance for the implementation of high - school -level community service projects. The contest is open to all students in Connecticut, and all project and essay prompts align with the Connecticut State Frameworks in science, mathematics and

writing. All participants receive recognition for their submissions, and winners are honored at a special awards ceremony at the Legislative Office Building at the state capitol.

Connecticut Science Fair: Since 2008, **eEsmarts** has been a sponsor of the Sustainable Resources and Practices category at the Connecticut Science Fair. The science fair and this category, in particular, allow middle school students and educators to reflect on the major scientific principles and public policies that revolve around energy efficiency and clean, renewable energy, such as climate change and the depletion of fossil fuels.

In 2011, the **eEsmarts** program sponsored both the Sustainable Resources & Practices (middle school) category as well as the Future Sustainability (high school) category at the Connecticut Science Fair. The first and second place winners of the Future Sustainability category, sisters Teresa and Bridget Oei, were given the opportunity to present their projects at the International Sustainable World Energy Engineering Environment Project (I-SWEEEP) Olympiad in Houston, Texas. Bridget's project, "Applying the Principles of the Tesla Engine to Design and Construct a Prototype of a Bladeless Wind Turbine," earned a Bronze medal prize in the Energy category.

Teresa, Bridget and their younger sister Maura have all been multi-year winners of the Sustainable Resources & Practices and the Future Sustainability categories at the Connecticut Science Fair. As a result of their continued passion for the exploration of environmental sciences, the Oei sisters were showcased in a segment produced by the Connecticut Public Television and funded by a grant from the Energy Efficiency Fund.

The **eEsmarts** program will continue to sponsor both middle and high school categories in 2012.

Girl Scouts of Connecticut: In 2010, the **eEsmarts** program initiated a partnership with the Girl Scouts of Connecticut to co-host Energy Forums for Girl Scouts statewide - an effort aligned with the Girl Scout's Forever Green initiative. In 2011, the **eEsmarts** program further developed the partnership with Girl Scouts of Connecticut by hosting statewide Forever Green Energy Forums to teach Girl Scout troops and members of their communities about energy efficiency, conservation and clean renewable energy sources.

Prior to the Forever Green Energy Forums, **eEsmarts** personnel trained high-school aged Girl Scout Energy Specialists in activities surrounding energy-related topics. These specialists led roundtable activities and discussions at the forums. In this manner, the older Scouts have an opportunity to pass their knowledge on to younger Girl Scout visitors. In Spring 2011, three Energy Forums reached 180 Girl Scouts statewide. Energy Specialist training and Energy Forums will also be scheduled throughout the 2011-2012 school year in all regions of the state.

Connecticut Technical High School System: **eEsmarts** and the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority's Learning for Clean Energy Innovation ("LCEI") program have partnered on a variety of initiatives with the Connecticut Technical High School System ("CTHSS"). Since 2006, **eEsmarts** has

provided professional development workshops for CTHSS electrician and science teachers and an on-site recognition ceremony for CTHSS electrical teachers. Starting in 2008, **eEsmarts** and LCEI started partnering to conduct joint professional development workshops for CTHSS educators.

In 2010, **eEsmarts**, the Museum Partnerships program and LCEI again partnered with the CTHSS schools statewide to roll out the E-House initiative. An E-House is a 20- by 16-foot outdoor structure to be built, modified and maintained by and for students at six technical high schools statewide. In October 2009, the Clean Energy Finance and Investment Authority sponsored a \$200K grant to the CTHSS toward the installation of solar thermal, solar photovoltaic and high-efficiency boilers within each of the six E-Houses. In addition to renewable technologies, the CTHSS approached **eEsmarts** and Museum Partnerships to assist with funding for energy efficiency equipment, technical assistance and curriculum assistance to align with the technologies within the E-House.

Throughout 2010 and 2011, E-Houses began construction at E.C. Goodwin Technical High School (New Britain), Oliver Wolcott Technical High School (Torrington), Grasso/Southeastern Technical High School (Groton), Bullard-Havens Technical high School (Bridgeport), Platt Technical High School (Milford) and Cheney Technical High School (Manchester).

During the 2011-2012 school year, the Energy Efficiency Fund will again financially support CTHSS as they build E-Houses at Norwich Technical High School (Norwich), Kaynor Technical High School (Waterbury) and Emmett O'Brien Technical High School (Ansonia). All CTHSS students will have access to the E-Houses statewide.

The E-House initiative (on-site at EC Goodwin Tech in New Britain, Conn.) was showcase in a segment produced by the Connecticut Public Television and funded by a grant from the Energy Efficiency Fund.

Museum Partnerships: In 2011, the **eEsmarts** program will continue to offer educational tours at the SmartLiving™ Center in Orange.

In 2010, the opening of the Energy Exhibit at The Discovery Museum in Bridgeport and the Energy Lab exhibit at Stepping Stones Museum for Children served as a new opportunity for teachers and students to learn about clean and efficient energy topics through the **eEsmarts** program. In 2010 and continuing into 2011, the **eEsmarts** program will enable museum education specialists with **eEsmarts** professional development workshops to fully integrate the lesson materials into the daily programming at the Connecticut Science Center in Hartford, the Discovery Museum in Bridgeport and Stepping Stones Museum for Children in Norwalk.

All **eEsmarts**-trained educators are offered a year-long pass to drive visitors to the exhibits, funded by the Energy Efficiency Fund at Stepping Stones Museum for Children, The Discovery Museum and the Connecticut Science Center.

Marketing Strategy:

The Electric Companies plan to market this program to consumers and businesses through area museums, science centers, schools, and other public venues, to help educate them on the value and importance of energy efficiency. In this effort, the Companies will recruit schools and educators using strategies that may include:

- outreach to new and participating educators via utility Program Administrators and workshop vendors (as appropriate);
- updating of the **eEsports** web site with an educators only access database, news features, links to more hands-on activities and lessons regarding energy, and links to events at the Fund's museum exhibits and centers;
- outreach to nonparticipating schools through teaser workshops, assemblies and activities for students;
- attendance at education conferences;
- joint partnership at SmartLiving Center & Museum Partnership events, Fund community events, Earth Day celebrations and book readings;
- promotion of the Spring 2012 student contest;
- Connecticut Science Fair;
- **eEsports** public relations opportunities, and
- promotion of the fully aligned **eEsports** lesson materials with Connecticut Science and Mathematics curriculum frameworks.

Goals:

Refer to Standard Filing Requirements for program goals.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

K-12 Education

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 29	\$ 16	\$ 85	\$ 16	\$ 50	\$ 84	\$ 84
Contractor Staff	\$ 1	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 30	\$ 21	\$ 85	\$ 16	\$ 50	\$ 84	\$ 84
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 3	\$ 0	\$ 4	\$ 3	\$ 3
Outside Services	\$ 161	\$ 298	\$ 130	\$ 71	\$ 238	\$ 231 a)	\$ 231
Marketing	\$ 2	\$ 9	\$ 4	\$ 1	\$ 5	\$ 4 b)	\$ 4
Administrative Expense	\$ 4	\$ 3	\$ 3	\$ 1	\$ 4	\$ 3	\$ 3
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 197	\$ 331	\$ 225	\$ 88	\$ 302	\$ 325	\$ 325

a) Educational Consultant: PIMMS (Wesleyan University). Conduct teacher training workshops and promote curriculum. Fulfillment of curriculum requests. Warehouse vendor: WB Meyer; Curriculum Writer: The Writing Company.

b) Includes bill inserts, mailings to curriculum directors and principal/pilot programs.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

The K-12 Program does not have a kW or kWh savings metric.

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Electric b/c Ratio	N/A
Total Resource b/c Ratio	N/A

Goal 1: Number of Workshops

20 Workshops (joint utility workshops) .

Energy Education Events

15 Events (joint utility workshops) .

Events with school children, i.e., book readings, eesmarts contests and service projects, green job training with CT Technical High School system.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

K-12 Education

Year	<u>Goal - # Curriculum Delivered</u>		
	Goal	Actual	% Achieved
2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	n/a	314	n/a
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a
2004	1400	2,058	147%
2005 Revised	800	1,282	160%
2006 Revised	600	561	94%
2007 Revised	600	1,311	n/a
2008 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	331	n/a
2010 Revised	400	n/a	n/a
2011 Revised	225	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	88	39%
2011 Y/E Projected	225	302	134%
2012	325	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Participation</u>		
	Goal	Actual	% of Goal
2001	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a
2004	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2006 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2007 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012	n/a	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Goal - Budget</u>		
	Budget	Actual	% of Goal
2001	\$ 200,000	\$ 159,000	80%
2002	\$ 270,000	\$ 215,000	80%
2003	\$ 300,000	\$ 249,000	83%
2004	\$ 210,000	\$ 62,000	30%
2005 Revised	\$ 254,944	\$ 233,000	91%
2006 Revised	\$ 202,500	\$ 159,987	79%
2007 Revised	\$ 200,000	\$ 233,000	117%
2008 Revised	\$ 201,000	\$ 208,000	103%
2009 Revised	\$ 201,000	\$ 331,133	165%
2010 Revised	\$ 400,000	\$ 333,133	83%
2011 Revised	\$ 225,000	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 88,369	39%
2011 Y/E Projected	\$ 225,000	\$ 301,875	75%
2012	\$ 325,000	n/a	n/a

Year	<u>Program Ratios</u>				
	\$/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW		
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual	Actual
2001	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2004	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2005 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2006 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2007 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2012	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes: K-12 Education

Budget/FTE
0.3

FTE for program administration

Goal

Conduct 20 Professional Development workshops for teachers.
Conduct 15 Energy Education Events.

Cost/Unit

Not applicable.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

K-12 Education

Baseline Assumptions:

Market

Primary and secondary schools throughout UI service territory

<u>Budget Projections</u>	2011		2011		<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>Revised Bud</u>	<u>YTD (June)</u>	<u>YE Projected</u>		
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 59,189	\$ 61,916	\$ 31,604	\$ 61,916	\$ 65,395 a)	\$ 68,665
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ - b)	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 59,189	\$ 61,916	\$ 31,604	\$ 61,916	\$ 65,395	\$ 68,665
Materials & Supplies	\$ 242	\$ 12,000	\$ 976	\$ 12,000	\$ 8,521 c)	\$ 8,500
Outside Services	\$ 203,247	\$ 197,698	\$ 74,197	\$ 197,698	\$ 197,698 d)	\$ 197,600
Incentives	\$ 28,515	\$ 75,000	\$ 13,758	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000 e)	\$ 75,000
Marketing	\$ 30,460	\$ 47,411	\$ 11,845	\$ 47,411	\$ 47,411 f)	\$ 44,260
Other	\$ 23,512	\$ -	\$ 1,197	\$ 1,197	\$ - g)	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 1,313	\$ 7,800	\$ 476	\$ 6,603	\$ 7,800 h)	\$ 7,800
Total	\$ 346,478	\$ 401,825	\$ 134,053	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825

a) .58 FTE

b) No comment

c) Supplies for on-site and professional development activities

d) Warehousing, shipping, professional development services, Curriculum development, Summer Institute Workshops (Joint UI and CL&P)

e) SmartLiving Center tours, eesmarks bus and museum partnership reimbursements

f) Promotional supplies, targeted marketing of program

g) No comment

h) Meals, miles, travel and training

Goals and Metrics Information:

	<u>2012</u>
Curriculum Units Under Request Agreements	2,000
General/Custom Workshop	20
Educational Outreach Events - Essay Contest, Technical School Outreach, School Assemblies, etc	15

The United Illuminating Company

LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

K - 12 Education

Goal - Program Costs (000's)

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	\$363	\$392	108.0%
2001	\$427	\$298	69.8%
2002	\$377	\$855	226.8%
2003	\$427	\$266	62.3%
2004	\$319	\$223	69.9%
2005	\$416	\$324	77.9%
2006	\$302	\$309	102.3%
2007	\$281	\$296	105.3%
2008	\$282	\$311	110.3%
2009	\$432	\$311	72.0%
2010	\$432	\$346	80.1%
2011	\$402		
2011 YTD (Jun)	\$402	\$134	33.3%
2011 YE Projected	\$402	\$402	100.0%
2012	\$402		

Goal - Number of Curriculum Delivered

Year	Goal	Actual	% of Goal Achieved
2000	-	-	0.0%
2001	-	-	0.0%
2002	38	619	1628.9%
2003	38	696	0.0%
2004	600	830	138.3%
2005	600	974	162.3%
2006*	300	367	122.3%
2007	340	747	219.7%
2008	340	1,574	462.9%
2009	1,074	3,965	369.2%
2010	950	5,271	554.8%
2011	2,000		
2011 YTD (Jun)	2,000	97	4.9%
2011 YE Projected	2,000	2000	100.0%
2012	2,000		

*Curriculum with sign Curriculum Request Agreement (CRA)

The United Illuminating Company LF-26 Standard Filing Requirement

Program Notes: K - 12 Education

Budget/FTE:

.58 FTE for contract administration, direct contact with education community, oversight of curriculum and implementation strategy and professional development redesigns.

Goal:

Redefined goals reflected in curriculum alignment with CT Department of Education Frameworks

Metric Changes:

Curriculum Units Under Request Agreements	2,000
General/Custom Workshop	20
Educational Outreach Events	15
- Essay Contest, Technical School Outreach, School Assemblies, etc	

This page intentionally blank

CHAPTER FIVE: FINANCING, LOAD MANAGEMENT, RD&D

Conservation & Load Management Financing Overview

The objective of the Electric and Natural Gas Companies' C&LM Financing programs is to provide attractive financing alternatives to the balance of customer costs not covered by the Fund's incentive. These financing options include referrals to third-party lenders, subsidized low interest third-party loans and subsidized interest-free on-bill financing funded by the Electric Companies (Small Business Energy Advantage ["SBEA"] and Municipal Loan programs) so that customers may easily implement cost-effective energy-efficiency projects. The Companies are also offering subsidized, low interest rate loans with on-bill repayment to Residential customers.

Commercial and Industrial Sector

The Electric Companies' zero percent, on-bill financing for the SBEA program has been extremely successful and is recognized as a strong business model by other utilities. The Companies expect continued strong customer participation in the SBEA program due to this financing option. The SBEA financing model is very simple, easy to explain to customers and is sold directly to the customers through the SBEA contractors. Additionally, the default rates have remained low (less than 1percent) despite the current economic environment. In addition, this current financing model has been adopted for Municipalities and is instrumental for facilitating project implementation, especially when funding is scarce. In 2012, the SBEA program will expand to offer interest free on-bill repayment for energy efficiency projects that include gas savings measures.

In 2009, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies implemented several variations of third-party financing in the Commercial and Industrial sector to grow customer interest and improve implementation. Customer acceptance of this C&I loan program (Energy Opportunities) was limited due to having to sacrifice a portion of the project incentive to obtain the lowest possible interest rate. In 2010, the EDCs modified the loan offerings by subsidizing the loan interest rate to approximately 7 percent. This higher rate was established because the loan gave the customer access to the full project incentive available, in addition to the possibility of achieving positive cash flow. A 2.99 percent loan package was also developed for qualifying projects that replaced T12 or High Intensity Discharge (HID) lighting systems. The 2010 changes have resulted in a higher volume of program activity in both 2010 and 2011. The Companies continue to strive to offer positive cash flows to their financing customers. The loan programs are summarized below.

Loans for the Commercial and Industrial Sector

1. The Small Business Energy Advantage & Municipal Program offers:
 - a. Zero percent, on-bill loan repayment to small businesses that participate in the Electric Companies' SBEA program.

- b. Zero percent, on-bill loan repayment to municipal customers who participate in either the SBEA program or the Energy Opportunities program.
 - c. Zero percent, on-bill repayment to customers installing energy efficiency projects that include gas measures.
2. The Small Commercial & Industrial Loan Program offers:
 - a. Reduced interest-rate loans through a third-party financing entity.
 - b. Customer loans ranging from \$2,000 to \$250,000 through a third-party lender, with the Electric and Natural Gas Companies providing various subsidized loan options on the first \$100,000 of the loan amount.
3. The DPUC C&I Loan Program offers:
 - a. Low-interest DPUC-subsidized financing for energy efficiency projects costing more than \$1,000,000.
4. The Hospital Loan Program offers:
 - a. Connecticut Hospital Association Trust loans for participating eligible health care facilities. In 2012, CL&P is including CHA Administration expenses in its financing budget to allow this program to continue to provide its revolving loan fund.

Residential Sector

The Electric and Natural Gas Companies provide attractive third-party consumer financing for energy improvement projects recommended through the Home Energy Solutions (“HES”) program.

The Companies ran a Residential Financing Pilot program from June 1, 2010 through May 31, 2011. The pilot program offered loans at attractive, below-market interest rates. The pilot also allowed the companies to engage customers and contractors in a new way by reducing one of the barriers to implementing deeper energy efficiency. The Residential Financing Pilot program successfully funded loans to over 1,250 customers representing over \$14.5M in energy efficient home improvements.

Although the pilot was successful, the cost to the Fund was high due to the capital source used by the Third Party financing vendor. The Companies, in conjunction with the EEB, sought alternative financing models to reduce the cost to the Fund. On June 1, 2011 the Companies introduced a new residential loan program by offering subsidized, low interest rate loans with on-bill repayment to HES residential customers who make qualified energy efficiency improvements to their homes. This program will be one of the first in the nation to offer on-bill repayment of energy efficiency measures for residential customers.

CL&P’s new residential loan program is also administered by CHIF and the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Finance Company (“CEEFCO”), a 501 (c)(3) Special Purpose Entity set-up to administer the

loan program and leverage Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund monies. UI's residential loan program is administered by CHIF and funded by utility capital.

To qualify for the interest rates below and obtain a loan, a customer must participate in the Home Energy Solutions Program (HES) through a Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund approved HES contractor. All measures or equipment financed must meet the criteria set forth below including the Home Energy Solutions (HES) participation criteria and the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund rebate and criteria where noted. Customers are eligible for a minimum loan amount of \$2,500 to a maximum amount of \$20,000 with a maximum loan term of ten years.

If 4.99 percent and 2.99 percent measures are bundled together, the entire package qualifies for 2.99 percent (with the exception noted below for oil or propane heated homes).

Measures that have unproven or questionable savings (including but not limited to fuel oil catalyst products, radiant barriers, and power correction devices) will NOT be financed.

100% of work being done shall apply to qualifying measures as listed below. Non-listed work directly related and necessary to the installation of the listed qualifying measures may be financed along with the qualifying measure at the applicable interest rate.

Advanced air sealing and/or duct sealing can be financed only when air sealing or duct sealing is necessary to increase the energy efficiency of the qualifying measure. The interest rate is set based on the qualifying measure installed.

Qualifying Measures and Requirements for 2.99%

Measure	HES	Efficiency Requirements	Additional Criteria	Other
High Efficiency Insulation For Natural Gas or Electric heated homes	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ceilings with less than R-30 insulation must install a minimum of R-19 and the final R-value of the ceiling must be equal to or greater than R-38 Walls that have no insulation or an R-value of 4 or less must install a minimum of R-13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insulation applies to above grade walls or ceilings as part of the homes conditioned envelope Basement ceilings, below grade walls, or insulation installed within interior walls do not qualify Accepted insulation materials: fiberglass batts, blown-fiberglass, cellulose, dense pack cellulose, spray foam or rigid foam or rigid spray foam products 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oil or propane heated homes in CL&P service territory will be financed at the current market rate. See below.
ENERGY STAR® Ductless Heat Pumps	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ductless Heat Pump must be AHRI rated and ENERGY STAR qualified Must meet or exceed: 14.5 SEER, 12 EER, 8.2 HSPF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must meet Energy Efficiency Fund equipment performance criteria for the \$1,000 incentive level Must be installed in a zone that has electric resistance heat as the primary source of heat 	
ENERGY STAR Electric Heat Pump Water Heaters	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must meet or exceed: Energy Factor (EF) of 2.0 or greater 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of an operating electric resistance hot water heater with ENERGY STAR Electric Heat Pump Water Heater 	
ENERGY STAR Tankless Natural Gas Hot Water Heaters	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ENERGY STAR Tankless Natural Gas Water Heater 0.82 EF or greater with Electronic Ignition High Efficiency Indirect Water Heater attached to a natural gas ENERGY STAR qualified boiler (85% AFUE or greater) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of an operating hot water heater 	

Qualifying Measures and Requirements for 4.99%

Measure	HES	Efficiency Requirements	Additional Criteria	Other
ENERGY STAR Central Air System	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must meet or exceed: 14.5 SEER, 12 EER 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of an operating Central Air Conditioning system Participate in Energy Efficiency Fund High Efficiency Heating and Cooling System Rebate Must meet the Energy Efficiency Fund Quality Installation and Verification Program criteria 	
ENERGY STAR Air to Air Heat Pump	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must meet or exceed: 14.5 SEER, 12 EER, 8.2 HSPF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of an operating electric resistant heat, electric furnace or air to air heat pump system Participate in Energy Efficiency Fund High Efficiency Heating and Cooling System Rebate Must meet the Energy Efficiency Fund Quality Installation and Verification Program criteria 	
ENERGY STAR Natural Gas Furnaces and Boilers	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Furnace: AHRI rated 92% AFUE with Air Handler Performance Level EAE of 2% or lower Boiler: 90% AFUE or greater with temperature reset or purge control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of an operating heating system 	
Windows (Natural Gas and Electric heated homes only)	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must have: ENERGY STAR U-factor < or = 0.30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must replace single-pane (no storm) windows Applies to existing window(s) part of the primary building envelope only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basement and attic windows (in unheated areas) do not qualify Garage windows (in unheated areas) do not qualify

Qualifying Measures and Requirements for Market Rate¹-(CL&P Customers only)

Measure	HES	Efficiency Requirements	Additional Criteria	Other
High Efficiency Insulation (Oil or Propane heated homes)	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ceilings with less than R-30 insulation must install a minimum of R-19 and the final R-value of the ceiling must be equal or greater than R-38 Walls that have no insulation or an R-value of 4 or less must install a minimum of R-13 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insulation applies to above grade walls or ceilings as part of the homes conditioned envelope Basement ceilings, below grade walls, or insulation installed within interior walls do not qualify Accepted insulation materials: fiberglass batts, blown-fiberglass, cellulose, dense pack cellulose, spray foam or rigid foam or rigid spray foam products 	
ENERGY STAR Oil or Propane Furnaces and Boilers	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oil Furnace: 85% AFUE with Air Handler Performance Level EAE of 2% or lower Propane Furnace: 92% AFUE with Air Handler Performance Level EAE of 2% or lower Oil Boilers: 85% AFUE with temperature reset or purge control Propane Boiler: 90% AFUE with temperature reset or purge control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacement of an operating oil, propane, or electric resistance furnace or boiler system 	
Geothermal Systems	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> GLHP Closed Loop Water to Air 17.1 EER, 3.6 COP DX Direct Expansion Refrigerant 16.0 EER, 3.6 COP Water to Water 16.1 EER, 3.1 COP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Geothermal Prequalification Application must be submitted to the electric utility and approved by the Geothermal Project Coordinator (Visit http://www.cl-p.com/home/saveenergy/rebates/heatpumprebate.aspx for an application) 	
Windows (Oil or Propane heated homes)	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must have: ENERGY STAR U-factor < or = 0.30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Must replace single-pane (no storm) windows Applies to existing window(s) part of the primary building envelope only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basement and attic windows (in unheated areas) do not qualify Garage windows (in unheated areas) do not qualify

¹ The current market rate is 9.25% (June 1, 2011).

The Electric and Natural Gas Companies now offer their entire customer base a broader portfolio of loan options that consists of Fund program offerings and other established loan offerings. The loan programs are summarized below.

Loans for the Residential Sector

1. The Energy Conservation Loan Program (ECL) and the Multifamily Energy Conservation Loan Program (MEL) provide financing at below market rates to single family and multi-family residential property owners for the purchase and installation of cost-saving energy conservation improvements. The program is administered by the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund, Inc. (CHIF) with funding from the Connecticut Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD). Loans are available for Single family (1-4 units) homeowners may borrow up to \$25,000 and multi-family property owners may borrow up to \$2,000 per unit (a maximum of \$60,000 per building) for a period of 10 years for eligible improvements.
2. HES offers subsidized, low interest rate, unsecured loans with on-bill repayment through either utility company capital or Fund capital. CHIF is administering the Residential Loan Program on behalf of the Companies.

Financial/Incentive Strategy Development

In response to the suggestions and direction provided by the Department during recent years, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies have worked closely with the EEB's Residential and C&I Committees to systematically review the C&LM program incentives, finance offerings and assessment of market-driven opportunities for leveraging Fund dollars and enhancing financial offerings under the current program structure. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies continue to work with the EEB and its committees to further develop the C&LM financing strategy by examining other innovations, initiatives, practices, tools and private and public resources. This process is ongoing and is expected to allow the C&LM programs to further develop and enhance the financing options each year. These efforts include:

- ongoing meetings and consultations with the EEB's committees throughout the remainder of 2011 and 2012, recognizing that the revamped financial offerings noted above are just the next step in enhancing program success rates and cost-effectiveness;
- cooperation/coordination with the EEB and other parties to research innovative financial mechanisms, capital investment pools, public and private educational and technical resources, energy service performance contracting, positive cash-flow financial mechanisms, energy service agreements, etc.; and
- utilization of national and regional experts in innovative financing for energy-efficiency and load management.

It is anticipated that these ongoing efforts will allow the C&LM programs to continue to improve and enhance its programs and financial offerings, noted above. The Companies and the EEB will periodically report to the Department on the progress of this effort and solicit its input.

C&LM Financing - Small Business/Municipal Loan Program (Electric & Gas)

Objective:

The objective of the Electric Companies' C&LM Financing program is to provide attractive financing options to a broader base of the C&I sector that includes small businesses and municipalities, enabling those customers to implement cost-effective energy efficiency projects in conjunction with the existing incentive offerings.

Target Market:

The primary target market consists of two distinct groups of commercial and industrial customers: small businesses and municipalities within the Electric Companies' service territories. Electric and gas energy efficient improvements are eligible for financing. The Companies have modified their definition of "small business" in order to increase service to smaller mid-size customers. The Companies define small businesses as those customer accounts that experience a 12-month average peak demand of up to 200 kW as the maximum criteria. Municipal customers are a well-defined group that includes all of the accounts paid for by municipal governments.

Program Description:

Many obstacles must be addressed en route to educating these customers as to the benefits of energy efficiency. These obstacles include financial limitations, time constraints, decision-making policies, and a general lack of awareness of the benefits of energy-efficient measures. Offering a financing option such as this program to qualified customers mitigates some of these obstacles, allowing customers to participate and enhance their operations by reducing energy costs.

This financing program is designed to supplement the existing incentive structures by offering interest-free financing to small businesses and municipalities, as ordered by the Department in its May 28, 2003 Decision in Docket No. 03-01-01. This mechanism enables the Electric Companies to offer financing to qualifying customers in an aggregate amount greater than would be possible if only Fund revenues were used as the source of funds.

The Electric Companies provide the capital to make loans to customers and charge the Fund only for certain costs related to the financing. First, the Fund is the source of interest payments, which are made to the Electric Companies on the aggregate principal amount of loans outstanding at an annual rate equal to each of the Companies' weighted cost of capital. For purposes of this program, the applicable interest rate for new loans is reviewed from time to time (at least once a year) and adjusted as appropriate. Second, unlike other financing programs that would terminate electric services for nonpayment of loans, the Fund is also used to compensate the Companies for any defaulted and charged-off loans. The amount of such compensation is limited to the outstanding principal balance of the customer's loan.

The Electric Companies have received the Department's approval, under CGS §16-43(b), to lend monies to qualified customers on the terms and conditions described in the section headed "Incentive Strategy" below, including the provision of loans with repayment periods of one year or more.

Marketing Strategy:

The C&LM Financing program is marketed to eligible small business and municipal customers through marketing channels that are currently used in other Fund programs. The primary marketing techniques involve direct customer contact.

Incentive Strategy:

The Electric Companies offer a combination of incentives and interest-free financing that facilitate reduction of the customer's share of project costs. The interest-free finance payments are billed to customers as a line item on their electric bills.

The terms and conditions of the C&LM Financing program include the following:

1. Maximum cumulative amount outstanding (between small businesses and municipality projects) is \$30 million over three years for CL&P projects and \$7.5 million over three years (beginning Sept. 2, 2009) for UI projects.
2. Maximum term for loans is 48 months.
3. The maximum dollar amount eligible for financing is \$100,000 per project for both CL&P and UI projects. It should be noted that the Companies also utilize capping criteria based on a gross maximum dollar amount for total amounts financed per municipality.
4. The minimum dollar amount eligible for financing is \$500 per project. If the amount is less than \$500, it defaults to a one-time receivable.
5. The Electric Companies provide the capital for funding principal for the loan.
6. Interest is paid to the Electric Companies at the Department-approved weighted average cost of capital from Fund monies.

Goals:

The primary goal of this program is to provide small business financing to a broader base of C&I customers while achieving the same customer response as was achieved with the previous program offerings. For municipal customers specifically, the goal is to create general awareness and acceptance of this program. Controls are in place to ensure the amount of outstanding loans in any given year will not exceed the maximum cumulative outstanding balance as noted above nor exceed one-third of the Electric Companies' total Fund budget.

New Program Issues:

Municipalities that participate in current C&LM retrofit programs are eligible for financing, provided they meet the qualifications. In response to the Department's request, the Electric Companies addressed the legal issues surrounding the financing proposal in briefs submitted to the Department on Oct. 1, 2003.

The Companies have incorporated gas measures for 2012 and are working on offering the zero percent (0%) financing or "on-bill" repayment for those measures. In addition to the electric measure financing already offered.

There exist a couple of options for implementing on - bill financing for combined gas and electric measures. The first option is one we feel is the most practical. It allows the EDCs to provide on - bill repayment installments for both the electric and gas measures on the electric bill and then "charge back" the costs for the cost of the measures, the interest rate buy down and any loan defaults to the gas utilities. This first option is similar in methodology to that which was approved by the DPUC for Residential financing in its final decision under Docket #10-10-03. A second option is to create two loans for one project, one loan for the electric portion and one for the gas. This option may be confusing to customers by having one project summary document with two loans. In addition, there are logistical issues when the companies are not owned by the same parent company. As an example, CL&P can create an on-bill loan for CL&P and YGS; However, CL&P cannot create an on-bill loan for CL&P and CNG or SCG). UI is in the same situation when serving the customer that utilizes Yankee gas in its territory. It should be noted that in Massachusetts, the EDCs have been proceeding with a similar methodology with a relatively small list of prescriptive type measures. The electric utility pays the entire incentive and then invoices or "charges back" the gas company for its prescriptive incentive. Then the electric utility invoices the company for the entire customer balance (electric and gas customer costs). The electric utility does not charge the gas utility for the interest rate buy-down on the gas portion and the electric energy efficiency fund assumes the entire default rate risk.

Customers that do not qualify for interest-free financing through the SBEA program now may be eligible for alternative financing options through a third-party vendor. These financing options are generally expected to take the form of zero or low-interest rate loans.

Company Issues:

In addition to the municipal and small business sectors, the Electric Companies will continue extending financing to larger qualified C&I customers who participate in current C&LM retrofit programs in 2012. (The section on "New Program Issues" for C&I Energy Efficiency Financing program provides specifics.)

UI Specific Issues:

For 2012, the Company plans on modifying its financing eligibility requirements for the larger projects. The planned modification will require customers seeking loan amounts greater than \$45,000 and loan terms of 48 months to be verified through an external resource such as Dunn & Bradstreet. This plan will further protect the SBEA program and the fund from increased occurrences of delinquency.

C&LM Financing - C&I Energy Efficiency Financing Program (Electric & Gas)

Objective:

The objective of the C&I Energy Efficiency Financing program is to provide third-party financing for customers who would otherwise find it difficult to fund energy-efficient measures.

Target Market:

Commercial, manufacturing and industrial electric customers operating within the last three years and having a 12-month peak demand averaging greater than 10 kW are the target market groups. In addition to be eligible for financing any gas measures, a customer needs to be a firm gas customer. Financing is available for projects that include either gas or electric energy efficient measures or both. Customers utilizing fossil fuels other than natural gas would only be eligible for electric incentives.

Program Description:

Existing industrial, manufacturing and commercial businesses operating within the Electric and Natural Gas Companies' (the "Companies") combined service territories are eligible for this program. To qualify, an industrial/manufacturing customer must have had an average monthly demand greater than 10 kW the past 12 months. Businesses must have been in existence for three years and qualify through a third party business credit review.

Qualified customer projects are eligible for interest-free third-party loans ranging from a minimum of \$2,000 to a maximum of \$100,000 for energy-efficient retrofits and / or equipment replacements. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies will continually evaluate these amounts based on program participation, customer need and cost effectiveness. Application requirements are made through account executives, program administrators, the customer, or the customer's contractor. The Companies provide program support and quality assurance throughout the process. Customers may receive loans of up to \$100,000, with low interest-rates from 5 - 10 percent in addition to the EEF-calculated program incentive are also offered to customers. However, the total subsidy is capped at 112.5 percent of the calculated incentive. The term for this loan is limited to five years. A blended-rate loan is available to customers if they choose to accept the Energy Efficiency Fund-calculated program incentive for finance amounts between the \$100,000 limit (subsidized) and up to \$250,000 (unsubsidized).

A third party provides loans and assumes all risks associated with repayment. The subsidized interest portion of the loan is funded by a Fund contribution (included as a program budget line item) that buys down the interest rate to below market rates. This program is not applicable to new construction or major renovation projects, federal projects, or SBEA (and Municipal) projects that qualify and accept interest-free financing under the Companies' existing C&LM financing program. It should be noted that if an SBEA or Municipal project were on an "incentive only" basis and did not proceed with the C&LM

Small Business and Municipal Loan program financing offering, such a project would be eligible to pursue this loan offering in which case the interest rate for the loan would either be 0 percent or a low rate. The maximum loan payment period is five years, or 60 months (based on a simple payback).

Marketing Strategy:

This program seeks to encourage a higher market penetration of energy-efficient equipment by providing financing designed to supplement other program incentives for C&I customers. Eligible customers involved with Fund C&I programs will be advised of loan participation requirements upon qualification of their intended conservation projects.

New Program Issues:

In addition to the Municipal and Small Business sectors, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies are looking to extend financing to larger qualified C&I customers who participate in current C&LM retrofit programs in 2012. Financing for these customers would be via one or more third parties or other sources of capital, with the Companies offering a subsidized low-interest or zero- interest-rate buy-down or subsidy funded by the Fund. This financing option would only be available for eligible retrofit or equipment-replacement projects. The companies plan to issue an RFP in late 2011 for the 2012 - 2013 program years.

Eligibility guidelines for this type of loan are as follows:

1. The project must meet eligibility criteria for Energy Opportunities, Operation and Maintenance or Energy Conscious Blueprint programs.
2. State, municipal or small business projects not qualifying for other Fund financing or initiatives are eligible.
3. Any Federal, State, or Municipal project not qualifying for or not involved with an Energy Savings Performance Contract.
4. The loan must not be for a new construction or major renovation project.

The Companies are investigating ways to expand the loan offering which allows customers implementing natural gas measures to take advantage of the C&I Financing option.

In addition, the Companies also plan to explore options to close the gap between the current third party maximum threshold for loans of \$250,000 and the \$1 million loan option available through the Department. One way to achieve this could be by working through an additional third-party lender or lenders who would provide this increased financing to bridge the gap because the Companies do not typically see a high volume of loans in this dollar range. Such projects are normally addressed on a case-by-case basis. This will be addressed in the RFP which is planned to be issued in late 2011.

Residential Energy Efficiency Financing (Electric and Natural Gas)

Objective:

The Residential Energy Efficiency Financing offered for 2012 utilizes successes learned from the pilot loan program that was offered in 2010 - 2011. The new loan program approved by PURA was developed through a collaborative process between the Companies and the EEB Consultants. These low interest rate loans finance both electric and gas energy efficient measures.

The Electric and Natural Gas Companies developed a pilot loan program for residential customers that began June 1, 2010 and ceased May 31, 2011 with the objective of providing third-party financing to encourage homeowners to install energy efficient home improvements to achieve deeper energy savings.

The Companies began offering their new approved financing programs on June 1, 2011 with the objective of providing convenient repayment options and low interest rate financing to homeowners installing energy efficient home improvements. The financing programs that the Companies are offering are more cost effective to the Fund than the pilot program that ran through May 31, 2011.

Target Market:

Participants in the HES program, with an emphasis on HES—Home Performance participants who wish to upgrade their homes with energy efficient improvements.

Program Description:

The financing program offered for 2012 implements a number of improvements over the pilot program that was offered in 2010 -2011. In particular, the new loan program utilizes the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund more cost effectively than the pilot loan program.

The pilot loan program offered low interest rate financing (2.99 percent for projects from \$2,000 to \$6,999 and 0 percent for projects from \$7,000 to \$20,000) for qualifying residential energy efficiency projects. The program offered unsecured, third party loans through AFC First Financial Corporation ("AFC") and was introduced to the HES vendors and an existing group of qualified AFC contractors on June 1, 2010. The source of capital to AFC for these residential loans was Fannie Mae, whose applicable interest rate was 14.99 percent. The Companies used the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund to buy down the interest rate to either zero percent or 2.99 percent through April 2011, then 2.99 percent and 4.99 percent from April through May 31, 2011. While the cost of the interest rate buy-down was expensive, the pilot loan program was very successful in attracting a large number of homeowners who implemented energy efficiency measures and improved vendor project recommendation success rates. The Companies attribute some of the high volume of the loan program to the HES and non-HES vendors who used the loan program successfully and made it part of their sales process. The pilot

program offered streamlined loan processing that made it easy for homeowners and vendors to participate, achieving one of the major objectives of the pilot.

Measures allowed for the pilot financing program included a broad array of upgrades that included central air conditioning, replacement heating systems, insulation, heat pumps, and hot-water heaters. Fannie Mae assumed the risks associated with repayment. The Electric and Natural Gas Companies provided program support and quality assurance.

Throughout the pilot loan program year the Companies, in conjunction with the EEB, assessed and researched other financing opportunities hoping to secure an option that would result in more cost-effective programs. The Companies also worked closely with the EEB Consultants to ensure that approved measures qualifying for Fund subsidy have effective energy efficiency savings. Some of the financed measures that were approved under the pilot program are no longer allowed under the new Residential Financing program.

As of June 1, 2011, CL&P provided \$6 million of 2010 Fund carry-over to CEEFCO. CEEFCO, a 501(c)(3) Special Purpose Entity, was set-up to administer the loan program and leverage Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund monies to attract private capital and make a sustainable financing model into the future. CHIF will provide all necessary services to CEEFCO. The unsecured, subsidized loans are being offered for approved measures at 2.99% and 4.99%, while energy efficiency upgrades for oil or propane are set at market rate. Loans are made between \$2,500 and \$20,000 and borrowers have the option of choosing to repay CHIF directly or to repay their loan on their utility bill.

As of June 1, 2011 UI is making the unsecured, subsidized residential loans for the approved measures, using utility capital, at the same to 2.99% and 4.99% but are not currently offering any financing for oil or propane improvements. All UI residential loan borrowers will repay their loans through on-bill repayment.

In 2012, the Companies and the EEB will monitor customer buy-down rates and adjust them accordingly in order to serve more customers and provide financing solutions while utilizing ratepayer dollars to their maximum advantage.

Marketing Strategy:

The programs (pilot program and the new Residential Financing programs offered by the Companies) are aimed at encouraging a higher market penetration of energy-efficiency measures in the residential sector (e.g., insulation, heat pumps, water heaters, boilers and furnaces and AC upgrades) by providing financing that supplements the HES incentives. Customer interest will be generated through the creation and distribution of marketing materials and by briefing vendors on the program benefits.

New Program Issues:

The estimated loan volume in the new loan program has not been realized. The Companies believe the low loan volume is a result of the changes to the measures that can be financed in the new program. The approved measures for the new financing program properly incent the home owner to make the most cost effective, deeper energy efficient improvements to their home.

Public Act 11-80 calls for residential customers who heat with electricity to be able to finance and receive incentives to help switch to energy efficient natural gas or fuel oil furnaces and boilers.

The Companies are poised to collaborate with DEEP to establish a program that would promote and encourage residents to choose energy efficient heating equipment.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Residential Loan Fund (Includes ECLP)

All dollar values are in \$000

Budget Projections	2009 Actuals	2010 Actuals	Revised 2011 Budget	2011 YTD (Jun)	2011 YE Projected	2012 Budget	2013 Budget
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ 33	\$ 35	\$ 35
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 3
Total Labor	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ 30	\$ -	\$ 33	\$ 38	\$ 38
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ -	\$ 18,560 b)	\$ 3,120	\$ 2,410	\$ 3,406	\$ 2,013 a)	\$ 2,135
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administration	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ -	\$ 18,570	\$ 3,150	\$ 2,412	\$ 3,441	\$ 2,051	\$ 2,173

a) Includes subsidies to buy-down interest rates as well as the Energy Conscious Loan Program with the Connecticut Housing Investment Fund (CHIF) and Neighbor-to-Neighbor (N2N) costs of \$152K (\$452K over three years)

b) Includes \$15M reserve for Residential Financing Program (addressed in Docket 10-10-03-RE01)

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Residential Loan Fund (Include ECLP)

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 9,950	\$ 28,614	\$ 12,976	\$ 28,614	\$ 30,045	\$ 31,547
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 9,950	\$ 28,614	\$ 12,976	\$ 28,614	\$ 30,045	\$ 31,547
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ 417,814	\$ 560,473	\$ 216,478	\$ 400,000	\$ 317,235	\$ 297,208
Administrative Expenses	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 427,764	\$ 589,087	\$ 229,454	\$ 428,614	\$ 347,280	\$ 328,755

This page intentionally blank

ISO-NE Load Response Program (Electric)

Objective:

The objective of the Electric Companies' ISO-NE Load Response ("Load Response") program is to provide support, financing and technical assistance to facilitate customer participation in the ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market (FCM) via various ISO-NE programs such as: ISO-NE Demand Response Program, Day Ahead Load Response Program (DALRP) and Real-Time Price Response program. Customers who elect to participate in Real-Time Price Response are currently restricted from participating in the FCM by ISO-NE. The Demand Response program mandates load curtailments from customers who enroll and provides enhanced system reliability during peak system load conditions. The Price Response program helps to mitigate high Locational Marginal Prices throughout the year.

Target Market:

C&I customers and their affiliates capable of reducing their peak demand by a minimum 100 kW of load, either at a single site or in the aggregate for multiple facilities, are eligible for the program. The Demand Response portion of the program is accepting new enrollments to the Forward Capacity Market ("FCM") to maintain our current commitments.

Program Description:

Enrollment in the Load Response program peaked in 2009 following significant growth fueled by supplemental capacity payments provided for by the Energy Independence Act of 2005. Among the many changes and challenges brought about by the FCM was the realization that many customers would not be economically viable participants in the Load Response program in 2010 and beyond.

The primary impact from the transition to the FCM is the price of capacity. The FCM is a forward looking market, and auctions have already been held for 2012, 2013, and 2014. As a result of this competitive auction process, the price of capacity has been driven down and in 2012 customers can expect to receive approximately \$35 per kW per year. The FCM also limits the amount of emergency generation capacity that may be purchased by ISO-NE, further reducing payment for those customers to \$30 per kW per year. Additionally, in 2012 the *Reserve Margin Gross-up* once paid to Demand Resources to compensate them for avoided Reserve Requirement costs will be eliminated by ISO-NE. Other impacts from the FCM include complex measurement, performance, availability and settlement rules that adversely impact customers

Marketing Strategy:

The Companies promote the Load Response program through customer seminars as required and also engage customers through direct sales and service calls. Follow-up meetings to review detailed customer load analysis are also employed. These targeted customer outreach efforts assist in

minimizing attrition but do not yield significant growth. The reason for those customers willing to continue to participate in the Load Response program is for corporate goodwill and the desire to maintain grid reliability. A focus of message will need to transition from one of incentives to that of corporate and social responsibility.

Incentive Strategy:

Under the Load Response program, capacity payments are provided by ISO-NE through the FCM. The Electric Companies expect the program to continue to be funded out of FCM revenues.

UI Specific Issues:

Since June 1, 2010, UI operated this program as a market-based program subject to the terms of ISO-NE Market Rule 1. As of January 1, 2012, UI will operate the Load Response Program as part of its existing Energy Efficiency Fund program offerings. Funding for this program is provided by revenues received from the Forward Capacity Market. UI will use the revenues from the FCM to pay for customer incentives (for participation and response to ISO-NE Demand Response Events), ISO-NE data telemetry requirements, marketing, and administrative labor associated with the program. The program will be managed by existing C&LM personnel and will be administered subject to the regulations described in ISO-NE Market Rule 1.

UI is closely monitoring additional changes to the FCM currently being considered by ISO-NE. These changes are a result of FERC Order 745, which requires RTO's to allow Demand Response Resources to receive full Locational Margin Price payments for participation in the Day Ahead and Real-Time Energy Markets. ISO-NE has interpreted FERC directives in this Order as a mandate to require all Demand Response Resources with a commitment in the FCM to participate in the ISO-NE Energy Markets. This decision will subject Demand Response Resources to further risks and penalties previously incurred only by Generation Resources. This will also result in Demand Response Resources being dispatched based on clearing price rather than during electric system emergencies.

CL&P Specific Issues

Since June 1, 2010, CL&P has operated this program as part of the existing Load Response program in its Energy Efficiency Fund program offerings. However, the revenues needed to fund this program now come from the Forward Capacity Market. CL&P will use the revenues from the FCM to pay for customer incentives (for participation and response to ISO-NE Demand Response Events), Internet-based communication system services, marketing, and administrative labor associated with the program. The program will be managed by the existing C&LM personnel and will be administered subject to the regulations described in ISO-NE Market Rule 1.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Load Management

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 89	\$ 241	\$ 500	\$ 226	\$ 500	\$ 342	\$ 342
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 92	\$ 173	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 94	\$ 94
Total Labor	\$ 89	\$ 332	\$ 673	\$ 226	\$ 500	\$ 435	\$ 435
Materials & Supplies	\$ 1	\$ 0	\$ 5	\$ 1	\$ 6	\$ 5	\$ 4
Outside Services	\$ 52	\$ 457	\$ 1,000	\$ 385	\$ 800	\$ 743 a)	\$ 637
Incentives (Supplemental Payments)	\$ (43)	\$ 2,071	\$ 1,300	\$ 2,207	\$ 2,997	\$ 2,295 b) c)	\$ 1,967
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10 d)	\$ 9
Administrative Expenses	\$ 3	\$ 2	\$ 12	\$ 7	\$ 17	\$ 12 e)	\$ 10
Other	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 6	\$ 12	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 103	\$ 2,864	\$ 3,000	\$ 2,833	\$ 4,332	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,062

- a) Includes communications software usage fees and meter maintenance fees.
- b) Incentives (Supplemental payments) are for Demand Response, offset by ISO-NE Transition Period Payments. ISO-NE Transition Period and ISO-NE ODR Payments are increasing, offsetting more of program costs.
- c) Incentives paid to customers for facility upgrades that help enable load response.
- d) Dollars for providing the participants with the latest program information and refresher training.
- e) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	100,000
Annual Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Electric b/c Ratio	1.0
Total Resource b/c Ratio	1.0

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Load Management

Program Costs

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget	\$/MW
2000	\$1,799,000	\$ 2,750,000	153%	
2001	\$1,270,000	\$ 2,750,000	217%	
2002	\$1,908,000	\$ 1,722,000	90%	n/a
2003	\$2,805,000	\$ 2,437,000	87%	n/a
2004	\$ 350,000	\$ 140,000	40%	n/a
2005 Revised	\$2,513,893	\$ 102,909	4%	\$1,694
2006 Revised	\$1,400,000	\$ 1,241,601	89%	\$52,664
2007 Revised	\$1,483,167	\$ 456,000	31%	\$28,500
2008 Revised	\$ 480,000	\$ 456,025	95%	\$26,369
2009 Revised	\$ 350,000	\$ 102,909	29%	\$7,916
2010 Revised	\$6,000,000	\$ 2,864,264	48%	\$24,185
2011 Revised	\$3,000,000	n/a	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	\$ 2,833,144	47%	\$34,977
2011 Y/E Projected	\$3,000,000	\$ 4,332,037	72%	\$43,320
2012	\$1,700,000	n/a	n/a	n/a

/CT Goal - MW Enrollment

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	20	17	85%

WCT Goal - MW Enrollment

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	20	25	125%

Statewide Goal - MW Enrollment

Year	Budget	Actual	% of Budget
2004	16	29.9	187%
2005 Revised	10	61	608%
2006 Revised	32	24	74%
2007 Revised	20	16	80%
2008 Revised	10	17	173%
2009 Revised	10	13	130%
2010 Revised	180	118	66%
2011 Revised	110	n/a	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	81	74%
2011 Y/E Projected	110	100	91%
2012	100	n/a	n/a

Program Ratios

Year	i/Lifetime kWh		\$/Annualized kW	
	Plan	Actual	Plan	Actual
2002	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2003	n/a	n/a	\$70	\$58
2004	n/a	n/a	\$22	\$5
2005 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$251	\$2
2006 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$32	n/a
2007 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$74	n/a
2008 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$32	n/a
2009 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$32	n/a
2010 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$32	n/a
2011 Revised	n/a	n/a	\$32	n/a
2011 YTD (Jun)	n/a	n/a	\$32	35
2011 Y/E Projected	n/a	n/a	\$32	43
2012	n/a	n/a	\$32	n/a

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

CL&P Program Notes - Load Management

Budget / (FTE)
2.5 FTE for Program Administration

Goal
Not applicable.

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)
Not applicable.

Goal Setting Methodology
Not applicable.

Metric Changes
Not applicable.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

ISO-NE Response Program Support

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor		
UI Labor	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 125,000	\$ 125,000
Materials & Supplies	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000
Outside Services	\$ 351,000 a)	\$ 276,000
Incentives	\$ 878,000 b)	\$ 677,000
Marketing	\$ 10,000 c)	\$ 10,000
Other	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 7,000 d)	\$ 7,000
 Total	 \$ 1,376,000	 \$ 1,100,000

- a) Includes communications software usage fees and meter maintenance fees
- b) Incentives paid to customers
- c) Providing the participants with latest program information and refresher training
- d) Employee expenses including mileage, training and conference attendance.

Goals and Metrics Information:
Savings

Demand Savings (kW)	34,000
Cost per kW	\$ 40

Research, Development and Demonstration (Electric)

Objective:

The objective of the joint-utility Research, Development and Demonstration (“RD&D”) program is the advancement of new energy-efficiency measures and more cost-effective and efficient renewable energy technologies. The program is one in which the Electric Companies jointly participate.

Target Market:

At present the RD&D program is not in a position to accommodate any new clients, since its mandate is currently limited to energy-saving and distributed resource RD&D projects funded in previous years. No new projects will be funded in 2012. However, limited funding may become available for continuation of previously funded RD&D projects.

Program Description:

The RD&D program currently provides engineering and marketing support for previously funded RD&D projects to help them acquire alternative funding, review their reports, and help commercialize their projects to whatever extent possible.

The RD&D program provides on- going technical support of the EEB Roadmap Process, under which new products or technologies submitted to the EEB are evaluated for consideration of their potential inclusion in an existing Fund program. The RD&D program reviews and assesses the feasibility, appropriateness, potential effectiveness and cost effectiveness of each proposed new product or technology and makes resultant recommendations to the EEB. Such reviews are prepared by the RD&D program staff, with input from utility program administrators, EEB consultants, and others as may be appropriate. Review oversight is provided by the RD&D program’s Policy Working Group.

Goals:

The goal of the RD&D program is to maximize prior-year investments of RD&D project funding and assist with leveraging of additional funding from other sources for follow-up development and/or commercialization activities.

A second goal of the RD&D program is to provide timely technical reviews of new products or technologies proposed for consideration of their potential for inclusion in an existing Fund program.

A third goal of the RD&D program is to provide technical support and liaison associated with special projects involving new energy efficient technologies.

New Program Issues:

The 2012 RD&D program funding level does not accommodate the RFP solicitation of new energy-saving or distributed resource projects for project funding consideration.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Research, Development and Demonstration

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 73	\$ 98	\$ 74	\$ 50	\$ 100	\$ 73 a)	\$ 73
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 73	\$ 98	\$ 74	\$ 50	\$ 100	\$ 73	\$ 73
Marketing and Materials	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ 2	\$ -	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 2
Outside Services	\$ 1	\$ 0	\$ 119	\$ 0	\$ 106	\$ 270 b)	\$ 270
Fees and Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expense	\$ 2	\$ 4	\$ 5	\$ 2	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5
Other	\$ 0	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 75	\$ 102	\$ 200	\$ 52	\$ 213	\$ 350	\$ 350

a) NU Labor in support of the following activities:

Technical review support of the EEB Roadmap Process;
Administration of monthly RD&D Program Policy Working Group (PWG) Meetings;
Technical reviews of new energy efficiency products submitted to C&LM for consideration under existing approved programs;
Participation with external technical working groups associated with emerging technologies, e.g., heat pump water heaters; LED lighting, etc
Technical liaison with external and internal agencies, e.g. Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI); U.S. DOE's National Labs;
Consortium for Energy Efficiency (CEE); Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA); Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnerships (NEEP);
NU's Asset Management Department; NU's Enterprise Planning Department, etc.

b) Engineering consultant(s) due diligence reviews & site visits as required;

Anticipated continuation of one or more previously approved RD&D projects - subject to RD&D Program Staff, and Policy Working Group (PWG) review, recommendation and EEB funding approval.

2012 Goals and Metrics Information - The RD&D Program does not have a kW or kWh savings metric.

Demand Savings (kW Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Energy Savings (KWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Lifetime Energy Savings (kWh Reduction Goal)	N/A
Annual Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/kWh)	N/A
Electric b/c Ratio	N/A
Total Resource b/c Ratio	N/A

Note: The goal is to maximize prior-year investments of RD&D project funding, and assist with leveraging additional funding from other sources for follow-on development and/or commercialization activities.

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Research, Development and Demonstration

Not a goal based program.

CL&P Program Notes - Research, Development and Demonstration

Budget / (FTE)

0.5 FTE for program administration of Research, Development and Demonstration activities

Goal

To maximize prior-year investments of RD&D project funding, and assist with leveraging funding from other sources for follow-on development and/or commercialization
To provide on-going technical review support of the Energy Efficiency Board (EEB) Roadmap process. Technical reviews are provided for evaluation of new products or are submitted to the EEB for consideration of their potential for inclusion in an existing
To provide on-going technical review support for new products or technologies that are submitted directly to C&LM for consideration of their potential for inclusion in an existing C&LM

Cost/kWh (Cost/Unit)

Not applicable.

Goal Setting Methodology

Not applicable.

Metric Changes

Not applicable.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Research, Development & Demonstration

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ 193,877	\$ 125,000	\$ 10,340	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 193,877	\$ 125,000	\$ 10,340	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Administration

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 709	\$ 751	\$ 765	\$ 389	\$ 820	\$ 759 a)	\$ 759
Contractor Staff	\$ 1	\$ 22	\$ 44	\$ 33	\$ 47	\$ 90	\$ 90
Total Labor	\$ 710	\$ 773	\$ 809	\$ 423	\$ 867	\$ 849	\$ 849
Materials & Supplies	\$ 2	\$ 6	\$ 8	\$ 4	\$ 9	\$ 4	\$ 4
Outside Services	\$ 12	\$ 32	\$ -	\$ 7	\$ 14	\$ -	\$ -
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ -	\$ -
Administration	\$ 10	\$ 11	\$ 53	\$ 8	\$ 57	\$ 30 c)	\$ 30
Other	\$ 14	\$ 12	\$ 30	\$ 5	\$ 17	\$ 17 b)	\$ 17
Total	\$ 748	\$ 836	\$ 900	\$ 447	\$ 965	\$ 900	\$ 900

a) Budget includes Business Management FTE's.

b) Budget includes industry association expenses and sponsorship fees.

c) Employee expenses including mileage, training, conference attendance and misc.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Administration

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	2011 <u>Revised Bud</u>	2011 <u>YTD (June)</u>	2011 <u>YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 544,738	\$ 603,103	\$ 264,111	\$ 573,103	\$ 643,268	\$ 675,431
Contractor Staff	\$ 4,440	\$ -	\$ 16,606	\$ 30,000	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 549,178	\$ 603,103	\$ 280,717	\$ 603,103	\$ 643,268	\$ 675,431
Materials & Supplies	\$ 37,241	\$ 2,500	\$ 6,260	\$ 6,260	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500
Outside Services	\$ 136,109	\$ 35,332	\$ 13,435	\$ 27,473	\$ 98,532	\$ 98,532
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 2,656	\$ -	\$ 1,373	\$ 1,373	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ 11,113	\$ -	\$ 2,726	\$ 2,726	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 5,386	\$ 5,700	\$ 4,825	\$ 5,700	\$ 5,700	\$ 5,700
Total	\$ 741,683	\$ 646,635	\$ 309,336	\$ 646,635	\$ 750,000	\$ 782,163

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Planning

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 491	\$ 499	\$ 627	\$ 276	\$ 628	\$ 579	\$ 579
Contractor Staff	\$ 2	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 5
Total Labor	\$ 493	\$ 503	\$ 627	\$ 276	\$ 628	\$ 585	\$ 585
Materials & Supplies	\$ 3	\$ 3	\$ 6	\$ 0	\$ 7	\$ 6	\$ 6
Outside Services	\$ 83	\$ 47	\$ -	\$ (11)	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 20
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 4	\$ 12	\$ -	\$ 25	\$ 25	\$ -	\$ -
Administration	\$ 12	\$ 8	\$ 8	\$ 3	\$ 8	\$ 19	\$ 19
Other	\$ 25	\$ 1	\$ 9	\$ 21	\$ 9	\$ 20	\$ 20
Total	\$ 619	\$ 573	\$ 650	\$ 314	\$ 678	\$ 650	\$ 650

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Planning & Evaluation

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 284,095	\$ 303,402	\$ 149,066	\$ 303,402	\$ 311,348	\$ 326,915
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 284,095	\$ 303,402	\$ 149,066	\$ 303,402	\$ 311,348	\$ 326,915
Materials & Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Outside Services	\$ 244,673	\$ 430,000	\$ 79,485	\$ 430,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ 4,502	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ 750	\$ 750	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ -	\$ 5,417	\$ -	\$ 4,667	\$ 5,417	\$ 5,417
Total	\$ 534,020	\$ 738,819	\$ 229,301	\$ 738,819	\$ 886,765	\$ 902,332

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Evaluation

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 98	\$ 70	\$ 116	\$ 56	\$ 96	\$ 194	\$ 194
Contractor Staff	\$ 36	\$ 36	\$ 53	\$ 27	\$ 44	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 133	\$ 107	\$ 169	\$ 83	\$ 141	\$ 194	\$ 194
Materials & Supplies	\$ 25	\$ 1	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5
Outside Services	\$ 838	\$ 1,371	\$ 1,616	\$ 209	\$ 1,345	\$ 1,801	\$ 1,801
Incentives	\$ -		\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administration	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 5	\$ 0	\$ 4	\$ 5	\$ 5
Other	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 5	\$ 108	\$ 4	\$ 5	\$ 5
Total	\$ 999	\$ 1,481	\$ 1,800	\$ 400	\$ 1,499	\$ 2,010	\$ 2,010

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

Information Technology

All dollar values are in \$000

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2009 Actuals</u>	<u>2010 Actuals</u>	<u>Revised 2011 Budget</u>	<u>2011 YTD (Jun)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Budget</u>	<u>2013 Budget</u>
Labor:							
NU Labor	\$ 418	\$ 406	\$ 745	\$ 261	\$ 772	\$ 550 a)	\$ 550
Contractor Staff	\$ 68	\$ 9	\$ -	\$ 9	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 486	\$ 415	\$ 745	\$ 271	\$ 772	\$ 550	\$ 550
Materials & Supplies	\$ 82	\$ 36	\$ 200	\$ 29	\$ 191	\$ 200	\$ 200
Outside Services	\$ 662	\$ 1,349	\$ 675	\$ 595	\$ 699	\$ 870 b)	\$ 870
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administration	\$ 39	\$ 10	\$ 80	\$ 1	\$ 83	\$ 80 c)	\$ 80
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,269	\$ 1,811	\$ 1,700	\$ 897	\$ 1,745	\$ 1,700	\$ 1,700

a) Includes NU IT labor support charged to C&LM for Day-to-day support of desktop hardware and operating system software, including problem resolution and repairs. Also includes enhancements to existing applications in response to changing busi computing infrastructure; Development of new applications to support new C&LM programs and reporting requirements. The C&LM Tracking and Reporting Initiative is also included.

b) Includes Vendor support to design/build the IT Initiatives.

c) Includes Vendor support coded as software design/build the IT Initiatives.

The United Illuminating Company
EL-25 Standard Filing Requirement
2012

Information Technology

<u>Budget Projections</u>	<u>2010 Act</u>	<u>2011 Revised Bud</u>	<u>2011 YTD (June)</u>	<u>2011 YE Projected</u>	<u>2012 Bud</u>	<u>2013 Bud</u>
Labor						
UI Labor	\$ 46,842	\$ 48,528	\$ 23,900	\$ 48,528	\$ 49,983	\$ 52,482
Contractor Staff	\$ -	\$ 12,589	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Labor	\$ 46,842	\$ 61,117	\$ 23,900	\$ 48,528	\$ 49,983	\$ 52,482
Materials & Supplies	\$ 76,286	\$ 72,075	\$ 37,146	\$ 72,075	\$ 134,531	\$ 134,531
Outside Services	\$ 157,379	\$ 107,208	\$ 94,540	\$ 119,797	\$ 155,386	\$ 152,887
Incentives	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Marketing	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 125	\$ 125	\$ -	\$ -
Administrative Expenses	\$ 309	\$ 2,600	\$ -	\$ 2,475	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,600
Total	\$ 280,817	\$ 243,000	\$ 155,711	\$ 243,000	\$ 342,500	\$ 342,500

CHAPTER SIX: BENEFIT COST ANALYSIS (Electric and Natural Gas)

Overview

For the 2012 C&LM Plan, the Electric Distribution Companies (EDCs) and Natural Gas Companies (LDCs) have continued to use similar benefit-cost screening tools within the Conservation and Load Management (C&LM) programs. The screening tools include consistent methodologies and the same sources of avoided costs for the all of the avoided costs modeled. The electric and natural gas avoided costs that are used are based on a regional avoided energy supply cost study (“AECS”) completed in 2011 for New England utilities by Synapse Energy Economics¹⁹. The transmission and distribution (electric) avoided costs are based on studies conducted by the Companies in 2009²⁰.

For electric program benefit-cost screening, the avoided costs include energy, generation capacity, distribution, transmission and Demand Reduction Induced Price Effect, or DRIPE²¹. In addition, non-electric benefits, including fossil fuel savings, water, and non-resource benefits are quantified. For natural gas benefit-cost screening, avoided costs include natural gas, as well as other non-natural gas benefits such as water savings.

The EDCs and LDCs use the Connecticut Program Savings Documentation (“PSD”) to document savings assumptions and to highlight 2012 program changes and the results of recent program evaluations. The PSD²² provides engineering estimates, savings algorithms and measure life estimates used by the Companies within their programs. It also reflects the results of evaluations by providing realization rates to “true-up” savings

Use of common cost-effectiveness testing methodologies and savings assumptions allows the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Board (EEB), and others to compare the benefits, costs, and benefit/cost ratios (“BCRs”) of both the EDCs and LDCs on an “apples to apples” basis. All electric and natural gas conservation measures are evaluated within an integrated supply-and-demand planning framework to ensure that the programs are cost-effective and yield positive net benefits to the customers.

¹⁹ Avoided Energy Supply Costs in New England: 2011 Report, July 21, 2011, Synapse Energy Economics, Inc.

²⁰ CL&P values based on *Assessment of Avoided Cost of Transmission and Distribution*, ICF International, October 30, 2009. UI values were based The United Illuminating Company Avoided Transmission & Distribution Study, Black & Veatch, October 27, 2009

²¹ Demand-Reduction-Induced Price Effects, the reduction in prices in the wholesale energy and capacity markets due to the reduction in energy and demand from conservation programs.

²² The Companies’ PSD is filed annually as part of the Electric and Natural Gas Companies’ C&LM Plan. The PSD is a centralized reference of savings (energy, capacity, fossil fuel and other non-electric) assumptions used by the EDCs and LDCs within the programs.

Avoided Energy Supply Cost Study

The majority of the avoided costs used to analyze the cost effectiveness of the efficiency programs have come from a regional avoided energy cost study which was sponsored by program administrators throughout the New England region. This study, *Avoided Energy Supply Costs in New England* (AESC), Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. (Synapse), has been updated on a biennial basis. Starting in 2007 (including 2009 and 2011) Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. provided the studies. In 2011 Synapse was again selected through a competitive bidding process to conduct the study. The results of this study will be used for C&LM benefit cost screening in 2012 and 2013.

For the AESC, the Synapse team modeled Connecticut as three separate geographic electric zones: Norwalk/Stamford region, Southwest Connecticut, and non-Southwest Connecticut. Avoided costs were produced for each of those three zones as well as Connecticut statewide averages. The AESC found that market prices and out-of-market costs varied only slightly across these three sub-areas. Because the values across three zones were found to be nearly identical, the EDCs are using Connecticut statewide average avoided costs. The avoided energy costs from the AESC are approximately 19 percent lower than the comparable values from the last study which was conducted in 2009. The decrease in costs was a combination of lower projected fuel costs and delay in Federal regulation of carbon emissions. The decrease was somewhat offset by higher Renewable Energy Credit (REC) costs.


The avoided capacity costs were increased by about 91 percent from the AESC done in 2009. Consistent with the 2009 study the 2011 AESC ties the avoided demand costs to the time the demand gets bid into the FCM. This increase is primarily due to the extension of floor prices through Forward capacity Auction 6 and increase in projected capacity retirement. The retirements in the 2011 study were estimated at about 3,000 MW between by 2020. This was approximately three times the value in the 2009 study. The AESC also quantified a price reduction benefit associated with energy efficiency. The DRIPE benefit is the reduction of energy and capacity market prices that results from reductions in demand as a result of conservation efforts. The Connecticut energy DRIPE values on average were about 18 percent higher than the 2009 AESC. The change was a result of changes in DRIPE dissipation factor offset by lower wholesale energy. The capacity DRIPE for Connecticut was about 370 percent higher than the 2009 study due to the higher projections in capacity prices and a larger DRIPE dissipation factor. The longer dissipation in capacity DRIPE was based upon a detailed analysis of various factors such as: 1) timing of new capacity additions, 2) timing of existing capacity retirement, 3) elasticity of customer demand, 4) the portion of capacity that Load Serving Entities acquire from the Forward Capacity Market.

Table 1: Avoided Cost Comparison for Connecticut

Avoided Cost Comparison (15 Year Levelized Results, 2011\$)			
	AESC 2009	AESC 2011	% Change
Avoided Energy Costs	\$0.088 /kWh	\$0.072 /kWh	-19%
Avoided Capacity Costs	\$25.15 /kW-yr	\$48.09 /kW-yr	+91%
Avoided energy DRIPE Cost	\$0.015 /kWh	\$0.018 /kWh	+18%
Avoided Capacity DRIPE Cost	\$6.57 / kW-yr	\$30.72 / kW-yr	+370%

The 2011 average avoided cost of natural gas decreased about forty percent from the 2009 AESC. Figure 1 compares the 2011 AESC forecast with the 2009 AESC forecast. The lower avoided natural gas costs are attributed mainly to the forecast of lower Henry Hub natural gas prices.


Figure 1²³: Comparison of Henry Hub Gas Price Forecasts - AESC 2011 vs AESC 2009 (\$2011 \$/MMBtu)



This lower Henry Hub prices were primarily driven by the availability of shale gas resources. The difficulty in forecasting the cost and availability of Shale gas resources led to some disagreement within the study group. In particular, some members of the study group thought that future regulatory costs were not properly accounted for in the Synapse forecast. The natural gas forecast is dependent on the production and cost forecast of shale gas. The graph in Figure 2 shows a comparison between the AESC estimates and other references. Figure 2 shows that the AESC base case is consistent with two of the high price cases from Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2011.

²³AESC Exhibit 1-14

Figure 2²⁴: Comparison of Henry Hub Gas Price Forecasts - AESC 2011 vs AEO 2011 (\$/MMBtu)



Benefit-Cost Tests

For the analysis of the proposed 2012 C&LM Plan programs, the Electric and Natural Gas Companies used the same two tests: the **Utility Cost Test**²⁵ and the **Total Resource Test**. The Utility Cost Test compares the present value of utility-specific program benefits to the “utility cost”, or program cost, of the program. For electric-benefit cost testing, the Utility Cost Test includes electric benefits and electric program costs. For natural gas, the Utility Cost Test compares the value of natural gas benefits with the natural gas program costs.

In the simplest sense, the benefit of an efficiency measure is the net present value of the avoided costs (i.e., value of the savings in 2012 dollars) associated with the net savings of that measure over the life of the measure. The savings is the “net savings,” as defined in the PSD. Therefore, the savings includes impact factors and realization rates that result from evaluation studies. Likewise, the life (in years) of a measure is defined in the PSD and is based on either the technical life of the measure or study results.

For electric measures, the electric benefit is broken into four main components: (1) the energy benefit; (2) the avoided generation capacity; (3) avoided transmission and distribution; and (4) Demand

²⁴ AESC Exhibit 1-16

²⁵ The Utility Cost Test is referred to as the Electric System Test (for electric conservation programs) or the Gas System Test (for natural gas conservation programs).

Reduction Induced Price Effect (DRIPE). The total electric benefit for a measure is the net present value of these avoided costs taken over the life of the measure.²⁶ The benefits for Load Response program are assumed to be equal to the revenues collected from ISO New England from that program. For natural gas measures, the benefit is based on the amount of avoided natural gas. The avoided cost of natural gas is calculated based on monthly load shapes. The monthly avoided gas cost includes both avoided fixed costs (cash pipeline demand charges) and variable costs (gas commodity costs, cash pipeline usage charges and adjustments for fuel and losses in pipeline transportation and storage of gas).

In the case of electric programs, the “utility cost” includes revenue from the Fund’s 3-mill charge, ISO-NE FCM, Class III Renewable Energy Credit (“REC”) sales revenues, and RGGI (refer to Table A-1 in the Chapter 1 Overview). It is assumed that these revenue sources are collected from program participants either directly (e.g., the 3-mill charge) or indirectly through collection mechanisms that eventually trickle down to the customer level. For natural gas programs, the “utility cost” is program funding, which is collected directly from customers.

The Total Resource Test compares the present value of future utility system and other customer savings to the total of the conservation expenditures plus customer costs necessary to implement the programs. The customer cost is above and beyond the program cost and represents out-of-pocket costs that a customer may make when installing a measure. Stated another way, the Total Resource Test evaluates the total cost of a measure (including program and customer out-of-pocket costs) with the “fuel blind” benefit of the measure. While certain programs may have low BCRs when assessed by the Utility System Test, the Total Resource Test provides a more comprehensive measure of the overall economic impact, since such programs may often have some value that is not recognized in the Utility System Test, such as other fuels, maintenance savings, or water savings.

Table B (Chapter 1) shows the BCRs for each program and sectors. Table B-1 shows the composition of the benefits for each program and sector. In order to avoid double-counting of benefits, natural gas benefits and costs are not counted in the Total Resource Test for the Electric Companies’ programs. Therefore, the Total Resource costs and benefits in the electric and natural gas Table B’s are additive.

²⁶ Additional information can be found in Docket No. 06-10-02, Order 5. This document provides an informative and detailed description and example of the benefit-cost calculations that are used in the measures screening process.

<http://www.dpuc.state.ct.us/DOCKHIST.NSF/60903cc7b9de44728525746b006e8ffb/0a1d4ae80b371f408525755a004c3dfa?OpenDocument&scrollTop=1462>.

The following table illustrates the components of the benefit cost tests that are used for program and measure screening:

Table 2: Cost Benefit Screening Components

Benefit-Cost Test	Cost							Benefit		
	3-Mill	ISO	Class III	RGGI	Gas Collections	Customer Cost (Electric)	Customer Cost (Gas)	Electric	Gas	Other*
Electric System Test	v	v	v	V**				v		
Gas System Test					v				v	
Total Resource Test (Electric)	v	v	v	v		v		v		v
Total Resource Test (Gas)					v		v		v	v

- *Water, other fossil fuels and maintenance are also included in Total Resource tests
- **Portion of RGGI used for Fuel Oil measures not included in EST

A. Electric System Screening

The electric benefits for energy efficiency programs are calculated as follows:

The following avoided costs are used by the EDCs when calculating Electric BCRs for the 2012 C&LM Plan programs. The avoided costs used to screen programs are in nominal dollars in accordance with the department’s March 17, 2010 Final Decision (Docket No. 09-10-03 and 08-10-02). The 2011 AESC provided Connecticut values in nominal dollars.

- **Avoided Electric Energy Values:** The Electric energy prices used by the EDCs are from the AESC. The avoided costs were estimated by factoring in the electric market zone, anticipated fossil fuel costs, existing generation, expected retirements and upgrades, and environmental regulations. Consistent with ISO-NE, energy prices are divided into the following four time periods:
 - Winter Peak: October - May; 6 a.m. - 10 p.m., weekdays excluding holidays.
 - Winter Off-Peak: October - May, 10 p.m. - 6 a.m., weekdays and also all weekends and ISO-NE defined holidays.
 - Summer Peak: June - September; 6 a.m. - 10 p.m., weekdays excluding holidays.

- Summer Off-Peak: June - September; 10 p.m. - 6 a.m., weekdays.
Also all weekends and ISO-NE defined holidays.

The following table shows statewide electric energy avoided costs used in the 2012 C&LM Plan.

Table 3 - 2012 AESC Connecticut Avoided Electric Energy Costs
Values are in nominal dollars²⁷.

Year	Winter Peak Energy (\$ per kWh)	Winter Off-Peak Energy (\$ per kWh)	Summer Peak Energy (\$ per kWh)	Summer Off-Peak Energy (\$ per kWh)
2012	0.060	0.051	0.072	0.051
2013	0.063	0.054	0.076	0.053
2014	0.066	0.057	0.079	0.056
2015	0.074	0.064	0.087	0.063
2016	0.076	0.065	0.096	0.065
2017	0.078	0.068	0.098	0.066
2018	0.087	0.077	0.111	0.074
2019	0.088	0.079	0.110	0.076
2020	0.093	0.081	0.108	0.080
2021	0.096	0.085	0.111	0.083
2022	0.102	0.090	0.117	0.088
2023	0.110	0.097	0.126	0.095
2024	0.117	0.101	0.131	0.099
2025	0.120	0.104	0.134	0.104
2026	0.124	0.107	0.142	0.106
2027	0.130	0.112	0.148	0.111
2028	0.137	0.118	0.155	0.117
2029	0.144	0.123	0.163	0.122
2030	0.151	0.129	0.171	0.129
2031	0.159	0.135	0.179	0.135

²⁷ AESC Appendix B, page B-29

- **Avoided Electric Generation Capacity Prices:** Avoided Generation Capacity prices are associated with demand savings, which is coincident with system peak. For the purpose of calculating BCRs, coincident system peak savings is based on the average capacity savings that takes place during the ISO-NE definition of Seasonal Summer Peak Savings, or average peak savings that takes place when the system exceeds at least 90 percent of the latest 50-50 forecasts (weather-driven extremes).

The avoided capacity costs are provided in two broad categories of approaches: capacity that is bid into the FCAs as a resource; and capacity that is not bid into the FCA but has value because it is reducing the ISO-NE forecast of peak demand for which capacity has to be acquired. The EDCs use a weighted average estimate of 100 percent of capacity being bid into the FCM of the planned savings. The two capacity values along with the weighted average based on the 100 percent FCA bid average are shown in Table 2.

Table 4 - 2012 AESC Connecticut Avoided Capacity Costs (Nominal Dollars)²⁸

Year	kW Bid into FCM (\$ per kW-Year)	kW Not Bid into FCM (\$ per kW-Year)	Weighted Average based on 100% (\$ per kW-Year)
2012	\$38.24		\$38.24
2013	\$38.24		\$38.24
2014	\$39.01		\$39.01
2015	\$39.79		\$39.79
2016	\$16.67	\$19.89	\$16.67
2017	\$25.01	\$29.88	\$25.01
2018	\$35.62	\$42.61	\$35.62
2019	\$40.77	\$48.81	\$40.77
2020	\$58.19	\$69.73	\$58.19
2021	\$60.48	\$72.55	\$60.48
2022	\$92.59	\$111.18	\$92.59
2023	\$113.79	\$136.80	\$113.79
2024	\$126.98	\$152.82	\$126.98
2025	\$134.40	\$161.93	\$134.40
2026	\$140.09	\$168.95	\$140.09
2027	\$144.11	\$174.00	\$144.11
2028	\$147.72	\$178.55	\$147.72
2029	\$150.86	\$182.54	\$150.86
2030	\$154.06	\$186.63	\$154.06
2031	\$157.34	\$190.81	\$157.34

²⁸ AESC Appendix B, page B-29

The DRIPE values are based on small incremental decreases in market prices as a result of lower energy and capacity demand due to conservation and load management efforts. While conservation efforts may only have a very small impact on price, the absolute dollar amount is significant when that lower price is applied to all energy and capacity being purchased in the market. DRIPE impacts are projected to dissipate over time as the market adjusts to the new lower energy and capacity requirements.

Table 5 - 2012 AESC Connecticut DRIPE Capacity and Energy Avoided Costs²⁹
Values are in nominal dollars

Year	Capacity DRIPE (\$ per kW)	WP Energy DRIPE (\$ per kWh)	WOP Energy DRIPE (\$ per kWh)	SP Energy DRIPE (\$ per kWh)	SOP Energy DRIPE (\$ per kWh)
2012	\$0.00	\$0.018	\$0.018	\$0.035	\$0.024
2013	\$0.00	\$0.019	\$0.018	\$0.036	\$0.024
2014	\$0.00	\$0.020	\$0.019	\$0.038	\$0.025
2015	\$0.00	\$0.023	\$0.022	\$0.043	\$0.029
2016	\$48.41	\$0.022	\$0.021	\$0.045	\$0.028
2017	\$49.98	\$0.022	\$0.022	\$0.045	\$0.028
2018	\$51.41	\$0.025	\$0.025	\$0.051	\$0.033
2019	\$50.52	\$0.026	\$0.026	\$0.051	\$0.034
2020	\$17.16	\$0.013	\$0.013	\$0.024	\$0.017
2021	\$17.67	\$0.012	\$0.012	\$0.023	\$0.016
2022	\$181.39	\$0.011	\$0.012	\$0.021	\$0.015
2023	\$91.23	\$0.011	\$0.011	\$0.019	\$0.014
2024	\$44.48	\$0.010	\$0.010	\$0.017	\$0.013
2025	\$23.10	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
2026	\$10.17	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
2027	\$0.00	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
2028	\$0.00	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
2029	\$0.00	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
2030	\$0.00	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000
2031	\$0.00	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000	\$0.000

- Transmission and Distribution: In response to Order 9 Final Decision Docket 08-10-03, the EDCs each hired a consultant to quantify these values. These studies were completed late in 2010. Based on the department’s 2010 Decision a weighted average of these studies was used for the 2011 screening. The Companies used a value of approximately \$35.18 per kW to represent avoided distribution and transmission costs. See details on the next page.

²⁹ AESC Appendix B, page B-29

Company	Avoided Costs in 2012 Dollars		
	Transmission	Distribution	Weighting
CL&P	\$1.28	\$30.33	80%
UI	\$2.59	\$46.88	20%
Electric Screening	\$1.54	\$33.64	

In addition to the electric benefits, the Total Resource BCRs include the following avoided costs (these are NOT included in the Electric System BCR):

- **Fossil Fuel Savings:** Fossil fuel avoided costs are calculated for Fuel Oil, natural gas, and propane. Fuel Oil, natural gas and propane avoided costs are from AESC.

Table 6 - 2012 AESC Connecticut Avoided Fuel Oil and Propane Energy Costs
Values are in nominal dollars³⁰.

Year	Residential Fuel Oil (\$ per MMBtu)	Residential Propane (\$ per MMBtu)	C&I Fuel Oil (\$ per MMBtu)
2012	\$26.74	\$40.14	\$21.50
2013	\$26.47	\$39.30	\$21.67
2014	\$26.20	\$38.79	\$21.70
2015	\$26.18	\$38.54	\$21.82
2016	\$26.65	\$38.36	\$22.25
2017	\$26.96	\$38.36	\$22.55
2018	\$28.30	\$39.84	\$23.73
2019	\$29.40	\$40.95	\$24.81
2020	\$30.44	\$42.06	\$25.69
2021	\$31.23	\$43.20	\$26.43
2022	\$32.12	\$44.33	\$27.31
2023	\$33.18	\$45.59	\$28.15
2024	\$34.10	\$46.86	\$28.92
2025	\$35.19	\$48.17	\$29.87
2026	\$36.28	\$49.34	\$30.73
2027	\$37.49	\$50.74	\$31.80
2028	\$38.75	\$52.18	\$32.92
2029	\$40.05	\$53.66	\$34.07
2030	\$41.39	\$55.18	\$35.26
2031	\$42.78	\$56.74	\$36.50

³⁰ AESC Appendix E, page E-2 adjusted for inflation.

- **Water Savings:** Water is valued at approximately \$0.01 per gallon and was estimated using Tighe and Bond water and sewer data and average Hartford prices of water and sewage rates.
- **Other Non-Resource Benefits:** These are savings that result from reduced maintenance, savings from the increase in productivity, etc. They are primarily used when screening CFLs to quantify the additional bulb cost savings that result due to CFLs having long lives, such as the value of avoiding future incandescent bulb purchases.
- **Value of Reduced Emissions:** The emissions avoided costs represent the environmental benefits associated with the reduced emissions of NOx, SOx, CO₂, and mercury. These represent projected environmental costs such as costs that are not yet internalized. These avoided costs are above and beyond the direct costs (included in the avoided energy costs) associated with complying with emissions regulators. The values shown below are average values per kWh saved and were derived from AESC.

Table 7 - 2012 Connections Emissions Avoided Costs
Values are in nominal dollars³¹

Year	Average Emissions Value (\$ per kWh)
2012	\$0.044
2013	\$0.045
2014	\$0.046
2015	\$0.046
2016	\$0.047
2017	\$0.048
2018	\$0.041
2019	\$0.040
2020	\$0.039
2021	\$0.037
2022	\$0.036
2023	\$0.035
2024	\$0.033
2025	\$0.032
2026	\$0.030
2027	\$0.031
2028	\$0.031
2029	\$0.032
2030	\$0.033
2031	\$0.033

³¹ AESC Appendix B, page B-29

B. Natural Gas Program Screening

The following avoided costs are used by the Natural Gas Companies when calculating Natural Gas BCRs for the 2012 Programs. Avoided costs used to screen programs are in nominal dollars in accordance with the Department’s March 17, 2010 Final Decision (Docket No. 09-10-03 and 08-10-02).

The values of avoided cost are based on AESC which calculated average values for the Southern New England Region which included Connecticut and Rhode Island. The 2012 C&LM Plan’s avoided costs and savings were separated into residential heating, residential water heating, C&I heating, and other C&I values. The avoided costs in AESC include the avoided cost of natural gas and the avoided costs associated with peak-day reduction.

The following table shows statewide gas energy avoided costs that are used in the 2012 BCR calculations.

Table 8 - 2012 AESC Connecticut Avoided Natural Gas Energy Costs
(Values are in nominal dollars³²)

Year	Residential Natural Gas Heating (\$ per MMBtu)	Residential Natural Gas Hot Water (\$ per MMBtu)	C&I Natural Gas Heating (\$ per MMBtu)	C&I Natural Gas (\$ per MMBtu)
2012	\$6.76	\$6.01	\$6.76	\$6.01
2013	\$7.12	\$6.34	\$7.12	\$6.34
2014	\$7.67	\$6.77	\$7.67	\$6.77
2015	\$8.34	\$7.53	\$8.34	\$7.53
2016	\$8.53	\$7.72	\$8.53	\$7.72
2017	\$8.68	\$7.85	\$8.68	\$7.85
2018	\$8.89	\$8.03	\$8.89	\$8.03
2019	\$9.13	\$8.24	\$9.13	\$8.24
2020	\$9.43	\$8.52	\$9.43	\$8.52
2021	\$9.75	\$8.81	\$9.75	\$8.81
2022	\$10.16	\$9.15	\$10.16	\$9.15
2023	\$10.71	\$9.69	\$10.71	\$9.69
2024	\$11.15	\$10.14	\$11.15	\$10.14
2025	\$11.49	\$10.44	\$11.49	\$10.44
2026	\$11.90	\$10.82	\$11.90	\$10.82
2027	\$12.30	\$11.18	\$12.30	\$11.18
2028	\$12.72	\$11.57	\$12.72	\$11.57
2029	\$13.14	\$11.96	\$13.14	\$11.96
2030	\$13.59	\$12.37	\$13.59	\$12.37
2031	\$14.04	\$12.79	\$14.04	\$12.79

³² AESC Appendix D, page D-6 adjusted for inflation.

In addition to avoided natural gas costs associated with natural gas savings, certain measures also have water savings associated with them. These measures are limited to the residential sector and include low flow showerheads and aerators. The avoided water savings is calculated and used for the Total Resource Cost test only. The value of water savings is approximately 1.0 cents per gallon and was estimated using Tighe and Bond water and sewer costs for Hartford.

Financial Indicators:

The following financial indicators were used within the net-present value calculation of benefits for both the Utility Cost and Total Resource Cost screening:

Nominal Discount Rate ("NDR"): The discount rate is the interest rate used to discount the value of future savings in a standard, present worth economic analysis. A higher rate discounts the present value of future savings more deeply than a lower rate. Thus higher rates result in lower BCRs and lower rates result in higher BCRs. Based on the March 17, 2010 DPUC’s Final decision in Docket No. 08-10-03 and 08-10-02, the Companies’ after-tax cost of capital weighted average (“COC”) was used to calculate the NDR (For electric the weight average of CL&P and UI were used; for gas the weighted average of CNG, SCG and YGS were used). These values were compared to 7 percent and the higher value was used (electric 7.43 percent, gas 7.01 percent). See below for details.

Electric Company	COC	Weighting
CL&P	7.68%	80%
UI	6.41%	20%
EDC Screening	7.43%	
Gas Company	COC	Weighting
CNG	6.74%	33%
SCG	6.78%	32%
YGS	7.48%	35%
LDC Screening	7.01%	

Inflation Rate: The inflation rate of 2 percent based on the 2011 AESC is used to calculate the avoided cost in nominal dollars.

This page intentionally blank

CHAPTER SEVEN: IT INITIATIVE (CL&P)

The C&LM IT Tracking and Reporting system is an automated tracking and reporting system in accordance with PURA's directive to develop a comprehensive presentation of tracking data for each C&LM program as part of the annual filings. This system is required to meet increasing financial and reporting requirements by the Department such as the included in the Standard Filing Requirements (SFRs). The system was also designed to improve the operating efficiency of the CL&P C&LM staff. The enhancements planned for 2012 intend to continue to fulfill the Department's requirement that all tracking entries of C&LM projects should be traceable and cross-referenced to the Program Savings Document (PSD) Manual, a detailed comprehensive documentation of all claimed resource costs and savings corresponding to individual C&LM technologies. Future enhancements are expected to result in improved accountability and independence in the process of tracking, monitoring and verification of C&LM information.

2011 Major Initiatives completed

- HES Invoicing - updates to the HES system so that vendors can individually invoice CL&P via established purchase orders for approved jobs that are completed.
- HES data review and reconciliation for the Core HES Energy Assessment Jobs, HES Jobs from ARRA/Stimulus funding, HES Jobs from RGGI funding and Insulation rebates via XML files received from Energy Federation, Inc. (EFI)
- Development and deployment of online (web-based) applications for Residential Services (HES and HES-IE) for both CL&P and Yankee Gas.
- Update of System Reports to accommodate Telerik reporting integration
- 2010 Savings calculations enhancements & reconciliation to the Program Savings Document (PSD)
- 2011 Savings calc and new program enhancements
- Residential Financing tracking module which in addition to tracking Residential Loans associated with the HES Program also links HES Recommendations, HES Rebates and Residential Financing to individual customers. The Residential Financing information is loaded in the system via weekly Excel data files provided the Residential Financing vendor.
- Data Warehouse - Report Mart, substantially completed.
- HES New construction module
- Production Implementation of 17 releases of small enhancement and user support issues (annually, hundreds of items are addressed)

2012 Planned Major Initiatives:

Plans call for continuation of the revision of the underlying CLMTRS technology to bring it into line with current industry best-practice standards. Enhancements to existing modules and systems will also continue to be made as tasks are reviewed for process improvements.

- Reviews and upgrades of C&LM Large C&I tracking and reporting system capabilities, such as the system's lead log and custom tracking gas projects. This is the last major module that needs to be incorporated into web based CLMTRS system.
- Data Warehouse/Report Mart Phase II enhancements - 2012 updates are expected to include the design of additional reports and extractions to accommodate ISO-NE Forward Capacity Tracking and Class III RECs tracking and reporting as measures drop off over time.
- Build HES-IE forecasting module to accommodate Letters of Agreement (LOA);
- CLMTRS updates as a result of Merger activities (Best practices, system comparisons, etc.) - Additional items may need to be incorporated as a result of findings from the Merger's Functional Integration Teams (FIT) that review the C&LM program data and tracking from the various MA and CT programs.
- New Retail Products development -
- Ongoing product support (through three-week release cycles) of product fixes and small-system enhancements, and
- HES sales/upgrade tracking
- User support (as needed).

CHAPTER EIGHT: INCREASED SAVINGS SCENARIO

Overview

A stated goal of the Malloy administration is to make Connecticut the leading state in energy efficiency. To achieve this ambitious outcome, the current program offerings will need to be expanded significantly. In addition, private capital will need to be leveraged to deliver savings of the scale required to put Connecticut in the lead. This chapter builds upon the base plan detailed in previous chapters with a framework of modifications needed to begin the process of accelerating savings to achieve the stated policy objectives.

In addition to significantly expanded electric savings programs, this section also identifies increases in gas savings programs that are approximately double the savings outlined in the base plan. Energy efficiency is not limited to electricity - if Connecticut is to become an energy leader, then gas and fuel oil savings must play an important role as well.

The strategy in Chapter 8 also makes a number of assumptions around the removal of obstacles or barriers to deeper and broader savings. One such barrier is how to provide programmatic tools for oil savings measures for businesses as well as residences. Connecticut will need to develop a methodology to capture savings for fuel oil burning equipment. This chapter assumes that statutory or other barriers around fuel oil savings have been removed. The funding needs identified in Chapter 8 also include funding for fuel oil measures.

This increased savings scenario calls for slightly more than two percent of electrical energy savings in 2012. This is nearly twice the savings that would be achieved with the funding available in the base plan outlined in the previous chapters. While this is a substantial increase, it is merely a waypoint on the journey to becoming the leading state in energy efficiency.

The following tables identify the increases in savings and spending. The strategies to achieve these results would include things such as performance contracting, leveraging of private capital, and significant State and Municipal building efforts. This plan also lays out strategies to go deeper and broader in energy efficiency efforts. This approach will be key to accomplishing the levels of savings required in Connecticut.

The strategies outlined in this chapter will require additional funding. Although the amount of the funding required has been identified, the source of that funding has not been identified. There are a number of strategies to provide the funding, each with their own advantages and drawbacks. We assume that these considerations will be part of the review process, allowing for robust stakeholder input into the best approaches to achieve our goals.

There are many goals embodied in Public Act 11-80 ("Act") that would be accomplished by the plan. There are even more objectives from the Act that will require some additional interpretation before the

details of the goal achievement can be identified. One of those objectives is the goal of weatherizing 80 percent of the homes in Connecticut. The term weatherize is not defined in statute, and there are many interpretations that various stakeholders may make. These goals, and others like them, will be worked out through the stakeholder process conducted by the Energy Efficiency Board.

Table 1. Savings as a Percent of Annual kWh Sales

	2012 Base Budget Savings as % of Annual kWh Sales	2012 Increased Savings as a % of annual kWh Sales	Increase-%	% Increase
Electric	0.80%	2.13%	1.33%	166.3%
Gas	0.35%	0.70%	0.35%	100%

Table 2. 2012 Budget - Base Budget and Increased Savings Budget

	2012 Base Budget	2012 Increased Savings Budget	\$ Increase	% Increase
Electric*	\$105,561,749	\$218,896,200	\$113,334,451	107.4%
Gas	\$19,127,475	\$34,203,989	\$15,076,514	78.8%
Total	\$124,689,224	\$253,100,189	\$128,410,965	103.0%

**Increased Savings Budget includes \$17 million of oil funding.*

Short-Term Initiatives and Long-Term Planning

This increased savings plan is consistent with both the short-term initiatives and long-term planning needs.

- Reduce electricity consumption by approximately 2 percent, per annum, potentially higher in future years, post 2012
- Reduce natural gas energy consumption by approximately 1 percent, per annum, potentially higher in future years, post 2012
- Reduce energy consumption in State buildings by 10 percent by the end of 2012
- Leverage the Energy Efficiency Fund through Innovative financing and performance contracting
- Weatherize 80 percent of Connecticut homes by 2030
- Implement all cost-effective measures of energy efficiency on a fuel-blind basis

Budget Needs and Short-Term Approaches

In order meet the budget and savings goals, some of the following items are critical:

- Oil Funding - Table 2 identifies the oil funding needed to support electric savings in homes - \$17 million. Funding is needed from the oil industry to support oil energy efficiency projects and a proposal is being developed in collaboration with the EEB and its consultants.
- Additional funding is needed on the electric side beyond the standard mill rate, RGGI, FCM, and Class III RECs.
- Reference codes and standards in support of residential initiatives (boilers, set-top-boxes, etc.)

The increased budget funding needs can be accomplished by a combination of the following methods:

- CAM (Conservation Adjustment Mechanism) - short-term or long-term approach for both electric and natural gas
- Capitalization / Rates (Decoupling or rate basing energy efficiency.); and
- Securitization of the mill rate to be utilized for energy efficiency funding

Additionally, in order to accommodate budget flexibility, the Companies and EEB have advocated the use of a rolling budget which can utilize funds from a future year to fund current year program activity (i.e., utilize 2013 future funding in 2012). This practice has been utilized in previous Plans and the Companies have accounting mechanisms in place to borrow from subsequent Plans. The Companies are allowed to earn interest at their respective weighted average cost of capital on the Companies' funds that are expended in advance of the revenues collected. Similarly, the Companies pay carrying charges on funds they collect in advance of being spent on energy efficiency.

2012 Increased Savings Program Assumptions and Caveats (Program Risks)

The following section contains the strategies, outcomes and caveats by sector and program in achieving the spending and savings goals outlined in the subsequent financial tables.

Expanded Plan Strategies, Outcomes and Caveats

Commercial & Industrial Sector:

In the commercial & industrial sector, there are a number of initiatives and focus areas that apply to the entire sector. These are outlined in the following table.

Initiative	Strategy	Outcome	Caveats
<p>Overall Approach for Commercial & Industrial Sector:</p> <p>Strategic framework for all C&I programs; i.e., Sustainable Energy Management (SEM) and High Performance Building Upgrades</p> <p>Increased comprehensiveness – broader and deeper savings and bill reduction</p> <p>Facilitate Performance contracts and 3rd Party Financing</p> <p>Cultivate high performance State Building projects - Develop projects and facility management practices that will result in approximately 69 MWh of energy savings</p> <p>Focus on actual building performance beyond just single measures or simple compliance</p> <p>Broaden reach of programs to reach under-served market segments, especially small businesses</p> <p>Emphasis on market transformation; i.e., raising performance level of the natural market</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Deliver all programs through a Sustainable Energy Management framework - Transition programs from discrete measures to high performance building/facility upgrades - Promote & support performance contracting & 3rd party financing, including utility capital - Consider modifying the incentive cap structure – tiered levels for greater tiers of savings, or based on customer contribution into the fund. - Maintain base incentive structures at current levels - Increase the comprehensive component of the structures - Focus on the State and Municipal Buildings market - Focus on Multi-family (MF) market - Facilitate a greater number of 3rd party financing or performance agreements - Greater Outreach & Education - Consider a broker or aggregator of energy projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Customers assume greater responsibility for their energy management and facility upgrades - Provide sustainable energy solutions that significantly reduce energy bills - Modified caps may encourage greater interest in deeper savings - Maintaining incentive structures at current levels helps maintain lower cost rate a focal point from EEB & DEEP - Increased Comprehensive helps drive projects to a broader and deeper level of savings - State market is virtually untapped representing large energy savings opportunities - MF market can produce substantial savings (both electric and gas) - Facilitating the financing helps leverage the fund \$\$ and is line with the EEB & DEEP direction - Greater outreach & education for informing the vendor and customer communities on the values energy savings as well as the best practices of alternative financing / Performance Contracting; system and equipment optimization; proper maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires business/institutional commitment - Meaningful market change requires longer term perspective - Need to develop mutually agreeable State agreements - Ramp up time for additional, qualified technical labor and market resources to evaluate and install a significant increased volume of projects – both from a vendor perspective and program administrative perspective - Turnaround time on project development – 15 days

Commercial & Industrial Program-Specific Strategies

The following table outlines the actions needed in the commercial & industrial programs to support an increased savings scenario.

Program	Strategy	Outcomes	Caveats
Energy Conscious Blueprint (ECB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use ECB to assist design/construction industry to prepare for IECC 2012 upgrade - Focus on deep efficiency building renovations and upgrades through Advanced Design Guidelines, energy modeling, deeper market penetration of Whole Building Performance initiative. - Focus on high rise multi-family opportunities - Maintain base incentive structures at current levels - Focus on major renovation and equipment change out since new construction market is depressed. - Test third-party project brokering for high performance projects and project financing - R&D building energy performance labeling and certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Enhanced capability of the design/construction industry to develop high performance buildings - Market transformation for the building upgrade market - Maintaining base incentive structures at current levels helps maintain the cost rates - Increase in projects – approx. 60 new projects electric and 216 natural gas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Market transformation requires multi-year effort - Long-term payoff requires equivalent regulatory perspective - Need State agreement to maximize the State opportunities - Need to demonstrate the business case for high performance building upgrades - Turnaround time on project development – 15 days
Energy Opportunities / Municipal (EO/MEO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue transition from discrete measures to comprehensive, high performance projects - Leverage CEEF through financing & performance contracting - Support Green State Buildings Plan and support high performance upgrades/retrofits for State buildings - Maintain base incentive structures at current levels - Increase the comprehensive component of the projects - Remove or modify the incentive caps - Focus on State buildings - Focus on high rise multi-family facilities - Reduce the MEO financing cap from the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comprehensive approach yields meaningful energy bill reductions - Maintaining base incentive structures at current levels helps maintain the cost rates - Same or higher comprehensive incentives will help drive projects - Modifying caps could allow greater magnitude of savings - Reducing the MEO cap will help force towns to consider alternative financing or performance contracts - Increase in projects – approx. 1,253 new projects electric and 189 natural gas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to shift customers' priority from rebates to investment benefits (i.e., bill reduction and other benefits) - Need State agreement in order to maximize the State opportunities - Loss of 0 percent financing on municipal buildings projects may stall implementation - Ramp up time for resources to evaluate and install a significant increased volume of projects – both from a vendor perspective and program administrative perspective

Program	Strategy	Outcomes	Caveats
	<p>\$400 thousand per municipality to possibility \$200 or even \$150 thousand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider offering memberships to Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) for performance contracting guidance - Consider subsidizing a performance contracting consultant - Consider subsidizing a broker for financing projects - Increased outreach and education 		
Retro Commissioning (RCx)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote market-driven RCx services - Maintain base incentive structures at current levels - Maximize the State opportunity – especially SCSU - Target buildings that were ECB New Construction projects in 2000-2004 - More RCx providers – issue RFP - Increased outreach & education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More RCx providers enhances the ability to increase work - Increase in projects – approx 320 new projects electric and 8 natural gas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need the State agreement in order to maximize the State opportunities - Turnaround time on project development – 15 days
O&M / Sustainable Energy Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote sustainable energy management and services for all customers - Provide access to energy management tools and services - Maximize the State opportunities - Maximize the multi-family opportunities - Maximize systems and process opportunities - Greater Outreach & Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Capture major and very cost-effective energy savings in a virtually untapped market - Creates market opportunity for service providers - Greater outreach & education for informing the vendors and customers on the values and best practices O&M - Increase in projects – approx. 80 new projects electric and several natural gas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requires business / institutional commitment - Need to upgrade service provider capabilities which requires sustained, long-term efforts - Need State agreement in order to maximize the State opportunities - Turn around time on project development – 15 business days
Small Business Energy Advantage (SBEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aggressively address under served markets - Maintain base incentive structures at current levels - Increase the comprehensive component of the projects - CL&P – increase number of SBEA vendors participating in the CL&P - CL&P – ramp up program administration efforts to evaluate and approve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More equitable service provision in economically depressed areas - Maintaining base incentive structures at current levels helps maintain the cost rates - Same or higher comprehensive incentives will help drive projects - Reducing the size reverts back to the UI's original form of SBEA and may push the larger customer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need State agreement in order to maximize the State opportunities - Need to establish an agreed upon process for acting on the agreement when approved – 15 business days - Ramp up time for resources to evaluate and install a significant increased volume of projects – both from a

Program	Strategy	Outcomes	Caveats
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> projects - UI - Consider reducing the size of SBEA from 200 kW to 150 kW or less (UI only) - Maximize the State opportunity - Maximize the opportunities in economically depressed urban areas – a low income version of SBEA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to consider 3rd party loans - Reducing the size also may fit into the skill sets of traditional SBEA vendors - Addressing the size eligibility - State facilities could yield approx 3.5 MWh (UI) - Addressing the economically depressed businesses yields low savings; increases costs and carries a strong PR message - Increase in projects – approx. 4,261 new projects electric and 39 natural gas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vendor perspective and program administrative perspective

Residential Sector

The following assumptions and strategies apply to the residential sector:

- Increased funding for oil measures: \$17 million
- Significant increase in the number of gas and oil heated homes served in HES and HES -IE programs
- Continue to focus on the promotion of standard CFLs and increase focus on Solid State Lighting (LEDs)
- Deeper and more comprehensiveness needed in HES

Residential: Program Specific Strategies:

Program	Strategy	Outcome	Caveats
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue to offer HES services to oil and propane heated homes. Targeting of high use older homes with inferior construction and central air. - Triple number of residences served - Focus on the adoption of add-on measures - Increase and offer fuel-blind financing (UI) of energy efficiency upgrades suggested through HES - Targeting of multi-family opportunities - Increase number of bulbs per home currently capped at 25 - Greater “pressure” on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greater savings per home by serving customers based on need. - Meets the State goal of weatherizing 80 percent CT homes by 2030 - Increase residence savings for all heating fuels - Increase energy savings for all fuel types. - Increased participation and deeper savings in Multi-family projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Imperative that a funding mechanism for oil measures be established - Timeline for program approval and the ability for vendors to ramp up production. The need for additional vendors might exist. - HES vendor base will need to focus on comprehensive services - Ramp up time for additional, qualified technical labor and market resources to evaluate and install a significant increased volume of projects – both from a vendor perspective and

Program	Strategy	Outcome	Caveats
	vendors, including weeding out those that under perform <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More use of financing for higher value project - More comprehensive Tier II/Home Performance with HES jobs 		program administrative perspective
Retail Products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continue promotion of standard CFLs, increase in CFLs and specialty CFLs in the 2% plan - Promote LED lighting - Educate consumers to choose lighting based on lumens, not watts - Development of an new appliance and consumer electronics rebate initiative - Leverage EISA and new FTC lamp labels as a marketing/educational opportunity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase socket saturation of CFLs within CT homes - Introduce customers to alternative energy efficient lighting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Look to DEEP to eliminate socket saturation goals - LED price point are still high but decreasing. - Supply of products available at retail outlets, especially LED products where supply may be limited. - Higher CFL costs driven by large increase in phosphor prices
Home Energy Solutions – Income Eligible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant increase in the number of customers to be served and deepness of measures being installed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meets the State’s goal of weatherizing 80% of CT homes by 2030 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact of unspent DOE WAP ARRA funds - Vendor capacity
Residential New Construction (RNC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase participation of oil homes - Move new homes to increasingly higher savings tiers - Use innovative marketing techniques like proposed “New Home, No Bill” promotion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use oil funding to increase oil/propane rebates to a level which is on par with current electric and natural gas rebates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Imperative that a funding mechanism for oil measures be established.
Other Programs and Initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investigate possible new programs and initiatives for the purpose of increasing cost effective savings in existing programs and/or launching new programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of new programs, initiatives or restructuring of current offerings. New offerings may include Appliance Retirement, High Efficiency Products (e.g. Top Ten), High Efficiency Furnace Fan, Advanced Power Strips, expanded Ductless Heat Pump (DHP) and Heat Pump Water Heater (HPWH) offerings, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The market potential and consumer acceptance of new offerings is unknown. Cost effectiveness could be a barrier in some cases.

Performance Incentives

In addition to the largest driver being the reduction in energy consumption and peak demand, the following performance measures are addressed in the 2012 increased savings scenario:

- Residential
 - 20 percent increase in the Average Savings per HES Participant
 - 10 percent of the HES participants will achieve 25 percent energy savings based on the average consumption per HES participant
 - Meet HES-IE spending targets. (Failure to meet 88 percent of the spending target will result in a Negative Performance Incentive)
 - Alignment of HES and HES-IE BPI Certifications. One person in each crew with both BPI Building Analyst 1 and Envelop Specialist certifications by 6/30/12. By 9/30/12 each crew will have received training and be able to provide duct sealing services as per HES guidelines. Each crew will have the necessary testing and diagnostic equipment to perform duct sealing.
- Commercial and Industrial
 - Energy Opportunities and Small Business Energy Advantage
 - EO - 10 percent of signed projects will incorporate performance contracting and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital.
 - EO and SBEA - 15 percent of projects participating in the Comprehensive Initiative.
 - EO and SBEA - The Companies will develop a plan which includes a protocol for defining market penetration and segmentation and establishing long term goals in collaboration with the EEB
 - Energy Conscious Blueprint
 - Percentage of new construction/major renovation projects that exceed the new construction State Energy Code baseline by at least 30 percent of follow the whole building performance track
 - The companies will develop a plan to transition into IECC 2012 (ASHRAE 2010) in collaboration with the EEB:
 - Awareness: Prepare the market by working with the A/E community, the trade communities; and inspectors
 - Develop and deliver a series of code training sessions for the A/E and trade communities
 - Operations & Maintenance

- The Companies will develop and promote a Sustainable Energy Management Plan and Guide which includes benchmarking, the use of energy monitoring dashboards, and an implementation plan in collaboration with EEB

Marketing

Increased marketing efforts and expenditures will be a necessary component of an increased savings scenario. Marketing follows two tracks. The first track is primarily programmatic. The marketing strategies outlined in the base plan for each program will still be pursued, but at an increased level consistent with the increased budget and participation goals. The other track has traditionally been characterized as general awareness.

The Companies have described several marketing strategies and have provided a plan outline to support their recommended strategy for a statewide integrated communications plan. (Presented at the August 24 EEB meeting.) The Companies are working with the EEB and the Marketing Committee to finalize a plan which includes reintroducing the brand. The plan will be forwarded DEEP and PURA once completed.

INCREASED SAVING SCENARIO TABLES

Table A1 2012 CL&P/UI Proposed C&LM Budget - Increased Savings			
CL&P/UI C&LM BUDGET	2012 CL&P Increased Savings Budget	2012 UI Increased Savings Budget	2012 CL&P/UI Proposed Budget Total
RESIDENTIAL			
Residential Retail Products	\$ 10,960,000	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 14,405,304
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 4,000,000		\$ 4,000,000
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 14,960,000	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 18,405,304
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,838,050	\$ 177,329	\$ 2,015,379
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting)	\$ 19,905,000	\$ 7,364,631	\$ 27,269,631
HES Income Eligible	\$ 19,039,000	\$ 5,038,002	\$ 24,077,002
Subtotal Residential	\$ 55,742,050	\$ 16,025,266	\$ 71,767,316
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL			
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY			
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,669,250	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 12,552,068
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,669,250	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 12,552,068
C&I LARGE RETROFIT			
Energy Opportunities	\$ 33,614,000	\$ 10,529,387	\$ 44,143,387
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 9,581,000	\$ 3,776,044	\$ 13,357,044
PRIME	\$ 536,550	\$ 402,385	\$ 938,935
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 43,731,550	\$ 14,707,816	\$ 58,439,366
Small Business	\$ 38,305,000	\$ 4,512,339	\$ 42,817,339
Subtotal C&I	\$ 90,705,800	\$ 23,102,973	\$ 113,808,773
OTHER - EDUCATION *			
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400,350	\$ 481,746	\$ 882,096
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 1,500,400	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,800,400
K-8 Education	\$ 325,000	\$ 401,825	\$ 726,825
Science Center	\$ 166,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 208,000
Subtotal Education	\$ 2,391,750	\$ 1,225,571	\$ 3,617,321
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS			
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 448,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 560,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 2,050,700	\$ 347,280	\$ 2,397,980
C&I Loan Program	\$ 500,000	\$ 173,000	\$ 673,000
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 300,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 350,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 3,298,700	\$ 682,280	\$ 3,980,980
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT			
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D			
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 375,900	\$ 225,000	\$ 600,900
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 375,900	\$ 225,000	\$ 600,900
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING			
Administration	\$ 1,199,700	\$ 750,000	\$ 1,949,700
Marketing Plan	\$ 500,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 750,000
Planning (UI Planning & Evaluation)	\$ 779,550	\$ 316,765	\$ 1,096,315
Evaluation (UI Evaluation, Outside Services)	\$ 2,210,400	\$ 570,000	\$ 2,780,400
Information Technology	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 342,500	\$ 2,292,500
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 650,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 1,000,000
Performance Management Fee	\$ 8,132,693	\$ 2,243,318	\$ 10,376,011
Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 15,422,343	\$ 4,822,583	\$ 20,244,926
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS			
Residential	\$ 60,171,150	\$ 17,633,368	\$ 77,804,518
C&I	\$ 95,519,150	\$ 24,916,722	\$ 120,435,872
Other*	\$ 15,746,243	\$ 4,909,583	\$ 20,655,826
TOTAL Note 1	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 47,459,673	\$ 218,896,216


* OTHER -EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.

Note 1: See Table A2 for Revenue Breakdown

Table A2 2012, 2013, 2014 CL&P/UI C&LM Revenues						
CL&P/UI C&LM REVENUES	2012 Base Budget with RGGI			2012 with RGGI & Increased Savings		
	2012 CL&P Revenues	2012 UI Revenues	2012 CL&P/UI Total	2012 CL&P Revenues	2012 UI Revenues	2012 CL&P/UI Total
Collections (Mil Rate)	\$ 67,359,070	\$ 16,494,000	\$ 83,853,070	\$ 67,359,070	\$ 16,494,000	\$ 83,853,070
ISO-NE Other Demand Resources (ODRs)	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 8,100,000	\$ 6,500,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 8,100,000
ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market Demand Response Revenues	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 4,876,000
Class III Renewable Energy Credits	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 3,600,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 4,500,000
Carrying Charges	\$ 800,000		\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000		\$ 800,000
RGGI*	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679
Other Fuel Revenues (Oil Funding)				\$ 12,907,000	\$ 4,155,287	\$ 17,062,287
Other Revenues (i.e., CAM, other)				\$ 74,337,794	\$ 21,934,386	\$ 96,272,180
Total - C&LM Revenues	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 21,370,000	\$ 105,561,749	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 47,459,673	\$ 218,896,216
CL&P/UI C&LM REVENUES	2013 Proposed Base Budget			2014 Proposed Base Budget		
	2013 CL&P Revenues	2013 UI Revenues	2013 CL&P/UI Total	2014 CL&P Revenues	2014 UI Revenues	2014 CL&P/UI Total
Collections (Mil Rate)	\$ 68,429,150	\$ 16,515,000	\$ 84,944,150	\$ 69,467,920	\$ 16,641,000	\$ 86,108,920
ISO-NE Other Demand Resources (ODRs)	\$ 6,200,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 7,800,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 1,600,000	\$ 7,600,000
ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market Demand Response Revenues	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 4,100,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 4,100,000
Class III Renewable Energy Credits	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 3,800,000
RGGI*	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679	\$ 2,432,679	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 3,432,679
Total - C&LM Revenues	\$ 83,261,829	\$ 21,015,000	\$ 104,276,829	\$ 83,900,599	\$ 21,141,000	\$ 105,041,599

*RGGI Budget is based on 50% of the \$2.00 / allowance for 2012 through 2014

Statewide (CL&P and UI) 2012 C&LM Budget and Parity Analysis
Table A1 Pie Chart



Customer Class	Budget (\$,000)	% of Total C&LM Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget	% of Residential & C&I Revenue	Difference
Res. Income Eligible	\$24,455,249	11.17%	12.34%	12.27%	0.07%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$53,349,269	24.37%	26.91%	29.38%	-2.47%
Residential Subtotal	\$77,804,518	35.54%	39.25%	41.65%	-2.40%
C&I	\$120,435,872	55.02%	60.75%	58.35%	2.40%
C&I Subtotal	\$120,435,872	55.02%	60.75%	58.35%	2.40%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$198,240,390	90.56%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Other Expenditures					
Other Expenditures	\$20,655,826	9.44%			
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$20,655,826	9.44%			
C&LM TOTAL	\$218,896,216	100.00%			
CL&P	\$171,436,543	78.32%			
UI	\$47,459,673	21.68%			

Totals may vary due to rounding

**TABLE B2
STATEWIDE TOTAL RESOURCE COSTS AND BENEFITS FOR C&LM PROGRAMS**

Program	Utility Costs 2012	Customer Cost 2012	Total Resource Cost 2012	Total Resource Benefit 2012	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Annualized Savings kWh	Lifetime Savings kWh	Load Savings kW	Annual Water Savings (Gal)	Lifetime Water Savings (Gal)	Annual Gas Savings (CCF)	Lifetime Gas Savings (CCF)	Peak Day Gas Savings (CCF)	Annual Oil Savings (Gal)	Lifetime Oil Savings (gal)	Annual Propane Savings (Gal)	Lifetime Propane Savings (Gal)	CO2 Emissions Reductions (Lifetime Tons)
Residential Retail Products	\$ 14,405,304	\$ 9,669,948	\$ 24,075,252	\$ 102,293,216	4.2	159,304,199	740,343,299	11,919	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	371,800
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 6,504,726	1.1	8,000,000	80,000,000	720	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 18,405,304	\$ 11,669,948	\$ 30,075,252	\$ 108,797,943	3.6	167,304,199	820,343,299	12,639	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	371,800
Water Heating	\$ 156,266	\$ 327,652	\$ 484,218	\$ 297,613	0.6	-	46,788	-	-	-	46,788	561,454	150	-	-	-	-	3,277
Residential New Construction	\$ 3,265,379	\$ 1,974,932	\$ 5,180,311	\$ 7,530,338	1.5	2,753,889	46,667,439	624	-	-	103,361	2,584,022	936	3,371	84,283	28,382	709,556	43,942
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 36,317,400	\$ 6,462,212	\$ 42,779,612	\$ 96,593,910	2.3	30,001,096	309,048,744	6,248	8,574,268	59,786,810	1,359,419	26,122,060	12,050	954,288	17,649,033	137,590	2,064,539	517,664
HES Income Eligible	\$ 30,741,319	\$ 1,620,769	\$ 32,362,088	\$ 62,893,476	1.9	29,349,197	281,996,751	2,098	7,214,416	38,189,659	883,368	16,087,656	6,586	681,733	11,847,166	82,852	1,008,170	384,052
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 88,885,668	\$ 21,995,814	\$ 110,881,482	\$ 276,113,280	2.5	229,408,382	1,438,056,233	21,608	15,788,684	97,976,669	2,392,936	45,355,193	19,723	1,639,372	29,580,462	248,804	3,782,804	1,300,735
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 20,131,606	\$ 4,019,971	\$ 24,151,577	\$ 67,418,450	2.8	31,839,084	488,764,416	6,406	-	-	1,545,905	23,458,899	11,848	-	-	-	-	382,369
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 20,131,606	\$ 4,019,971	\$ 24,151,577	\$ 67,418,450	2.8	31,839,084	488,764,416	6,406	-	-	1,545,905	23,458,899	11,848	-	-	-	-	382,369
Energy Opportunities	\$ 49,983,835	\$ 83,686,760	\$ 133,670,595	\$ 210,207,987	1.6	139,062,594	1,712,845,309	19,915	-	-	1,732,861	19,705,118	27,652	-	-	-	-	975,195
C&M Svcs (BSC, Training, RetroCx)	\$ 14,056,157	\$ 16,174,358	\$ 30,230,515	\$ 68,712,975	2.3	68,966,017	525,995,327	7,677	-	-	287,227	2,872,300	3,532	-	-	-	-	280,918
PRIME	\$ 936,935	\$ 50,513	\$ 910,063	\$ 16,564,772	18.2	3,187,775	15,939,141	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,005
TOTAL - C&LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 64,978,927	\$ 99,911,631	\$ 164,811,173	\$ 295,485,433	1.8	211,216,386	2,254,779,777	27,591	-	-	2,020,088	22,577,418	31,184	-	-	-	-	1,264,117
Small Business	\$ 43,443,627	\$ 54,506,772	\$ 97,950,399	\$ 184,286,733	1.7	116,784,575	1,434,182,444	20,049	-	-	(409,807)	(5,072,786)	(2,883)	-	-	-	-	690,640
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 128,554,160	\$ 158,438,374	\$ 286,913,149	\$ 527,190,615	1.8	359,840,045	4,177,726,637	54,047	-	-	3,156,185	40,963,531	40,149	-	-	-	-	2,337,127

Table A
CL&P 2012 Proposed C&LM Budget

CL&P C&LM BUDGET	2011 CL&P Revised Budget 06/30/11	2012 CL&P Proposed Base Budget 10/01/11	2012 (A) CL&P Proposed Budget Increased Savings 10/01/11	2013 CL&P Proposed Base Budget 10/01/11
RESIDENTIAL				
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ 6,132,901	\$ 4,850,000	\$ 10,960,000	\$ 4,818,475
Appliance Rebate Program / New Programs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000	\$ -
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 6,132,901	\$ 4,850,000	\$ 14,960,000	\$ 4,818,475
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,460,024	\$ 1,261,000	\$ 1,838,050	\$ 1,252,803
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 4	\$ 17,749,370	\$ 11,757,000	\$ 19,905,000	\$ 11,729,390
HES Income Eligible	\$ 11,027,047	\$ 9,399,700	\$ 19,039,000	\$ 9,338,600
Subtotal Residential	\$ 36,369,342	\$ 27,267,700	\$ 55,742,050	\$ 27,139,268
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL				
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,759,606	\$ 8,503,000	\$ 8,669,250	\$ 8,447,516
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,759,606	\$ 8,503,000	\$ 8,669,250	\$ 8,447,516
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 25,935,919	\$ 13,241,680	\$ 33,614,000	\$ 13,155,610
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 4,729,740	\$ 4,171,000	\$ 9,581,000	\$ 4,143,900
PRIME	\$ 488,087	\$ 485,000	\$ 536,550	\$ 485,000
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 31,153,746	\$ 17,897,680	\$ 43,731,550	\$ 17,784,510
Small Business	\$ 13,436,752	\$ 11,640,000	\$ 38,305,000	\$ 11,577,638
Subtotal C&I	\$ 53,350,104	\$ 38,040,680	\$ 90,705,800	\$ 37,809,664
OTHER - EDUCATION *				
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 400,350	\$ 400,000
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 850,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,500,400	\$ 850,000
K-8 Education	\$ 225,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000	\$ 325,000
Science Center		\$ 166,000	\$ 166,000	\$ 166,000
Subtotal Education	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 1,891,000	\$ 2,391,750	\$ 1,741,000
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 3,650,000	\$ 2,051,429	\$ 2,050,700	\$ 2,175,238
C&I Loan Program	\$ 475,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 135,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 150,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 4,708,000	\$ 3,149,429	\$ 3,298,700	\$ 3,273,238
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT				
ISO Load Response Program Note 2	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,000,000
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D				
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 375,900	\$ 350,000
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 200,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 375,900	\$ 350,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Administration	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 1,199,700	\$ 900,000
Marketing Plan	\$ 176,651	\$ 200,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 200,000
Planning Note 3	\$ 650,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 779,550	\$ 650,000
Evaluation Note 3	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 2,010,000	\$ 2,210,400	\$ 2,010,000
Information Technology	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 1,950,000	\$ 1,700,000
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 400,000	\$ 550,000	\$ 650,000	\$ 550,000
Performance Management Fee	\$ 5,216,455	\$ 3,982,940	\$ 8,132,693	\$ 3,938,659
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 10,843,106	\$ 9,992,940	\$ 15,422,343	\$ 9,948,659
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS				
Residential	\$ 41,385,663	\$ 31,056,929	\$ 60,171,150	\$ 30,932,306
C&I	\$ 57,245,434	\$ 42,543,880	\$ 95,519,150	\$ 41,782,864
Other*	\$ 11,314,455	\$ 10,590,940	\$ 15,746,243	\$ 10,546,659
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 109,945,552	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 83,261,829
TOTAL	\$ 109,945,552	\$ 84,191,749	\$ 171,436,543	\$ 83,261,829

* OTHER -EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.



Note 1: Retail Products includes Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances.

Note 2: ISO-NE Load Response Customer payments are funded from the Forward Capacity Market

Note 3: Planning and Evaluation activities split into separate budget line items.

Note 4: Residential HVAC program renamed "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

CL&P 2012 C&LM Budget and Parity Analysis
Table A Pie Chart



Customer Class	Budget	% of Total C&LM Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget	% of Residential & C&I Revenue	Difference
Res. Income Eligible	\$19,039,000	11.11%	12.23%	12.23%	0.00%
Res. Non Income Eligible	\$41,132,150	23.99%	26.42%	29.88%	-3.46%
Residential Subtotal	\$60,171,150	35.10%	38.65%	42.11%	-3.46%
C&I Small/Med	\$43,365,694	25.30%	27.85%	26.28%	1.57%
C&I Large	\$52,153,456	30.42%	33.50%	31.61%	1.89%
C&I Subtotal	\$95,519,150	55.72%	61.35%	57.89%	3.46%
Residential and C&I Subtotal	\$155,690,300	90.82%	100.00%	100.0%	0.0%
<i>Other Expenditures</i>					
Other Expenditures	\$15,746,243	9.18%			
Other Expenditures Subtotal	\$15,746,243	9.18%			
C&LM TOTAL	\$171,436,543	100.00%			

C&I Non-Gov't	
Budget	Revenue
61.35%	57.89%

Note - Municipalities and state facilities are eligible to participate in C&I Program offerings as applicable.

TABLE B
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS - ELECTRIC & OIL

COMPARISON OF CL&P CONSERVATION PROGRAMS FOR 2012																		
Program	Utility Costs (electric & oil) (000)	Customer Costs (000)	Total Resource Costs (000)	Electric System Benefit (000)	Total Resource Benefit (000)	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Statewide Total Resource B/C Ratio	# of Units	Units	Annualized Savings (MYR)	Lifetime Savings (MYR)	KW Impact (T/E)	Demand Cost \$/KW-yr	Demand Cost \$/KW-yr	Cost Rate \$/kw Annualize**	Utility Cost Ratio \$/LTKWH**	
RESIDENTIAL																		
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ 10,980	\$ 8,379	\$ 19,359	\$ 47,992	\$ 82,666	4.4	4.3	4.2	3,916,115	Products	128,669	598,166	9,162	\$ 1,196	\$ 1,196	\$ 0.085	\$ 0.018	
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 4,000	\$ 2,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,505	\$ 9,003	1.6	1.5	1.1	10,000	Products	8,000	80,000	720	\$ 5,556	\$ 5,556	\$ 0.500	\$ 0.050	
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 14,980	\$ 10,379	\$ 25,359	\$ 54,497	\$ 91,669	3.6	3.6	3.6			136,669	678,166	9,882	\$ 1,514	\$ 1,514	\$ 0.109	\$ 0.022	
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,838	\$ 1,096	\$ 2,934	\$ 3,391	\$ 5,663	1.8	2.0	1.5	729	Homes	2,612	43,726	521	\$ 3,526	\$ 3,526	\$ 0.732	\$ 0.042	
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 2	\$ 19,905	\$ 4,508	\$ 24,413	\$ 18,488	\$ 58,124	0.9	2.4	2.3	30,537	Cash/HVAC Rebates	21,719	224,916	4,024	\$ 4,728	\$ 4,728	\$ 0.876	\$ 0.085	
HES Income Eligible	\$ 19,039	\$ 979	\$ 20,018	\$ 14,907	\$ 39,053	0.8	2.0	1.9	25,193	Customers	23,697	196,693	1,621	\$ 11,743	\$ 11,743	\$ 0.803	\$ 0.097	
Subtotal Residential	\$ 55,742	\$ 16,962	\$ 72,704	\$ 91,284	\$ 194,710	1.6	2.7	2.5			184,597	1,143,501	16,049	\$ 3,473	\$ 3,473	\$ 0.302	\$ 0.049	
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL																		
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY																		
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,689	\$ 325	\$ 8,994	\$ 27,467	\$ 35,061	3.2	3.9	2.8	487	Customers	20,110	309,173	4,435	\$ 1,955	\$ 1,955	\$ 0.431	\$ 0.028	
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,689	\$ 325	\$ 8,994	\$ 27,467	\$ 35,061	3.2	3.9	2.8	487		20,110	309,173	4,435	\$ 1,955	\$ 1,955	\$ 0.431	\$ 0.028	
C&I LARGE RETRO FIT																		
Energy Opportunities	\$ 33,614	\$ 53,610	\$ 87,124	\$ 114,071	\$ 149,677	3.4	1.7	1.6	1,650	Customers	105,469	1,290,212	15,256	\$ 2,203	\$ 2,203	\$ 0.319	\$ 0.026	
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC) Note 3	\$ 9,581	\$ 12,955	\$ 22,536	\$ 43,216	\$ 58,464	4.5	2.8	2.3	370	Customers	59,894	468,969	6,311	\$ 1,518	\$ 1,518	\$ 0.160	\$ 0.021	
PRIME	\$ 537	\$ 51	\$ 587	\$ 803	\$ 15,774	1.5	26.8	18.2	72	Customers	1,896	9,478	-	N/A	N/A	\$ 0.283	\$ 0.057	
Large - C&I Retrofit	\$ 43,732	\$ 66,515	\$ 110,247	\$ 158,090	\$ 223,915	3.6	2.0	1.8	2,091		167,258	1,756,660	21,567	\$ 2,026	\$ 2,026	\$ 0.261	\$ 0.025	
Small Business	\$ 38,305	\$ 48,099	\$ 86,404	\$ 113,513	\$ 149,039	3.0	1.7	1.7	5,492	Customers	107,187	1,313,076	18,450	\$ 2,076	\$ 2,076	\$ 0.357	\$ 0.029	
Subtotal C&I	\$ 90,706	\$ 114,939	\$ 205,644	\$ 299,070	\$ 408,015	3.3	2.0	1.8	8,070		294,555	3,380,909	44,452	\$ 2,041	\$ 2,041	\$ 0.308	\$ 0.027	
OTHER - EDUCATION *																		
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 400															
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ 1,500															
K-8 Education	\$ 325	\$ -	\$ 325															
Science Center	\$ 166	\$ -	\$ 166															
Subtotal Education	\$ 2,392	\$ -	\$ 2,392	\$ -	\$ -													

**TABLE B
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS - ELECTRIC & OIL**

COMPARISON OF CL&P CONSERVATION PROGRAMS FOR 2012																	
Program	Utility Costs (Electric & Oil) (000)	Customer Costs (000)	Total Resource Costs (000)	Electric System Benefit (000)	Total Resource Benefit (000)	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Statewide Total Resource B/C Ratio	# of Units	Units	Annualized Savings (MWh)	Lifetime Savings (MWh)	KW Impact (T/E)	Demand Load Reduction (\$/kW-yr)	Demand Cost (\$/kW-yr)	Cost Rate \$/kWh Annualize**	Utility Cost Ratio (\$/L kWh)**
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS																	
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 448	\$ -	\$ 448														
Other Funding Requests	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -														
Residential Loan Program	\$ 2,051	\$ -	\$ 2,051														
C&I Loan Program	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500														
C&I/M Loan Defaults	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 300														
Total Other Programs/Requirements	\$ 3,299	\$ -	\$ 3,299	\$ -	\$ -	0.00	0.00										
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT																	
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	1.0	1.0		400	Customers	-	-	110,000	\$ 32	\$ 32	N/A	N/A
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	1.0	1.0				-	-	110,000	\$ 32	\$ 32		
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D																	
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 376	\$ -	\$ 376														
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 376	\$ -	\$ 376	\$ -	\$ -												
Administration	\$ 1,200																
Marketing Plan	\$ 500																
Planning and Evaluation	\$ 2,990																
Information Technology	\$ 1,860																
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 650																
Performance Management Fee	\$ 8,133																
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 15,422																
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS																	
Residential	\$ 60,171										184,597	1,143,501	16,049				
C&I	\$ 95,519										294,555	3,380,909	154,452				
Other*	\$ 15,746										-	-	-				
TOTAL C&I/M BUDGET	\$ 171,437	\$ 131,900	\$ 287,914	\$ 393,653	\$ 606,225	2.3	2.1				479,152	4,524,410	170,500	\$ 2,776	\$ 294	\$ 0.358	\$ 0.038

* OTHER includes ISE/ECSU, RD&D, Admin, Planning & Evaluation, IT, EEB and PMF
 ** Total Ratio Columns exclude ISO-NE Load Response

Note 1: Beginning in 2006, Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances were combined into one program - Residential Retail Products.

Note 2: HES Cost Rates (\$/kW, \$/kW-year, \$/annual MWh, \$/lifetime MWh) include funding for oil measures. Residential HVAC program renamed "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

Note 3: O&M Services includes RetroCK, BSC budget and associated savings.

General Note: Costs and benefits associated with the gas programs that are delivered integrated with the electric programs are not included in the TRC analysis of the 2012 electric programs.

Gas program costs and benefits for integrated delivery programs are included in the 2012 Gas Plan.

**TABLE B
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS - ELECTRIC ONLY**

COMPARISON OF CL&P CONSERVATION PROGRAMS FOR 2012																	
Program	Electric Utility Costs (000)	Customer Costs (000)	Total Resource Costs (000)	Electric System Benefit (000)	Total Resource Benefit (000)	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Statewide Total Resource B/C Ratio	# of Units	Units	Annualized Savings (MWh)	Lifetime Savings (MWh)	kW Impact (YE)	Demand Cost \$/kW-yr**	Demand Savings \$/kW-yr**	Cost Rate \$/kWh Annualize**	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh**
RESIDENTIAL																	
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ 10,960	\$ 8,379	\$ 19,339	\$ 47,962	\$ 82,666	4.4	4.3	4.2	3,916,115	Products	125,669	595,166	9,162	\$ 1,196	\$ 257	\$ 0.065	\$ 0.018
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 3,500	\$ 2,000	\$ 5,500	\$ 9,003	\$ 9,003	1.9	1.6	1.1	10,000	Products	8,000	80,000	720	\$ 4,801	\$ 486	\$ 0.438	\$ 0.044
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 14,460	\$ 10,379	\$ 24,839	\$ 54,497	\$ 91,669	3.8	3.7	3.6			136,669	678,166	9,882	\$ 1,463	\$ 295	\$ 0.106	\$ 0.021
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,271	\$ 1,096	\$ 2,367	\$ 3,391	\$ 5,863	2.7	2.5	1.5	729	Homes	2,512	43,726	521	\$ 2,438	\$ 140	\$ 0.506	\$ 0.029
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 2	\$ 12,796	\$ 4,508	\$ 17,304	\$ 18,488	\$ 58,124	1.4	3.4	2.3	30,537	Cust/HVAC Rebates	21,719	224,916	4,024	\$ 2,961	\$ 286	\$ 0.549	\$ 0.053
HES Income Eligible	\$ 14,308	\$ 979	\$ 15,287	\$ 14,907	\$ 39,053	1.0	2.6	1.9	25,193	Customers	23,697	196,693	1,621	\$ 8,625	\$ 1,063	\$ 0.604	\$ 0.073
Subtotal Residential	\$ 42,835	\$ 16,962	\$ 59,797	\$ 91,284	\$ 194,710	2.1	3.3	2.5			184,597	1,143,501	16,049	\$ 2,669	\$ 431	\$ 0.232	\$ 0.037
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL																	
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY																	
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 8,669	\$ 325	\$ 8,994	\$ 27,467	\$ 35,061	3.2	3.9	2.8	487	Customers	20,110	308,173	4,435	\$ 1,955	\$ 127	\$ 0.431	\$ 0.028
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 8,669	\$ 325	\$ 8,994	\$ 27,467	\$ 35,061	3.2	3.9	2.8	487		20,110	308,173	4,435	\$ 1,955	\$ 127	\$ 0.431	\$ 0.028
C&I LARGE RETRO FIT																	
Energy Opportunities	\$ 33,614	\$ 53,610	\$ 87,124	\$ 114,071	\$ 149,677	3.4	1.7	1.6	1,850	Customers	105,469	1,290,212	15,256	\$ 2,203	\$ 180	\$ 0.319	\$ 0.026
OSM (Services, RetroCx, BSC) Note 3	\$ 9,581	\$ 12,955	\$ 22,536	\$ 43,216	\$ 59,464	4.5	2.6	2.3	370	Customers	59,894	458,969	6,311	\$ 1,518	\$ 198	\$ 0.160	\$ 0.021
PRIME	\$ 537	\$ 51	\$ 587	\$ 803	\$ 15,774	1.5	26.9	18.2	72	Customers	1,896	9,479	-	N/A	N/A	\$ 0.283	\$ 0.057
Large - C&I Retrofit	\$ 43,732	\$ 66,515	\$ 110,247	\$ 158,090	\$ 223,915	3.6	2.0	1.8	2,091		167,258	1,756,660	21,567	\$ 2,028	\$ 193	\$ 0.261	\$ 0.025
Small Business	\$ 38,305	\$ 48,099	\$ 86,404	\$ 113,513	\$ 149,039	3.0	1.7	1.7	5,492	Customers	107,187	1,313,076	18,450	\$ 2,076	\$ 169	\$ 0.357	\$ 0.029
Subtotal C&I	\$ 90,706	\$ 114,939	\$ 205,644	\$ 299,070	\$ 408,015	3.3	2.0	1.8	8,070		294,555	3,380,909	44,452	\$ 2,041	\$ 178	\$ 0.308	\$ 0.027
OTHER - EDUCATION*																	
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 400	\$ -	\$ 400														
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 1,500	\$ -	\$ 1,500														
K-8 Education	\$ 325	\$ -	\$ 325														
Science Center	\$ 166	\$ -	\$ 166														
Subtotal Education	\$ 2,392	\$ -	\$ 2,392	\$ -	\$ -												

**TABLE B
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS - ELECTRIC ONLY**

COMPARISON OF CL&P CONSERVATION PROGRAMS FOR 2012																	
Program	Electric Utility Costs (000)	Customer Costs (000)	Total Resource Costs (000)	Electric System Benefit (000)	Total Resource Benefit (000)	Electric System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Statewide Total Resource B/C Ratio	# of Units	Units	Annualized Savings (MWh)	Lifetime Savings (MWh)	kW Impact (YE)	Demand Cost \$/kW-yr**	Cost Rate \$/kWh Annualize**	Utility Cost Ratio \$/LT-kWh**	
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ISECSU)	\$ 448	\$ -	\$ 448														
Other Funding Requests	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -														
Residential Loan Program	\$ 2,051	\$ -	\$ 2,051														
C&I Loan Program	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ 500														
C&I/M Loan Defaults	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 300														
Total Other Programs/Requirements	\$ 3,299	\$ -	\$ 3,299	\$ -	\$ -	1.0	1.0										
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT																	
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	1.0	1.0		400	Customers	-	-	110,000	\$ 32	N/A	N/A	
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 3,500	1.0	1.0						110,000	\$ 32			
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D																	
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 376	\$ -	\$ 376														
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 376	\$ -	\$ 376	\$ -	\$ -												
Administration	\$ 1,200																
Marketing Plan	\$ 500																
Planning and Evaluation	\$ 2,980																
Information Technology	\$ 1,950																
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 650																
Performance Management Fee	\$ 8,133																
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 15,422																
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS																	
Residential	\$ 47,264										184,597	1,143,501	16,049				
C&I	\$ 95,519										294,555	3,380,909	154,452				
Other*	\$ 15,746										-	-	-				
TOTAL C&I/M BUDGET	\$ 158,530	\$ 131,900	\$ 275,007	\$ 393,853	\$ 606,225	2.5	2.2				479,152	4,524,410	170,500	\$ 2,562	\$ 0.331	\$ 0.035	

* OTHER includes ISECSU, RD&D, Admin, Planning & Evaluation, IT, EEB and PMF

** Total Ratio Columns include ISO-NE Load Response

Note 1: Beginning in 2008, Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances were combined into one program - Residential Retail Products.

Note 2: HES Cost Rates (\$/kW, \$/kW-Year, \$/kWh, \$/kWh-Year, \$/kWh, \$/kWh-Year) excludes \$/M of funding for oil measures. Residential HVAC program remained "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

Note 3: C&I Services include RetroCC, BSC Budget and associated savings.

General Note: Costs and benefits associated with the gas programs that are delivered integrated with the electric programs are not included in the TRC analysis of the 2012 electric programs.

Gas program costs and benefits for integrated delivery programs are included in the 2012 Gas Plan.

**TABLE B1
CL&P 2012 COMPARISON OF PROGRAM BENEFITS**

Program	Rate Impact (Program Costs less DRIPE) (000)	Electric System				Non-Electric Benefits				Total Benefits
		Energy Benefits (000)	Capacity Benefits (000)	DRIPE (000)	Electric System Benefits (000)	Resource Benefits (000)	Non-Resource Benefits (000)	Emissions Benefits (000)	Total Non- Electric Benefits (000)	Total Resource Benefits (000)
RESIDENTIAL										
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ (1,159)	\$ 33,090	\$ 2,783	\$ 12,119	\$ 47,992	\$ -	\$ 12,367	\$ 22,307	\$ 34,674	\$ 82,666
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 2,373	\$ 4,474	\$ 404	\$ 1,627	\$ 6,505	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,499	\$ 2,499	\$ 9,003
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 1,214	\$ 37,564	\$ 3,187	\$ 13,746	\$ 54,497	\$ -	\$ 12,367	\$ 24,806	\$ 37,172	\$ 91,669
Residential New Construction	\$ 1,244	\$ 2,161	\$ 636	\$ 594	\$ 3,391	\$ 1,521	\$ 3	\$ 947	\$ 2,472	\$ 5,863
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 2	\$ 16,287	\$ 11,497	\$ 3,373	\$ 3,618	\$ 18,488	\$ 32,091	\$ 1,849	\$ 5,696	\$ 39,636	\$ 58,124
HES Income Eligible	\$ 15,477	\$ 10,716	\$ 629	\$ 3,562	\$ 14,907	\$ 16,850	\$ 1,097	\$ 6,200	\$ 24,146	\$ 39,053
Subtotal Residential	\$ 34,222	\$ 61,938	\$ 7,825	\$ 21,520	\$ 91,284	\$ 50,461	\$ 15,316	\$ 37,649	\$ 103,426	\$ 194,710
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL										
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY										
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 2,811	\$ 17,402	\$ 4,207	\$ 5,859	\$ 27,467	\$ (245)	\$ 205	\$ 7,634	\$ 7,594	\$ 35,061
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 2,811	\$ 17,402	\$ 4,207	\$ 5,859	\$ 27,467	\$ (245)	\$ 205	\$ 7,634	\$ 7,594	\$ 35,061
C&I LARGE RETRO FIT										
Energy Opportunities	\$ 5,238	\$ 75,096	\$ 10,599	\$ 28,376	\$ 114,071	\$ (894)	\$ 614	\$ 35,886	\$ 35,606	\$ 149,677
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC) Note 3	\$ (1,956)	\$ 28,280	\$ 3,399	\$ 11,537	\$ 43,216	\$ (60)	\$ 41	\$ 15,268	\$ 15,249	\$ 58,464
PRIME	\$ 316	\$ 582	\$ -	\$ 220	\$ 803	\$ -	\$ 14,609	\$ 362	\$ 14,971	\$ 15,774
Large - C&I Retrofit	\$ 3,598	\$ 103,959	\$ 13,997	\$ 40,134	\$ 158,090	\$ (954)	\$ 15,264	\$ 51,516	\$ 65,826	\$ 223,915
Small Business	\$ 10,701	\$ 73,000	\$ 12,909	\$ 27,604	\$ 113,513	\$ (3,422)	\$ 2,350	\$ 36,598	\$ 35,526	\$ 149,039
Subtotal C&I	\$ 17,110	\$ 194,360	\$ 31,113	\$ 73,596	\$ 299,070	\$ (4,622)	\$ 17,820	\$ 95,747	\$ 108,945	\$ 408,015
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT										
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ 3,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500
Other (Educational, Other Programs/Requirements, RD&D, Admin & Planning)	21,489	-	-	-	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL C&LM	\$ 76,321	\$ 256,299	\$ 42,439	\$ 95,116	\$ 393,853	\$ 45,840	\$ 33,136	\$ 133,396	\$ 212,372	\$ 606,225

Note 1: Beginning in 2006, Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances were combined into one program - Residential Retail Products.

Note 2: Residential HVAC program renamed "CT Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

Note 3: O&M Services includes RetroCx budget, BSC, and associated savings.

General Note: Costs and benefits associated with the gas programs that are delivered integrated with the electric programs are not included in the Total Resource Cost (TRC) analysis of the 2012 electric programs.


Gas program costs and benefits for integrated delivery programs are included in the 2012 Gas Plan.

Table C
CL&P 2012 C&LM Budget Details - Increased Savings Model

CL&P C&LM BUDGET (\$000)	CL&P Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Contractor Labor	Incentives	Marketing	Other **	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
Residential Retail Products	\$ 260	\$ 4	\$ 1,200	\$ 100	\$ 8,586	\$ 750	\$ 35	\$ 25	\$ 10,960
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 130	\$ 5	\$ 50	\$ 100	\$ 3,555	\$ 100	\$ 35	\$ 25	\$ 4,000
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 390	\$ 9	\$ 1,250	\$ 200	\$ 12,141	\$ 850	\$ 70	\$ 50	\$ 14,960
Residential New Construction	\$ 174	\$ 3	\$ 148	\$ 28	\$ 1,435	\$ 40	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 1,838
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting)	\$ 1,200	\$ 35	\$ 435	\$ 500	\$ 16,985	\$ 600	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 19,905
HES Income Eligible	\$ 800	\$ 30	\$ 953	\$ 500	\$ 16,131	\$ 500	\$ 50	\$ 75	\$ 19,039
Subtotal Residential	\$ 2,564	\$ 77	\$ 2,786	\$ 1,228	\$ 46,692	\$ 1,990	\$ 200	\$ 205	\$ 55,742
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL									
C & I LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 950	\$ 10	\$ 900	\$ 321	\$ 6,170	\$ 200	\$ 70	\$ 48	\$ 8,669
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 950	\$ 10	\$ 900	\$ 321	\$ 6,170	\$ 200	\$ 70	\$ 48	\$ 8,669
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 950	\$ 10	\$ 900	\$ 321	\$ 6,170	\$ 200	\$ 70	\$ 48	\$ 8,669
C & I LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 3,700	\$ 50	\$ 750	\$ 1,500	\$ 26,824	\$ 600	\$ 30	\$ 160	\$ 33,614
Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,200	\$ 20	\$ 1,000	\$ 120	\$ 6,961	\$ 200	\$ 30	\$ 50	\$ 9,581
O&M (Service, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 45	\$ 5	\$ 20	\$ 10	\$ 394	\$ 50	\$ 3	\$ 10	\$ 537
PRIME	\$ 494	\$ 75	\$ 1,770	\$ 1,630	\$ 34,179	\$ 850	\$ 63	\$ 220	\$ 43,732
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 2,300	\$ 40	\$ 300	\$ 900	\$ 30,135	\$ 600	\$ 30	\$ 4,000	\$ 38,305
Small Business	\$ 8,195	\$ 125	\$ 2,970	\$ 2,851	\$ 70,484	\$ 1,650	\$ 163	\$ 4,268	\$ 90,706
Subtotal C&I	\$ 28	\$ 10	\$ 347	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 305	\$ -	\$ 1,156	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 2	\$ 2	\$ 1,500
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 84	\$ 3	\$ 231	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ 3	\$ 325
K-8 Education	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 166
Science Center	\$ 417	\$ 13	\$ 1,900	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ 39	\$ 2	\$ 5	\$ 2,392
Subtotal Education	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 448
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Other Funding Requests	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 2,013	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,051
Residential Loan Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
C&I Loan Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 35	\$ -	\$ 2,513	\$ 3	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 748	\$ -	\$ 3,299
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 341	\$ 5	\$ 743	\$ 94	\$ 2,295	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ 12	\$ 3,500
ISO Load Response Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Power Factor	\$ 341	\$ 5	\$ 743	\$ 94	\$ 2,295	\$ 10	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,500
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 100	\$ 2	\$ 269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 376
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 100	\$ 2	\$ 269	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 376
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 1,059	\$ 4	\$ -	\$ 90	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 17	\$ 30	\$ 1,200
Administration	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ 480	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500
Marketing	\$ 709	\$ 6	\$ 20	\$ 5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 20	\$ 19	\$ 780
Planning	\$ 194	\$ 5	\$ 2,001	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 2,210
Evaluation	\$ 550	\$ 200	\$ 1,120	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 80	\$ 1,950
Information Technology	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 650	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 650
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Performance Management Fee	\$ 215	\$ 215	\$ 3,791	\$ 110	\$ -	\$ 480	\$ 8,175	\$ 134	\$ 15,423
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 2,954	\$ 88	\$ 6,365	\$ 1,255	\$ 46,692	\$ 2,406	\$ 202	\$ 210	\$ 60,171
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS	\$ 8,604	\$ 152	\$ 4,547	\$ 2,951	\$ 72,779	\$ 1,763	\$ 463	\$ 4,280	\$ 95,519
Residential	\$ 2,564	\$ 77	\$ 2,786	\$ 1,228	\$ 46,692	\$ 1,990	\$ 200	\$ 205	\$ 55,742
C&I	\$ 8,195	\$ 125	\$ 2,970	\$ 2,851	\$ 70,484	\$ 1,650	\$ 163	\$ 4,268	\$ 90,706
Other*	\$ 14,170	\$ 437	\$ 14,972	\$ 4,301	\$ 119,471	\$ 4,169	\$ 9,288	\$ 4,629	\$ 171,437
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 28	\$ 10	\$ 347	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 400

* Other -includes ISE/ECSU, RD&D, Admin, Planning & Evaluation, and IT
 ** Other includes Performance Management Fee, ECSU, Energy Conservation Loan Fund, Loan Defaults, Dues, Postage.

CL&P
2011 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
C&LM Budget By Expense Class
Table C Pie Chart



<u>Expense Classes</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
NU Labor	\$ 14,170	8.3%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 437	0.3%
Outside Services	\$ 14,972	8.7%
Other Labor	\$ 4,301	2.5%
Incentives	\$ 119,471	69.7%
Marketing	\$ 4,169	2.4%
Other	\$ 9,288	5.4%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 4,629	2.7%
Total	\$ 171,437	100.00%

Table D
CL&P Historical and Projected S and KW

	Expenditures \$										2012 Budget	
	2003 Actual	2004 Actual	2005 Actual	2006 Actual	2007 Actual	2008 Actual	2009 Actual	2010 Actual	2011 Actual	2012 Budget		
RESIDENTIAL												
Rental Products Note 1	3,154,881	6,001,655	6,440,269	5,626,761	5,961,939	4,903,424	3,223,833	8,764,502	6,132,901	10,960,000		
Appliance Retirement		1,446,975	2,034,265	1,188,636		268,935		3,615,349	-	4,000,000		
Customer Initiated Projects		344,933	329,132									
Total - Consumer Products	3,154,881	7,693,563	8,803,716	6,815,397	5,961,939	5,172,359	3,223,833	13,379,851	6,132,901	14,960,000		
Residential New Construction Note 2	1,115,726	767,514	1,187,996	1,688,185	1,411,889	1,563,639	494,394	1,034,433	1,460,024	1,835,050		
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 3	1,462,685	1,438,871	2,029,289	4,533,563	5,467,875	7,167,887	7,949,519	22,409,603	17,749,370	19,905,000		
HES Income Eligible	3,180,815	4,590,734	4,682,547	5,298,538	7,112,363	7,035,693	7,758,662	9,361,764	11,027,047	19,039,000		
Subtotal Residential	8,914,107	14,490,682	16,703,048	18,115,783	19,956,366	20,939,578	19,456,108	45,185,651	36,369,342	55,742,050		
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL												
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY												
Energy Conscious Blueprint Note 4	10,410,843	14,479,658	12,468,319	9,448,615	13,084,740	18,460,455	6,756,126	8,033,028	8,759,606	8,669,250		
Total - Lost Opportunity	10,410,843	14,479,658	12,468,319	9,448,615	13,084,740	18,460,455	6,756,126	8,033,028	8,759,606	8,669,250		
C&I LARGE RETROFIT												
C&I RFP	2,049,863	4,037,727	9,176,612									
Energy Opportunities Note 5	766,397	777,245	1,026,898	9,081,115	22,928,130	29,465,748	10,231,492	17,863,695	25,935,919	33,614,000		
O&M (Service, RetroC, BSC)	450,905	933,762	1,833,005	1,435,302	1,113,822	1,929,890	1,100,065	1,347,241	4,729,740	9,831,000		
PRIME Note 6						394,290	476,627	488,087		536,550		
Municipal Energy & Schools Note 7	2,288,449	6,718,880	4,401,007									
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	5,555,614	12,467,614	16,437,522	10,516,417	24,041,952	31,495,638	11,725,847	19,687,563	31,653,746	43,731,550		
Small Business	2,167,157	3,263,609	2,710,538	7,497,147	10,204,353	11,990,772	12,100,944	13,436,752	38,305,000	39,905,800		
Subtotal C&I	18,133,614	30,210,881	31,616,379	27,462,179	47,331,045	61,346,995	23,361,491	39,821,535	53,350,104	90,705,800		
OTHER EDUCATION												
Smart Living Center	292,526	61,519	80,760	86,739	207,200	107,047	92,465	131,950	400,000	400,340		
Science Center			200,000	207,200	67,142	214,403	207,171	-		166,000		
EE/Smart* (K-12 Education)	249,053	61,542	242,897	159,987	232,784	208,451	197,076	331,133	225,000	325,000		
EE Community / Behavior Pilot							46,938	960,047	850,000	1,500,400		
Community Based Program (SWCT)	71,081	96,251	168,371	201,382	212,080							
Total - Education	614,660	219,312	692,028	655,308	719,206	529,901	543,021	1,432,130	1,475,000	2,891,750		
OTHER PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS												
Institute for Sustainable Energy (IECSU)	950,000	716,000	404,391	242,000	240,000	320,000	400,000	600,000	448,000	448,000		
Residential Loan Program							18,285	16,969,958	3,650,000	2,050,700		
C&I Loan Program							9,634	204,898	475,000	500,000		
Other Funding Requests							325,385					
C&I Loan Details							105,822	110,056	135,000	300,000		
Subtotal Other Programs/Requirements	950,000	855,710	532,512	313,592	297,267	357,923	533,741	19,610,297	4,708,000	3,998,700		
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT												
ISO Load Response Program	2,436,621	1,411,769	1,241,601	491,060	456,025	102,909	2,864,364	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,500,000		
Demand Reduction Note 8	118,454	62,067	12,663	9,513								
Power Factor	33,000	477,007	123,615	144,901	64,128							
Wait Until 800	209,639	100,000										
Subtotal Load Management	2,436,621	501,326	2,080,843	1,377,879	645,474	520,153	102,909	2,864,364	3,000,000	3,500,000		
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D												
Renewables Incentives	7,898	3,019										
Research, Development & Demonstration	1,721,585	1,117,495	625,597	(22,769)	131,220	114,559	75,087	102,434	200,000	375,900		
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	1,721,585	1,125,393	628,616	(22,769)	131,220	114,559	75,087	102,434	200,000	375,900		
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING												
Administration	2,330,603	852,550	504,237	728,465	663,411	586,204	747,757	835,729	900,000	1,199,700		
Marketing Plan			284,419	67,020	420,292	3,618	5,804	63,349	176,651	500,000		
Planning and Evaluation	812,535	827,799	2,008,477	1,138,717	750,975	1,433,843	1,617,773	2,450,000	2,989,950			
Information Technology	307,548	701,153	811,572	1,812,738	1,656,432	1,636,204	1,268,926	1,810,543	1,700,000	1,950,000		
Energy Efficiency Board	247,321	98,984	316,021	255,176	309,122	476,793	368,509	431,860	400,000	650,000		
Audit			294,459									
Performance Management Fee	1,180,501	3,937,752	3,866,548	4,056,741	4,788,385	3,903,735	2,239,767	5,474,571	5,216,455	8,132,693		
Admin Planning Expenditures	5,878,508	6,418,238	8,085,733	8,058,857	8,840,297	8,488,617	6,248,547	10,669,278	10,843,106	15,422,343		
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS	9,455,616	14,888,079	17,632,785	17,632,643	20,911,521	19,922,883	19,922,869	45,011,019	41,385,663	60,171,150		
Residential	20,643,356	30,673,832	33,842,055	29,024,118	48,215,139	61,970,086	23,650,206	49,331,022	57,245,434	65,519,150		
Other Note 9	8,550,093	8,256,631	8,834,321	8,211,668	8,539,545	8,471,338	6,717,830	11,533,848	11,514,145	15,742,213		
TOTAL (includes ISO Load Response)	38,649,098	53,821,542	60,309,164	55,906,629	77,669,195	91,849,506	50,290,904	119,676,789	109,945,852	171,436,543		
TOTAL (excludes ISO Load Response)	36,211,474	53,081,309	58,897,395	54,719,228	77,178,135	91,393,481	50,187,995	116,812,425	106,945,452	167,946,543		

Note 1. Includes Residential Lighting, Smart Living Catalog and Odors/Wastewater programs.
 Note 2. Includes Demand Savings from the GEO Thermal Heat Pump and Heat Pump Water Heater programs.
 Note 3. Includes Demand Savings from the Spectrum Heat program. In 2007, Residential HVAC program remained "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audit.
 Note 4. Includes Demand Savings from the Energy program.
 Note 5. Includes Demand Savings from the Energy program.
 Note 6. Previously included in Energy Conscious Program.
 Note 7. Includes Demand Savings from the State Buildings program.
 Note 8. Included in Energy Opportunities.
 Note 9. ISO Load Management Program. Load Savings kW are included in nearby totals.

**Table D1
CL&P Historical and Projected Annual kWh and Lifetime kWh**

Category	Annual Savings kWh (000's)												Lifetime Savings kWh (000's)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
	2003		2004		2005		2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023		2024		2025		2026		2027		2028		2029		2030		2031		2032		2033		2034		2035		2036		2037		2038		2039		2040		2041		2042		2043		2044		2045		2046		2047		2048		2049		2050		2051		2052		2053		2054		2055		2056		2057		2058		2059		2060		2061		2062		2063		2064		2065		2066		2067		2068		2069		2070		2071		2072		2073		2074		2075		2076		2077		2078		2079		2080		2081		2082		2083		2084		2085		2086		2087		2088		2089		2090		2091		2092		2093		2094		2095		2096		2097		2098		2099		2100		2101		2102		2103		2104		2105		2106		2107		2108		2109		2110		2111		2112		2113		2114		2115		2116		2117		2118		2119		2120		2121		2122		2123		2124		2125		2126		2127		2128		2129		2130		2131		2132		2133		2134		2135		2136		2137		2138		2139		2140		2141		2142		2143		2144		2145		2146		2147		2148		2149		2150		2151		2152		2153		2154		2155		2156		2157		2158		2159		2160		2161		2162		2163		2164		2165		2166		2167		2168		2169		2170		2171		2172		2173		2174		2175		2176		2177		2178		2179		2180		2181		2182		2183		2184		2185		2186		2187		2188		2189		2190		2191		2192		2193		2194		2195		2196		2197		2198		2199		2200		2201		2202		2203		2204		2205		2206		2207		2208		2209		2210		2211		2212		2213		2214		2215		2216		2217		2218		2219		2220		2221		2222		2223		2224		2225		2226		2227		2228		2229		2230		2231		2232		2233		2234		2235		2236		2237		2238		2239		2240		2241		2242		2243		2244		2245		2246		2247		2248		2249		2250		2251		2252		2253		2254		2255		2256		2257		2258		2259		2260		2261		2262		2263		2264		2265		2266		2267		2268		2269		2270		2271		2272		2273		2274		2275		2276		2277		2278		2279		2280		2281		2282		2283		2284		2285		2286		2287		2288		2289		2290		2291		2292		2293		2294		2295		2296		2297		2298		2299		2300		2301		2302		2303		2304		2305		2306		2307		2308		2309		2310		2311		2312		2313		2314		2315		2316		2317		2318		2319		2320		2321		2322		2323		2324		2325		2326		2327		2328		2329		2330		2331		2332		2333		2334		2335		2336		2337		2338		2339		2340		2341		2342		2343		2344		2345		2346		2347		2348		2349		2350		2351		2352		2353		2354		2355		2356		2357		2358		2359		2360		2361		2362		2363		2364		2365		2366		2367		2368		2369		2370		2371		2372		2373		2374		2375		2376		2377		2378		2379		2380		2381		2382		2383		2384		2385		2386		2387		2388		2389		2390		2391		2392		2393		2394		2395		2396		2397		2398		2399		2400		2401		2402		2403		2404		2405		2406		2407		2408		2409		2410		2411		2412		2413		2414		2415		2416		2417		2418		2419		2420		2421		2422		2423		2424		2425		2426		2427		2428		2429		2430		2431		2432		2433		2434		2435		2436		2437		2438		2439		2440		2441		2442		2443		2444		2445		2446		2447		2448		2449		2450		2451		2452		2453		2454		2455		2456		2457		2458		2459		2460		2461		2462		2463		2464		2465		2466		2467		2468		2469		2470		2471		2472		2473		2474		2475		2476		2477		2478		2479		2480		2481		2482		2483		2484		2485		2486		2487		2488		2489		2490		2491		2492		2493		2494		2495		2496		2497		2498		2499		2500		2501		2502		2503		2504		2505		2506		2507		2508		2509		2510		2511		2512		2513		2514		2515		2516		2517		2518		2519		2520		2521		2522		2523		2524		2525		2526		2527		2528		2529		2530		2531		2532		2533		2534		2535		2536		2537		2538		2539		2540		2541		2542		2543		2544		2545		2546		2547		2548		2549		2550		2551		2552		2553		2554		2555		2556		2557		2558		2559		2560		2561		2562		2563		2564		2565		2566		2567		2568		2569		2570		2571		2572		2573		2574		2575		2576		2577		2578		2579		2580		2581		2582		2583		2584		2585		2586		2587		2588		2589		2590		2591		2592		2593		2594		2595		2596		2597		2598		2599		2600		2601		2602		2603		2604		2605		2606		2607		2608		2609		2610		2611		2612		2613		2614		2615		2616		2617		2618		2619		2620		2621		2622		2623		2624		2625		2626		2627		2628		2629		2630		2631		2632		2633		2634		2635		2636		2637		2638		2639		2640		2641		2642		2643		2644		2645		2646		2647		2648		2649		2650		2651		2652		2653		2654		2655		2656		2657		2658		2659		2660		2661		2662		2663		2664		2665		2666		2667		2668		2669		2670		2671		2672		2673		2674		2675		2676		2677		2678		2679		2680		2681		2682		2683		2684		2685		2686		2687		2688		2689		2690		2691		2692		2693		2694		2695		2696		2697		2698		2699		2700		2701		2702		2703		2704		2705		2706		2707		2708		2709		2710		2711		2712		2713		2714		2715		2716		2717		2718		2719		2720		2721		2722		2723		2724		2725		2726		2727		2728		2729		2730		2731		2732		2733		2734		2735		2736		2737		2738		2739		2740		2741		2742		2743		2744		2745		2746		2747		2748		2749		2750		2751		2752		2753		2754		2755		2756		2757		2758		2759		2760		2761		2762		2763		2764		2765		2766		2767		2768		2769		2770		2771		2772		2773		2774		2775		2776		2777		2778		2779		2780		2781		2782		2783		2784		2785		2786		2787		2788		2789		2790		2791		2792		2793		2794		2795		2796		2797		2798		2799		2800		2801		2802		2803		2804		2805		2806		2807		2808		2809		2810		2811		2812		2813		2814		2815		2816		2817		2818		2819		2820		2821		2822		2823		2824		2825		2826		2827		2828		2829		2830		2831		2832		2833		2834		2835		2836		2837		2838		2839		2840		2841		2842		2843		2844		2845		2846		2847		2848		2849		2850		2851		2852		2853		2854		2855		2856		2857		2858		2859		2860		2861		2862		2863		2864		2865		2866		2867		2868		2869		2870		2871		2872		2873		2874		2875		2876		2877		2878		2879		2880		2881		2882		2883		2884		2885		2886		2887		2888		2889		2890		2891		2892		2893		2894		2895		2896		2897		2898		2899		2900		2901		2902		2903		2904		2905		2906		2907		2908		2909		2910		2911		2912		2913		2914		2915		2916		2917		2918		2919		2920		2921		2922		2923		2924		2925		2926		2927		2928		2929		2930		2931		2932		2933		2934		2935		2936		2937		2938		2939		2940		2941		2942		2943		2944		2945		2946		2947		2948		2949		2950		2951		2952		2953		2954		2955		2956		2957		2958		2959		2960		2961		2962		2963		2964		2965		2966		2967		2968		2969		2970		2971		2972		2973		2974		2975		2976		2977		2978		2979		2980		2981		2982		2983		2984		2985		2986		2987		2988		2989		2990		2991		2992		2993		2994		2995		2996		2997		2998		2999		3000		3001		3002		3003		3004		3005		3006		3007		3008		3009		3010		3011		3012		3013		3014		3015		3016		3017		3018		3019		3020		3021	

THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY

2012 Management Incentive Performance Indicators and Incentive Matrix


CL&P and the EEB recognize that having clear indicators and metrics of performance are helpful in delivering quality programs to Connecticut consumers. The following is a table of performance and incentive metrics developed by the utilities with input from the EEB, the Board consultants and the Department. These performance and incentive metrics apply to the programs delineated in this Plan. The projected CL&P Performance Incentive is **\$8,132,693** and is based on achieving **100%** of all performance targets and earning an incentive of **5%** of the total C&LM program budget of **\$162,653,850** as shown on Table A (exclusive of Energy Efficiency Board costs, management incentives and audit costs). The actual earned amount will be calculated on a sliding scale based on the percent of goal achieved and the actual total expenditures, based on the following performance range:

-Performance Incentive Illustration-		
<u>Performance %</u>	<u>Pretax Incentive</u>	<u>Pre-tax Incentive</u>
<u>Minimum</u>		
70	2%	\$3,253,077
80	3%	\$4,879,616
90	4%	\$6,506,154
100	5%	\$8,132,693
110	6%	\$9,759,231
120	7%	\$11,385,770
130	8%	\$13,012,308

Maximum

Incentive Basis Budget \$162,653,850

Goals will be prorated based on actual over/under spend of budget in the event actual spending is over/under 5% of budget.



SECTOR Program	Performance Indicators				Incentive Metrics			
	Program Name	L T-kWh	kW	% (1)	Incentive Metric	Target Goal	Weight	Incentive
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL (C&I)								
	\$90,706	309,173,450	4,435	9.3%	Total Electric System Benefit from C&I programs	Electric System Benefit from C&I programs \$270,388	0.2100	\$1,707,865
C&I Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget		1,290,212,047	15,256	37.6%				
		458,968,506	6,311	13.7%				
		9,479,141	-	0.2%				
		1,313,075,883	18,450	39.2%				
		3,380,909,006	44,452					
		Savings Rate \$ 0.06857 / kWh \$ 867.64 / kW						
		Savings \$ 231,820 \$ 38,568						
		(1) percent of target goal						
Net Electric System Benefit: C&I		Electric System Benefit less Program Costs		\$179,682		\$179,682	0.2100	\$1,707,865
C&I Market Segmentation	\$0	The Companies will develop a plan which includes a protocol for defining market penetration and segmentation and establishing long term goals in collaboration with the EEB (EO and SBEA)						
Energy Opportunities	\$33,614	1) Percentage of EO signed projects that incorporate performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital)				10% of the signed projects will incorporate performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital)	0.0200	\$162,654
		2) Percentage of projects participating in the Comprehensive Initiative receiving comprehensive incentive				15% of the signed projects will be comprehensive projects	0.0200	\$162,654
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$6,669	1) Number of new construction/major renovation projects that exceed the new construction State Energy Code baseline by at least 30 % or follow the whole building performance track.				40% of signed contracts exceed code or are whole building performance track project	0.020	\$162,654
		2) The companies will develop a plan to transition into IECC 2012 (ASHRAE 2010) in collaboration with the EEB:						
		a) Awareness: Prepare the market by working with the AE community, the trade communities; specifiers and inspectors						
		b) Develop and deliver a series of code training sessions for the AE and trade communities						
		c) Develop and deliver a series of training sessions on a variety of subjects relating to Integrated Design and High Performance Buildings (including Net Zero buildings) and code						
Small Business	\$38,305	Electric Saving LTRWh : 1,313,075,883			Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric			
		Demand Saving kW : 18,450						
		Number of signed projects participating in the "Comprehensive" initiative. (i.e., 2 or more end uses) receiving comprehensive performance incentive				15% of the signed projects will be comprehensive projects	0.02	\$162,654
O&M / RCx	\$5,581	1) The Companies will develop and promote a Sustainable Energy Management Plan and Guide which includes benchmarking, the use of dashboards, and an implementation plan including Retro-commissioning in collaboration with the EEB.				Develop the Sustainable Energy Mgmt Guide and enroll 100 customers	0.02	\$162,654
Total of Incentives							1.00000	\$8,132,693



Table A
UI 2012 Proposed C&LM Budget

UI C&LM BUDGET	2011	2012	2012	2013
	UI REVISED BASE BUDGET 3/15/2011	UI PROPOSED BASE BUDGET 9/1/2011	UI PROPOSED INCREASED SAVINGS BUDGET 9/1/2011	UI PROPOSED BASE BUDGET 9/1/2011
RESIDENTIAL				
Residential Retail Products	\$ 2,133,216	\$ 1,755,855	3,445,304	1,744,913
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 2,133,216	\$ 1,755,855	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,744,913
Residential New Construction	\$ 215,440	\$ 177,329	\$ 177,329	\$ 176,224
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting)	\$ 2,960,781	\$ 2,281,658	\$ 7,364,631	\$ 2,267,440
HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,498,996	\$ 2,118,093	\$ 5,038,002	\$ 2,104,894
Subtotal RESIDENTIAL	\$ 7,808,433	\$ 6,332,935	\$ 16,025,266	\$ 6,293,471
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL				
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 3,174,527	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 2,371,352
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 3,174,527	\$ 2,386,221	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 2,371,352
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 3,811,021	\$ 2,957,319	\$ 10,529,387	\$ 2,938,891
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 429,667	\$ 631,298	\$ 3,776,044	\$ 627,364
PRIME	\$ 86,008	\$ 116,141	\$ 402,385	\$ 115,417
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 4,326,696	\$ 3,704,759	\$ 14,707,816	\$ 3,681,673
Small Business	\$ 2,717,634	\$ 2,227,636	\$ 4,512,339	\$ 2,213,754
Subtotal C&I	\$ 10,218,857	\$ 8,318,616	\$ 23,102,973	\$ 8,266,779
OTHER - EDUCATION				
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 459,246	\$ 481,746	\$ 481,746	\$ 481,746
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 176,822	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
Science Center	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000
K - 8 Education	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825	\$ 401,825
Subtotal Education	\$ 1,037,893	\$ 1,225,571	\$ 1,225,571	\$ 1,225,571
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 589,087	\$ 347,280	\$ 347,280	\$ 328,755
C&I Loan Program	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 173,000	\$ 50,000
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 801,087	\$ 559,280	\$ 682,280	\$ 540,755
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT				
ISO Load Response Program Support	\$ -	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,100,000
Subtotal Load Management	\$ -	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,100,000
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D				
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 125,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Administration	\$ 646,635	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 782,163
Planning and Evaluation	\$ 308,819	\$ 316,765	\$ 316,765	\$ 332,332
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ 430,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000
Information Technology	\$ 243,000	\$ 342,500	\$ 342,500	\$ 342,500
EEB	\$ 210,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 300,000
2011 Performance Management Fee	\$ 1,083,486	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ 1,003,333	\$ 2,243,318	\$ -
2013 Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 986,429
Marketing Plan	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 50,000
Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 2,971,940	\$ 3,332,598	\$ 4,822,583	\$ 3,363,424
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS				
Residential	\$ 9,348,199	\$ 7,781,037	\$ 17,633,368	\$ 7,723,048
C&I	\$ 10,456,071	\$ 9,969,365	\$ 24,916,722	\$ 9,641,528
Other*	\$ 3,158,940	\$ 3,619,598	\$ 4,909,583	\$ 3,650,424
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 22,963,210	\$ 21,370,000	\$ 47,459,673	\$ 21,015,000

* OTHER - EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.

Totals may vary due to rounding

THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT BUDGET PIES
INCREASED SAVINGS
TABLE A



Customer Class	Budget	% of Total C&LM Budget	% of Residential & C&I Budget	% of Residential & C&I Revenue	Difference
Res. Low Income	\$ 5,416,249	11.41%	12.73%	12.44%	0.29%
Res Non-Low Income	\$ 12,217,119	25.74%	28.71%	27.11%	1.60%
Residential Sub-total	\$ 17,633,368	37.15%	41.44%	39.55%	1.89%
Small Business <150kW	\$ 4,512,339	9.51%	10.60%	19.39%	-8.79%
Med & Large Commercial	\$ 13,915,089	29.32%	32.70%	26.72%	5.98%
Med & Large Industrial	\$ 5,786,909	12.19%	13.60%	10.23%	3.37%
Municipal	\$ 702,385	1.48%	1.65%	4.11%	-2.46%
C & I Sub-total	\$ 24,916,722	52.50%	58.56%	60.45%	-1.89%
Sub-total for Residential and C&I	\$ 42,550,090	89.66%	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%
Other Expenditures	\$ 4,909,583	10.34%			
Other Expenditures Sub-total	\$ 4,909,583	10.34%			
GRAND TOTAL *	\$ 47,459,673	100%			

Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
COMPARISON OF UI CONSERVATION PROGRAMS
INCLUDES DRIPE AND CO²
INCREASED SAVINGS
TABLE B**

Program	Utility Costs 2012	Customer Cost 2012	Total Resource Cost 2012	Electric System Benefit 2012	Total Resource Benefit 2012	Electric System BC Ratio	Total Resource BC Ratio	Goals# Units	Units of Measure	Annualized Savings kWh	Lifetime Savings kWh	Load Savings kW	Demand Cost \$/kW	Demand Cost \$/kW yr	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh Annualized	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh Lifetime
Residential Retail Products	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,291,087	\$ 4,736,391	\$ 11,666,506	\$ 19,627,226	3.39	4.14	1,032,118	Bulbs, Fixtures	30,634,720	142,177,199	2,757.1	\$ 1,250	\$ 269	\$ 0.1125	\$ 0.024
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,291,087	\$ 4,736,391	\$ 11,666,506	\$ 19,627,226	3.39	4.14						\$ 1,250	\$ 269	\$ 0.1125	\$ 0.024
Residential New Construction	\$ 177,329	\$ 154,071	\$ 331,400	\$ 349,378	\$ 434,448	1.97	1.31	113	No of Homes	241,509	2,941,285	103.0	\$ 1,722	\$ 141	\$ 0.7343	\$ 0.060
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 7,364,631	\$ 951,349	\$ 8,315,980	\$ 8,223,480	\$ 24,577,596	1.12	2.96	8,494	No of Homes	8,282,425	84,133,117	2,223.8	\$ 3,312	\$ 326	\$ 0.8892	\$ 0.088
HES Income Eligible	\$ 5,038,002	\$ 641,466	\$ 5,679,468	\$ 4,482,847	\$ 14,868,726	0.89	2.62	7,568	Customers	5,652,316	65,303,756	475.0	\$ 10,606	\$ 918	\$ 0.8913	\$ 0.077
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 16,025,266	\$ 3,037,972	\$ 19,063,238	\$ 24,722,211	\$ 59,505,995	1.54	3.12			44,810,970	294,555,356	5,558.9	\$ 2,893	\$ 439	\$ 0.3576	\$ 0.054
Energy Conscious Blueprint (a)	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 1,502,953	\$ 5,385,771	\$ 15,132,018	\$ 19,688,014	3.90	3.66	129	Projects	11,729,327	179,590,966	1,971.6	\$ 1,969	\$ 129	\$ 0.3310	\$ 0.022
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 1,502,953	\$ 5,385,771	\$ 15,132,018	\$ 19,688,014	3.90	3.66			11,729,327	179,590,966	1,971.6	\$ 1,969	\$ 129	\$ 0.3310	\$ 0.022
Energy Opportunities	\$ 10,702,387	\$ 22,075,764	\$ 32,778,150	\$ 36,260,274	\$ 47,519,162	3.39	1.45	273	Projects	33,593,977	422,633,262	4,658.3	\$ 2,288	\$ 183	\$ 0.3186	\$ 0.025
O&M	\$ 3,776,044	\$ 2,679,182	\$ 6,455,226	\$ 6,179,844	\$ 8,461,087	1.64	1.31	141	Projects	9,072,327	67,026,822	1,365.9	\$ 2,764	\$ 374	\$ 0.4162	\$ 0.056
Services (BSC, Training, RetroX)	\$ 402,365	\$ -	\$ 323,000	\$ 547,102	\$ 791,071	1.36	2.45	64	Projects	1,292,000	6,460,000	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.3114	\$ 0.062
PRIME	\$ 14,880,816	\$ 24,754,945	\$ 39,556,376	\$ 42,987,220	\$ 56,771,319	2.89	1.44			43,958,304	496,120,083	6,024.2	\$ 2,470	\$ 219	\$ 0.3385	\$ 0.030
TOTAL - C&I/LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 14,880,816	\$ 24,754,945	\$ 39,556,376	\$ 42,987,220	\$ 56,771,319	2.89	1.44			43,958,304	496,120,083	6,024.2	\$ 2,470	\$ 219	\$ 0.3385	\$ 0.030
Small Business	\$ 4,512,339	\$ 5,745,466	\$ 10,257,805	\$ 10,695,135	\$ 13,987,509	2.37	1.35	400	Projects	9,597,396	121,106,581	1,599.3	\$ 2,821	\$ 224	\$ 0.4702	\$ 0.037
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 23,275,973	\$ 32,003,365	\$ 55,199,953	\$ 68,814,373	\$ 90,346,842	2.96	1.64			65,285,027	796,817,631	9,595.1	\$ 2,426	\$ 199	\$ 0.3565	\$ 0.029
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 481,746							15,000	Customers							
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 300,000															
Science Center	\$ 42,000															
K-8 Education	\$ 401,825							2,000	Curriculum							
SUB-TOTAL EDUCATION	\$ 1,225,571															
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 112,000															
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 347,280															
C&I Loan Defaults	\$ 50,000															
SUB-TOTAL PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS	\$ 509,280															
ISO Load Response Program Support	\$ 1,376,000															
SUB-TOTAL LOAD MANAGEMENT	\$ 1,376,000															
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 225,000															
SUB-TOTAL RENEWABLES AND RD&D	\$ 225,000															
Administration	\$ 750,000															
Planning & Evaluation	\$ 316,765															
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ 570,000															
Information Technology	\$ 342,500															
EEB	\$ 350,000															
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ 2,243,318															
Marketing Plan	\$ 250,000															
SUB-TOTAL ADMIN & PLANNING	\$ 4,822,583															
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS	\$ 17,633,368	\$ 3,037,972	\$ 19,063,238	\$ 24,722,211	\$ 59,505,995	1.40	3.12			44,810,970	294,555,356	5,558.9	\$ 3,172	\$ 483	\$ 0.3955	\$ 0.060
RESIDENTIAL	\$ 24,916,722	\$ 32,003,365	\$ 55,199,953	\$ 68,814,373	\$ 90,346,842	2.76	1.64			65,285,027	796,817,631	34,000.0	\$ 2,597	\$ 213	\$ 0.3817	\$ 0.031
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL	\$ 4,909,583	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	-			-	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	-
OTHER *	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	-			-	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	-	-
TOTAL C&I/M BUDGET Note 2	\$ 47,459,673	\$ 35,041,337	\$ 74,263,191	\$ 93,536,584	\$ 149,852,837	1.97	2.02			110,095,997	1,091,372,987	49,154.1	\$ 3,041	\$ 307	\$ 0.4311	\$ 0.043

Notes:
(a) Energy Blueprint includes Motors and Cool Choice

* Other - Education is primarily allocated to Residential Programs

Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
COMPARISON OF UI CONSERVATION PROGRAMS
INCLUDES SAVINGS AND CO₂
INCREASED SAVINGS - ELECTRIC ONLY**

TABLE B

Program	Electric System Costs 2012 ^(a)	Total Utility Costs 2012	Customer Cost 2012	Total Resource Cost 2012	Electric System Benefit 2012	Total Resource Benefit 2012	Electric System B/C Ratio ^(b)	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Goals# Units	Units of Measure	Annualized Savings kWh	Lifetime Savings kWh	Load Savings kW	Demand Cost \$/kW yr ^(b)	Demand Cost \$/kW Annualized ^(b)	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh Annualized ^(b)	Utility Cost Rate \$/kWh Lifetime ^(b)
Residential Retail Products	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,291,087	\$ 4,736,391	\$ 11,666,506	\$ 19,627,226	3.39	4.14	1,032,118	Bulbs, Fixtures	30,634,720	142,177,199	2,757.1	\$ 1,250	\$ 269	\$ 0.1125	\$ 0.024	
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 3,445,304	\$ 1,291,087	\$ 4,736,391	\$ 11,666,506	\$ 19,627,226	3.39	4.14			30,634,720	142,177,199	2,757.1	\$ 1,250	\$ 269	\$ 0.1125	\$ 0.024	
Residential New Construction	\$ 177,329	\$ 177,329	\$ 154,071	\$ 331,400	\$ 349,378	\$ 434,448	1.97	1.31	113	No of Homes	241,509	2,941,265	1023.0	\$ 1,722	\$ 141	\$ 0.7343	\$ 0.060	
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 4,652,878	\$ 7,364,631	\$ 951,349	\$ 8,315,980	\$ 8,223,460	\$ 24,577,596	1.77	2.96	8,494	No of Homes	8,282,425	84,133,117	2,273.8	\$ 2,092	\$ 206	\$ 0.5618	\$ 0.055	
HES Income Eligible	\$ 3,594,468	\$ 5,038,002	\$ 641,466	\$ 5,679,468	\$ 4,482,847	\$ 14,868,726	1.25	2.62	7,568	Customers	5,652,316	65,303,756	475.0	\$ 7,567	\$ 655	\$ 0.6359	\$ 0.055	
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 11,869,979	\$ 16,025,266	\$ 3,037,972	\$ 19,063,238	\$ 24,722,211	\$ 59,505,995	2.08	3.12			44,910,970	294,555,356	5,558.9	\$ 2,135	\$ 325	\$ 0.2649	\$ 0.040	
Energy Conscious Blueprint (a)	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 1,507,953	\$ 5,385,771	\$ 15,132,018	\$ 19,688,014	3.90	3.66	129	Projects	11,729,327	179,590,966	1,971.6	\$ 1,969	\$ 129	\$ 0.3310	\$ 0.022	
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 3,882,818	\$ 1,507,953	\$ 5,385,771	\$ 15,132,018	\$ 19,688,014	3.90	3.66			11,729,327	179,590,966	1,971.6	\$ 1,969	\$ 129	\$ 0.3310	\$ 0.022	
Energy Opportunities	\$ 10,702,387	\$ 10,702,387	\$ 22,075,764	\$ 32,778,150	\$ 36,260,274	\$ 47,519,162	3.39	1.45	273	Projects	33,593,977	422,633,262	4,658.3	\$ 2,298	\$ 183	\$ 0.3186	\$ 0.025	
O&M	\$ 10,702,387	\$ 10,702,387	\$ 22,075,764	\$ 32,778,150	\$ 36,260,274	\$ 47,519,162	3.39	1.45			33,593,977	422,633,262	4,658.3	\$ 2,298	\$ 183	\$ 0.3186	\$ 0.025	
Services (BSC, Training, Retrov)	\$ 3,776,044	\$ 3,776,044	\$ 2,679,182	\$ 6,455,226	\$ 6,179,844	\$ 8,461,087	1.64	1.31	141	Projects	9,072,327	67,026,822	1,365.9	\$ 2,764	\$ 374	\$ 0.4162	\$ 0.056	
PRIME	\$ 402,385	\$ 402,385	\$ -	\$ 323,000	\$ 547,102	\$ 791,071	1.36	2.45	64	Projects	1,293,000	6,460,000	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.3114	\$ 0.062	
TOTAL - C&I LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 14,880,816	\$ 14,880,816	\$ 24,754,945	\$ 39,556,326	\$ 42,987,220	\$ 56,771,319	2.89	1.44			43,958,304	496,120,083	6,024.2	\$ 2,470	\$ 219	\$ 0.3385	\$ 0.030	
Small Business	\$ 4,512,339	\$ 4,512,339	\$ 5,745,466	\$ 10,257,805	\$ 10,695,135	\$ 13,887,509	2.37	1.35	400	Projects	9,597,396	121,106,581	1,590.3	\$ 2,821	\$ 224	\$ 0.4702	\$ 0.037	
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 23,275,973	\$ 23,275,973	\$ 32,003,365	\$ 55,199,953	\$ 68,814,373	\$ 90,346,842	2.96	1.64			65,285,027	796,817,631	9,595.1	\$ 2,426	\$ 199	\$ 0.3565	\$ 0.029	
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 481,746	\$ 481,746							15,000	Customers								
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000																
Science Center	\$ 42,000	\$ 42,000																
K-9 Education	\$ 401,925	\$ 401,925							2,000	Curriculum								
SUB-TOTAL EDUCATION	\$ 1,225,671	\$ 1,225,671																
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 112,000	\$ 112,000																
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 347,280	\$ 347,280																
C&I Loan Defaults	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000																
SUB-TOTAL PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS	\$ 509,280	\$ 509,280																
ISO Load Response Program Support	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,376,000																
SUB-TOTAL LOAD MANAGEMENT	\$ 1,376,000	\$ 1,376,000																
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000																
SUB-TOTAL RENEWABLES AND R&D	\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000																
Administration	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000																
Planning & Evaluation	\$ 316,765	\$ 316,765																
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ 570,000	\$ 570,000																
Information Technology	\$ 342,500	\$ 342,500																
EEB	\$ 350,000	\$ 350,000																
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ 2,243,318	\$ 2,243,318																
Marketing Plan	\$ 250,000	\$ 250,000																
SUB-TOTAL ADMIN & PLANNING	\$ 4,822,583	\$ 4,822,583																
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS	\$ 13,478,081	\$ 17,633,968	\$ 3,037,972	\$ 19,063,238	\$ 24,722,211	\$ 59,505,995	1.83	3.12										
RESIDENTIAL	\$ 24,916,722	\$ 24,916,722	\$ 32,003,365	\$ 55,199,953	\$ 68,814,373	\$ 90,346,842	2.76	1.64										
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL	\$ 4,909,583	\$ 4,909,583	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	-										
OTHER*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	-	-										
TOTAL C&I/BUDGET Note 2	\$ 43,304,386	\$ 47,459,673	\$ 35,041,337	\$ 74,263,191	\$ 93,536,584	\$ 149,852,837	2.16	2.02										

Notes:
(a) Energy Blueprint includes Motors and Cool Choice
(b) Based on Electric System Cost which excludes funds designated for oil measures.
* Other - Education is primarily allocated to Residential Programs

Totals may vary due to rounding


**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
INCREASED SAVINGS
TABLE C**

PROGRAM NAME	UI Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Contractor Labor	Incentives	Marketing	Other (b)	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
Residential Retail Products	\$ 494,224	\$ 13,381	\$ 509,200		\$ 1,997,246	\$ 420,803	\$ 5,803	\$ 4,647	\$ 3,445,304
TOTAL - CONSUMER PRODUCTS	\$ 494,224	\$ 13,381	\$ 509,200	\$ -	\$ 1,997,246	\$ 420,803	\$ 5,803	\$ 4,647	\$ 3,445,304
Residential New Construction	\$ 58,166	\$ 1,500	\$ 7,500	\$ -	\$ 92,663	\$ 15,000	\$ -	\$ 2,500	\$ 177,329
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 371,894	\$ 4,855	\$ 80,401	\$ -	\$ 6,744,248	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ 13,433	\$ 7,364,631
HES Income Eligible	\$ 489,057	\$ 6,200	\$ 38,440	\$ -	\$ 4,242,845	\$ 253,400	\$ -	\$ 8,060	\$ 5,038,002
SUB-TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$ 1,413,341	\$ 25,736	\$ 635,541	\$ -	\$ 13,077,002	\$ 839,203	\$ 5,803	\$ 28,640	\$ 16,025,266
Energy Conscious Blueprint (a)	\$ 537,396	\$ 10,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 2,835,486	\$ 150,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 110,936	\$ 3,882,818
TOTAL - LOST OPPORTUNITY	\$ 537,396	\$ 10,000	\$ 122,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 2,835,486	\$ 150,000	\$ 17,000	\$ 110,936	\$ 3,882,818
Energy Opportunities	\$ 538,015	\$ 9,700	\$ 325,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 8,648,454	\$ 125,000	\$ 18,989	\$ 537,229	\$ 10,702,387
O&M Services (RFP, BSC, Training, RetroX)	\$ 75,068	\$ 2,922	\$ 1,310,344	\$ -	\$ 2,320,768	\$ 41,900	\$ 3,540	\$ 21,502	\$ 3,776,044
PRIME	\$ 34,800	\$ 500	\$ 338,000	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 785	\$ 6,500	\$ 402,385
TOTAL - C&I LARGE RETROFIT	\$ 647,683	\$ 13,122	\$ 1,973,344	\$ 512,000	\$ 10,969,222	\$ 176,900	\$ 23,314	\$ 565,231	\$ 14,880,816
Small Business	\$ 300,000	\$ 9,630	\$ 110,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 3,107,835	\$ 82,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 800,374	\$ 4,512,339
SUB-TOTAL C&I	\$ 1,485,079	\$ 32,752	\$ 2,205,344	\$ 712,000	\$ 16,912,543	\$ 408,900	\$ 42,814	\$ 1,476,541	\$ 23,275,973
SmartLiving Center®	\$ 65,395	\$ 6,521	\$ 27,000	\$ 171,814	\$ -	\$ 35,000	\$ 174,016	\$ 2,000	\$ 481,746
EE Communities / Behavioral Pilot	\$ 28,297	\$ 6,000	\$ 253,703	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000
Science Center	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,000
K-8 Education	\$ 65,395	\$ 8,521	\$ 197,698	\$ -	\$ 75,000	\$ 47,411	\$ -	\$ 7,800	\$ 401,825
SUB-TOTAL EDUCATION	\$ 159,087	\$ 21,042	\$ 520,401	\$ 171,814	\$ 75,000	\$ 94,411	\$ 174,016	\$ 9,800	\$ 1,225,571
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 112,000	\$ -	\$ 112,000
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 30,045	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 317,235	\$ -	\$ 347,280
C&I/M Loan Defaults	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000
SUB-TOTAL PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS	\$ 30,045	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 479,235	\$ -	\$ 509,280
ISO Load Response Program	\$ 125,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 351,000	\$ -	\$ 878,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 1,376,000
SUB-TOTAL LOAD MANAGEMENT	\$ 125,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 351,000	\$ -	\$ 878,000	\$ 10,000	\$ -	\$ 7,000	\$ 1,376,000
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000
SUB-TOTAL RENEWABLES AND RD&D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 225,000
Administration	\$ 643,268	\$ 2,500	\$ 98,532	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,700	\$ 750,001
Planning & Evaluation	\$ 311,348	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,417	\$ 316,765
Evaluation, Outside Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 570,000
Information Technology	\$ 49,983	\$ 134,531	\$ 155,386	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,600	\$ 342,500
EEB	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 350,000
Marketing Plan	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000
2012 Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,243,318	\$ -	\$ 2,243,318
SUB-TOTAL ADMIN & PLANNING	\$ 1,004,599	\$ 137,031	\$ 1,173,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 2,243,318	\$ 13,717	\$ 4,822,584
PROGRAM SUB-TOTALS	\$ 1,563,735	\$ 44,274	\$ 1,091,402	\$ 137,451	\$ 13,152,002	\$ 1,124,214	\$ 462,251	\$ 38,040	\$ 17,633,368
RESIDENTIAL	\$ 1,628,818	\$ 40,257	\$ 2,620,885	\$ 746,363	\$ 17,790,543	\$ 478,300	\$ 127,617	\$ 1,483,941	\$ 24,916,722
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL	\$ 1,004,599	\$ 137,031	\$ 1,398,918	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,355,318	\$ 13,717	\$ 4,909,584
OTHER	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL C&I/M BUDGET	\$ 4,217,451	\$ 221,561	\$ 5,111,204	\$ 883,814	\$ 30,942,544	\$ 1,602,514	\$ 2,945,186	\$ 1,535,698	\$ 47,459,674

Notes:
(a) Energy Blueprint includes Motors and Cool Choice
(b) Other expenses include:
Performance Management Fee
Smart Living Center
Smart Living Center Utilities
ECSU
Energy Conservation Loan Fund
Marketing/Advertising Services
C&I/M Loan Defaults
NEEP Participation
Dues
Postage
Telephone Expense

Totals may vary due to rounding

**THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 CONSERVATION & LOAD MANAGEMENT
INCREASED SAVINGS
C&LM BUDGET BY EXPENSE CLASS**



<u>Expense Classes</u>	<u>Budget</u>	<u>% of Budget</u>
UI Labor	\$ 4,217,151	8.89%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 221,561	0.47%
Outside Services	\$ 5,111,204	10.77%
Contractor Labor	\$ 883,814	1.86%
Incentives	\$ 30,942,544	65.20%
Marketing	\$ 1,602,514	3.38%
Other	\$ 2,945,186	6.21%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 1,535,698	3.24%
Total	\$ 47,459,673	100.00%

Totals may vary due to rounding


THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 Management Incentive Performance Indicators and Incentive Matrix
Increased Savings

Provided below is the 2012 Incentive Matrix with Performance Indicators. The weights applied to each of the individual and sector level metrics were developed in collaboration with ECMB consultants. The Utility Performance Incentive is \$2,243,318. This calculated is based on achieving 100% of all performance targets and earning a target incentive of 5% of C&LM budgets (not including ECMB costs, Audit Costs or Management Incentive). Goals will be prorated based on actual over/under spend of budget. The actual incentive earned will be determined by the performance achieved in each of the Incentive Metrics identified below, based on the following Performance Index:

<u>Performance %</u>	<u>Pretax Incentive</u>	<u>Pre-tax Incentive</u>
70	2%	\$897,327
80	3%	\$1,345,991
90	4%	\$1,794,654
100	5%	\$2,243,318
110	6%	\$2,691,981
120	7%	\$3,140,645
130	8%	\$3,589,308

Total Original Budget* \$44,866,355

*Does not include Incentive, ECMB costs and Audit



SECTOR Program	Performance Indicators			Incentive Metrics			
	Incentive Metric	Target Goal	Weight	Incentive	Weight	Incentive	
RESIDENTIAL All Residential Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget	\$ 16,025,266	Residential Products & Services Lifetime kWh Residential Products & Services kW Homes Lifetime kWh Homes kW	142,177,199 2,757 2,941,285 103	Total Electric System Benefit from all Res programs Total Electric System Benefit: \$24,722,211	0.165	\$370,147	
		Home Energy Solutions Lifetime kWh Home Energy Solutions kW	84,133,117 2,224				
		HES Income Eligible Lifetime kWh HES Income Eligible kW	65,303,756 475				
		Total Residential Lifetime kWh Total Residential kW	294,555,356 5,559				
		Present Value of Res Lifetime kWh Present Value of Res Lifetime kW @ Customer Meter	\$0.0701 \$731.29				
		Total Res Lifetime kWh @ Present Value Factor Total Res kW @ Present Value Factor	\$20,657,048 \$4,065,163				
		Total Electric System Benefit The Net Electric System Benefit from all Res programs	\$24,722,211 \$8,696,945				
		Total Net Electric System Benefit	\$8,696,945	\$8,696,945		0.165	\$370,147
	Residential New Construction	\$ 177,329			Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric		
	HES	\$ 7,364,631	Increase average HES Participant savings by 20% for all fuels For 10% of HES participants achieve 25% overall reduction in total energy savings, based on the average energy usage of HES participants		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric Increase average HES savings by 20% Achieve deep savings of 25% across all participants	0.08	\$179,465
HES - Income Eligible	\$ 5,038,002	Fully expend 2012 HES-IE Budget. This is a penalty metric. Companies must expend at least 88% of budget to avoid penalty. Above 88% the penalty is scaled with a 10% reduction in the penalty for each one percent increase in budget spent above 88%. Expending 98% will avoid the penalty. The budget will be adjusted and prorated based on funding available through ARRA. The HES-IE Budget acknowledges the high priority for the spending of any remaining ARRA federal stimulus monies through March 2012 and the important support and resources the Companies are dedicating to that effort. Any under-expended HES-IE funding from 2012 will be carry forward to 2013, which would be in addition to the parity-level of HES-IE funding in 2013. Alignment of HES and HES-IE BPI Certifications. One person in each crew with both BPI Building Analyst 1 and Envelop Specialist certifications by 6/30/12. By 9/30/12 each crew will have received training and be able to provide duct sealing services as per HES guidelines. Each crew will have the necessary testing and diagnostic equipment to perform duct sealing.		Fully expend 2012 HES-IE Budget Note: the penalty below 88% is -.05 1 member of each crew certified by June 30, 2012. Duct Sealing Training and able/equipped by 9/30/12	0.04	\$89,733	
Retail Products	\$ 3,445,304			Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric			
EE Communities	\$ 300,000	HES Coordination with community tasks forces and vendors to bring in more HES Projects (projects completed from outside of the utilities)		Increase customer participation			
All Other Residential Programs		Electric savings		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric			

SECTOR Program		Performance Indicators			Incentive Metrics		
SECTOR Program	SECTOR Budget	Performance Indicators	Incentive Metric	Target Goal	Weight	Incentive	
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL (C/D) All C/I Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget	\$ 14,880,816	Energy Blueprint Lifetime kWh Energy Blueprint kW Energy Opportunities Lifetime kWh Energy Opportunities kW O&M (RetroCk, BOC, RFP) O&M RFP kW Small Business Lifetime kWh Small Business kW Total C&I Lifetime kWh Total C&I kW Present Value of C&I Lifetime kWh Present Value of C&I Lifetime kW @ Customer Meter Total C&I Lifetime kWh @ Present Value Factor Total C&I kW @ Present Value Factor Total Electric System Benefit The net Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs: Total Net Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs: Electric Savings LT kWh: 121,106,581 Demand Savings kW: 1,599.3	Total Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs. Total Electric System Benefit: \$68,814,373	Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs Total Electric System Benefit: \$68,814,373	0.21	\$471,097	
All C/I Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget Small Business	\$ 4,512,339			Total Electric System Benefit from all C&I	0.21	\$471,097	
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 3,882,818	1) Number of new construction/major renovation projects that exceed the new construction State Energy Code baseline by 30% or follow the whole building performance track. 2) The Companies will develop a plan to transition into IECC 2012 (ASHRAE 2010) in collaboration with the EEB; a) Awareness: Prepare the market by working with the A-E community, the trade communities, specifiers and inspectors. b) Develop and deliver a series of code training sessions for the A/E and trade communities. c) Develop and deliver a series of training sessions variety of projects to signed design members. Performance Buildings (including Net Zero buildings) and code issues.	Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric	15% signed projects will be Comprehensive projects	0.02	\$44,866	
Energy Opportunities	\$ 10,702,387	1) Number of projects participating in the Comprehensive Initiative based on the agreed definition of comprehensiveness. 2) Number of signed projects that incorporate performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital).	Plan completion for the end of 2nd Qtr. Produce awareness collateral Conduct joint training sessions with CL&P Conduct joint training sessions with CL&P	40% of the signed projects	0.02	\$44,866	
Business & Energy Sustainability (formerly O&M RFP) Includes funds for programs that may result from the public input	\$ 4,178,429	1) The Companies will develop and promote a Sustainable Energy Management Plan and Guide which includes benchmarking, the use of dashboards, and an implementation plan including Retro-commissioning in collaboration with the EEB. The Companies will develop a plan which includes a protocol for defining market segmentation and market penetration for the purposes of establishing long term goals in collaboration with the EEB (EO and SBEA).		15% signed projects will be Comprehensive 10% signed project that incorporates performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital)	0.02	\$44,866	
C&I Market Segmentation			Develop goals for inclusion for the 2013 plan Electric Savings include in appropriate sector level metric	Develop the Sustainable Energy Management Guide and enroll 20 customers.	0.02	\$44,866	
All Other C&I Programs		Electric Savings					
Non-Electric Benefits		Dollar savings associated with fossil fuel savings, water savings, maintenance, labor savings and any other identified benefit.					
Total Incentive \$ Residential and C&I		\$1,500,000 in benefits			1.0000	\$2,243,318	

**Table A1
YGS, CNG & SCG
Proposed Natural Gas Conservation Plan Budget - 2012 Base & 2012 Increased Savings**

Natural Gas C&LM Budget	2012 - Base Proposed				2012 - Increased Savings			
	2012 Yankee Proposed Budget	2012 CNG Proposed Budget	2012 SCG Proposed Budget	2012 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total	2012 Yankee Increased Savings	2012 CNG Increased Savings	2012 SCG Increased Savings	2012 Combined YGS/CNG/SCG Total
RESIDENTIAL								
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 1,170,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 3,270,000	\$ 2,181,500	\$ 2,078,744	\$ 2,317,498	\$ 6,577,742
HES Income Eligible - Audits	\$ 30,000	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,803	\$ 81,575	\$ 35,000	\$ 25,772	\$ 25,803	\$ 86,575
HES Income Eligible - Total	\$ 1,200,000	\$ 1,025,772	\$ 1,125,803	\$ 3,351,575	\$ 2,216,500	\$ 2,104,516	\$ 2,343,301	\$ 6,664,317
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 1,904,000	\$ 1,815,345	\$ 1,824,790	\$ 5,544,135	\$ 3,101,859	\$ 2,852,249	\$ 3,093,661	\$ 9,047,769
Residential New Construction	\$ 500,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 350,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,250,000
Water Heating	\$ 70,000	\$ 40,055	\$ 46,210	\$ 156,265	\$ 70,000	\$ 40,055	\$ 46,211	\$ 156,266
Subtotal Residential	\$ 3,674,000	\$ 3,231,172	\$ 3,296,803	\$ 10,201,975	\$ 5,988,359	\$ 5,346,820	\$ 5,783,173	\$ 17,118,352
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY								
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 3,870,000	\$ 3,136,612	\$ 2,362,464	\$ 2,080,462	\$ 7,579,538
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 1,480,000	\$ 1,240,000	\$ 1,150,000	\$ 3,870,000	\$ 3,136,612	\$ 2,362,464	\$ 2,080,462	\$ 7,579,538
C&I LARGE RETROFIT								
Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,020,000	\$ 860,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 2,680,000	\$ 2,474,834	\$ 1,735,328	\$ 1,457,286	\$ 5,667,448
O&M (RetroCx, Training)	\$ 200,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 324,548	\$ 190,515	\$ 184,050	\$ 699,113
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 1,220,000	\$ 960,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 3,080,000	\$ 2,799,382	\$ 1,925,843	\$ 1,641,336	\$ 6,366,561
Small Business	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 246,081	\$ 192,444	\$ 187,763	\$ 626,288
Subtotal C&I	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,300,000	\$ 2,150,000	\$ 7,250,000	\$ 6,182,075	\$ 4,480,751	\$ 3,909,561	\$ 14,572,387
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS								
CHIF Loan Fund	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 225,000
Residential Financing Subsidies	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 90,000	\$ 270,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000	\$ 405,000
C&I Financing Subsidies	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 225,000
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 570,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 855,000
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING								
Information Technology	\$ 35,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 52,500	\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000	\$ 142,500
Planning	\$ 59,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 51,000	\$ 161,000	\$ 88,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 76,500	\$ 241,500
Evaluation	\$ 284,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 258,000	\$ 800,000	\$ 426,000	\$ 387,000	\$ 387,000	\$ 1,200,000
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	\$ 49,500	\$ 24,750	\$ 24,750	\$ 24,750	\$ 74,250
Subtotal Other - Administrative & Planning	\$ 394,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 1,105,500	\$ 591,750	\$ 533,250	\$ 533,250	\$ 1,658,250
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS								
Residential	\$ 3,814,000	\$ 3,371,172	\$ 3,436,803	\$ 10,621,975	\$ 6,198,359	\$ 5,556,820	\$ 5,993,173	\$ 17,748,352
C&I	\$ 2,850,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 7,400,000	\$ 6,257,075	\$ 4,555,751	\$ 3,984,561	\$ 14,797,387
Other	\$ 394,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 355,500	\$ 1,105,500	\$ 591,750	\$ 533,250	\$ 533,250	\$ 1,658,250
TOTAL	\$ 7,058,500	\$ 6,076,672	\$ 5,992,303	\$ 19,127,475	\$ 13,047,184	\$ 10,645,821	\$ 10,510,984	\$ 34,203,989


**Table B
2012 COMPARISON OF CONSERVATION PROGRAMS
2012 INCREASED SAVINGS**

Program	2012 Budget	Customer Cost 2012	Total Resource Cost 2012	Gas Benefit	Total Resource Benefit	% of 2012 Budget	Gas System B/C Ratio	Total Resource B/C Ratio	Goals/Units	Units of Measure	Annualized Savings (ccf)	Lifetime Savings (ccf)	Peak Day Savings (ccf)	Annual Cost Rate (\$/ccf)	Lifetime Cost Rate (\$/ccf)
RESIDENTIAL															
YGS HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,216,500	\$ -	\$ 2,216,500	\$ 2,996,924	\$ 3,014,522	17.0%	1.35	1.36	3,270	Homes	315,965	5,920,875	2,805	\$ 7.02	\$ 0.37
CNG HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,104,516	\$ 0	\$ 2,104,516	\$ 2,475,314	\$ 2,798,561	19.8%	1.18	1.33	3,914	Homes	266,478	4,774,788	1,776	\$ 7.90	\$ 0.44
SCG HES Income Eligible	\$ 2,343,301	\$ 0	\$ 2,343,301	\$ 2,795,281	\$ 3,160,312	22.3%	1.19	1.35	4,420	Homes	300,924	5,391,993	2,006	\$ 7.79	\$ 0.43
Sub Total HES Income Eligible	\$ 6,664,317	\$ 0	\$ 6,664,317	\$ 8,267,520	\$ 8,973,395	19.5%	1.24	1.35	11,605	Homes	883,368	16,087,656	6,586	\$ 7.54	\$ 0.41
YGS Home Energy Solutions	\$ 3,101,859	\$ 413,419	\$ 3,515,278	\$ 4,579,972	\$ 4,620,483	23.8%	1.48	1.41	4,682	Homes & HVAC Rebated	490,733	8,975,876	4,210	\$ 6.32	\$ 0.35
CNG Home Energy Solutions	\$ 2,852,249	\$ 293,971	\$ 3,146,220	\$ 4,344,000	\$ 4,623,577	26.8%	1.52	1.47	3,681	Homes & HVAC Rebated	432,956	8,545,673	3,907	\$ 6.59	\$ 0.33
SCG Home Energy Solutions	\$ 3,093,681	\$ 295,707	\$ 3,389,388	\$ 4,372,866	\$ 4,647,990	29.4%	1.41	1.37	3,705	Homes & HVAC Rebated	435,731	8,600,512	3,932	\$ 7.10	\$ 0.36
Sub Total Home Energy Solutions	\$ 9,047,769	\$ 1,003,097	\$ 10,050,866	\$ 13,296,647	\$ 13,892,049	26.5%	1.47	1.38	12,067	Homes	1,359,419	26,122,060	12,050	\$ 6.66	\$ 0.35
YGS New Construction	\$ 600,000	\$ 106,355	\$ 706,355	\$ 580,019	\$ 580,019	4.6%	0.97	0.82	250	Homes	49,085	1,227,134	417	\$ 12.22	\$ 0.49
CNG New Construction	\$ 350,000	\$ 303,501	\$ 653,501	\$ 354,593	\$ 354,593	3.3%	1.01	0.54	107	Homes	29,480	736,990	282	\$ 11.87	\$ 0.47
SCG New Construction	\$ 300,000	\$ 255,281	\$ 555,281	\$ 298,256	\$ 298,256	2.9%	0.99	0.54	90	Homes	24,796	619,898	237	\$ 12.10	\$ 0.48
Sub Total New Construction	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 665,138	\$ 1,915,138	\$ 1,232,867	\$ 1,232,867	3.7%	0.99	0.64	447	Homes	103,361	2,584,022	936	\$ 12.09	\$ 0.48
YGS Water Heating	\$ 70,000	\$ 170,752	\$ 240,752	\$ 152,765	\$ 152,765	0.5%	2.18	0.63	569	Units	24,361	292,328	78	\$ 2.87	\$ 0.24
CNG Water Heating	\$ 40,055	\$ 71,400	\$ 111,455	\$ 65,790	\$ 65,790	0.4%	1.64	0.59	238	Units	10,186	122,237	33	\$ 3.93	\$ 0.33
SCG Water Heating	\$ 46,211	\$ 85,800	\$ 132,011	\$ 79,058	\$ 79,058	0.4%	1.71	0.60	288	Units	12,241	146,890	39	\$ 3.78	\$ 0.31
Sub Total Water Heating	\$ 156,266	\$ 327,952	\$ 484,218	\$ 297,613	\$ 297,613	0.5%	1.90	0.61	1,093	Units	46,788	561,454	150	\$ 3.34	\$ 0.28
Subtotal Residential	\$ 17,118,362	\$ 1,996,187	\$ 19,114,539	\$ 23,094,647	\$ 24,395,924	50.0%	1.35	1.28	25,212	Homes/Units	2,392,936	45,356,193	19,723	\$ 7.16	\$ 0.38
Commercial and Industrial C&I Lost Opportunity															
YGS Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 3,136,612	\$ 850,725	\$ 3,987,337	\$ 5,349,942	\$ 5,349,942	24.0%	1.71	1.34	175	Projects	672,820	10,190,977	5,198	\$ 4.66	\$ 0.31
CNG Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 2,362,464	\$ 667,351	\$ 3,029,815	\$ 3,901,163	\$ 3,901,163	22.2%	1.65	1.29	127	Projects	490,095	7,423,296	3,786	\$ 4.82	\$ 0.32
SCG Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 2,080,462	\$ 584,769	\$ 2,665,231	\$ 3,418,404	\$ 3,418,404	19.8%	1.64	1.28	111	Projects	429,447	6,504,683	3,318	\$ 4.84	\$ 0.32
Sub Total Lost Opportunity	\$ 7,579,538	\$ 2,102,844	\$ 9,682,382	\$ 12,669,509	\$ 12,669,509	22.2%	1.67	1.31	413	Projects	1,592,362	24,118,956	12,302	\$ 4.76	\$ 0.31
Commercial and Industrial Large Retrofit															
YGS Energy Opportunities	\$ 2,474,834	\$ 3,490,838	\$ 5,965,672	\$ 5,995,315	\$ 5,995,315	19.0%	2.30	0.95	154	Projects	888,623	10,221,524	13,377	\$ 2.79	\$ 0.24
CNG Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,735,328	\$ 2,412,508	\$ 4,147,836	\$ 3,883,167	\$ 3,883,167	16.3%	2.24	0.94	105	Projects	605,384	6,963,525	9,113	\$ 2.87	\$ 0.25
SCG Energy Opportunities	\$ 1,457,286	\$ 2,132,929	\$ 3,590,215	\$ 3,433,157	\$ 3,433,157	13.9%	2.36	0.96	93	Projects	535,228	6,156,541	6,057	\$ 2.72	\$ 0.24
Sub Total Energy Opportunities	\$ 5,667,448	\$ 8,036,274	\$ 13,703,722	\$ 13,011,639	\$ 13,011,639	16.6%	2.30	0.99	352	Projects	2,029,234	23,341,591	30,547	\$ 2.79	\$ 0.24
YGS O&M	\$ 324,548	\$ 182,538	\$ 507,086	\$ 857,446	\$ 857,446	2.5%	2.64	1.69	9	Projects	143,392	1,433,932	1,749	\$ 2.26	\$ 0.23
CNG O&M	\$ 190,515	\$ 176,659	\$ 367,174	\$ 466,498	\$ 466,498	1.8%	2.45	1.27	5	Projects	77,955	779,557	951	\$ 2.44	\$ 0.24
SCG O&M	\$ 184,050	\$ 175,460	\$ 359,510	\$ 463,331	\$ 463,331	1.8%	2.52	1.29	5	Projects	77,426	774,264	945	\$ 2.38	\$ 0.24
Sub Total O&M	\$ 699,113	\$ 534,658	\$ 1,237,771	\$ 1,787,275	\$ 1,787,275	2.0%	2.56	1.45	19	Projects	298,772	2,987,753	3,645	\$ 2.34	\$ 0.23
YGS Small Business	\$ 246,081	\$ 124,497	\$ 370,578	\$ 505,760	\$ 505,760	1.9%	2.06	1.36	27	Projects	78,912	907,700	1,188	\$ 3.12	\$ 0.27
CNG Small Business	\$ 192,444	\$ 265,434	\$ 457,878	\$ 427,241	\$ 427,241	1.8%	2.22	0.93	23	Projects	66,607	766,154	1,003	\$ 2.89	\$ 0.25
SCG Small Business	\$ 187,763	\$ 254,247	\$ 442,010	\$ 409,236	\$ 409,236	1.8%	2.18	0.93	22	Projects	63,800	733,867	960	\$ 2.94	\$ 0.26
Sub Total Small Business	\$ 626,288	\$ 644,178	\$ 1,270,466	\$ 1,342,238	\$ 1,342,238	1.8%	2.14	1.06	73	Projects	203,319	2,407,721	3,151	\$ 2.99	\$ 0.26
Subtotal Commercial & Industrial	\$ 14,572,387	\$ 11,317,954	\$ 25,890,341	\$ 28,810,661	\$ 28,810,661	42.6%	1.98	1.11	856	Projects	4,129,687	62,856,021	49,645	\$ 3.53	\$ 0.28
OTHER															
YGS CHIF - Residential, C&I Loan Program	\$ 285,000	\$ -	\$ 285,000	\$ -	\$ -	2.2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CNG CHIF - Residential, C&I Loan Program	\$ 285,000	\$ -	\$ 285,000	\$ -	\$ -	2.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCG CHIF - Residential, C&I Loan Program	\$ 285,000	\$ -	\$ 285,000	\$ -	\$ -	2.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub Total Other - Loan Program	\$ 855,000	\$ -	\$ 855,000	\$ -	\$ -	4.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YGS IT, Planning, Evaluation, and EEB	\$ 591,750	\$ -	\$ 591,750	\$ -	\$ -	5.0%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CNG IT, Planning, Evaluation, and EEB	\$ 533,250	\$ -	\$ 533,250	\$ -	\$ -	5.1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCG IT, Planning, Evaluation, and EEB	\$ 533,250	\$ -	\$ 533,250	\$ -	\$ -	4.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sub Total Other - Evaluation	\$ 1,658,250	\$ -	\$ 1,658,250	\$ -	\$ -	7.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal Other	\$ 2,513,250	\$ -	\$ 2,513,250	\$ -	\$ -	7.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS															
YGS Residential	\$ 5,988,359	\$ 690,526	\$ 6,678,885	\$ 8,309,681	\$ 8,367,780	45.9%	-	-	-	-	880,145	16,416,213	7,510	\$ 6.80	\$ 0.36
CNG Residential	\$ 5,346,820	\$ 668,673	\$ 6,015,493	\$ 7,240,105	\$ 7,842,520	50.2%	-	-	-	-	739,100	14,179,688	5,998	\$ 7.23	\$ 0.38
SCG Residential	\$ 5,783,173	\$ 636,789	\$ 6,419,962	\$ 7,544,861	\$ 8,185,616	55.0%	-	-	-	-	773,691	14,759,282	6,215	\$ 7.47	\$ 0.39
Residential Total	\$ 17,118,352	\$ 1,996,187	\$ 19,114,539	\$ 23,094,647	\$ 24,395,924	50.0%	-	-	-	-	2,392,936	45,356,193	19,723	\$ 7.15	\$ 0.38
YGS C&I	\$ 6,182,075	\$ 4,648,597	\$ 10,830,672	\$ 12,408,463	\$ 12,408,463	47.4%	-	-	-	-	1,783,747	22,754,135	21,512	\$ 3.47	\$ 0.27
CNG C&I	\$ 4,480,751	\$ 3,521,952	\$ 8,002,703	\$ 8,678,069	\$ 8,678,069	42.1%	-	-	-	-	1,240,040	15,932,532	14,853	\$ 3.61	\$ 0.28
SCG C&I	\$ 3,909,581	\$ 3,147,405	\$ 7,056,986	\$ 7,724,129	\$ 7,724,129	42.6%	-	-	-	-	1,105,900	14,169,355	13,280	\$ 3.54	\$ 0.28
Sub Total C&I Total	\$ 14,572,387	\$ 11,317,954	\$ 25,890,341	\$ 28,810,661	\$ 28,810,661	42.6%	-	-	-	-	4,129,687	62,856,021	49,645	\$ 3.53	\$ 0.28
YGS Other	\$ 876,750	\$ -	\$ 876,750	\$ -	\$ -	6.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CNG Other	\$ 818,250	\$ -	\$ 818,250	\$ -	\$ -	7.7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SCG Other	\$ 818,250	\$ -	\$ 818,250	\$ -	\$ -	7.8%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other Total	\$ 2,513,250	\$ -	\$ 2,513,250	\$ -	\$ -	7.3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
YGS TOTAL	\$ 13,047,184	\$ 5,339,124	\$ 18,386,307	\$ 20,718,144	\$ 20,718,144	38.1%	-	-	-	-	2,663,891	39,170,347	29,022	\$ 4.90	\$ 0.33
CNG TOTAL	\$ 10,645,821	\$ 4,190,825	\$ 14,836,646	\$ 15,918,174	\$ 16,520,589	31.1%	-	-	-	-	1,979,140	30,112,220	20,852	\$ 5.38	\$ 0.35
SCG TOTAL	\$ 10,510,984	\$ 3,784,193	\$ 14,295,177	\$ 15,268,990	\$ 15,909,744	30.7%	-	-	-	-	1,879,591	28,928,647	19,495	\$ 5.59	\$ 0.36
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 34,203,989	\$ 13,314,141	<												

**Table C
YGS 2012 Budget Details
INCREASED SAVINGS**

GAS CONSERVATION BUDGET (\$000)	Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Incentives	Marketing	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL							
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 175,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 180,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,181,500
HES Income Eligible - Audits			\$ 35,000				\$ 35,000
HES Income Eligible Total	\$ 175,500	\$ 3,500	\$ 215,000	\$ 1,800,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,216,500
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 300,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 156,874	\$ 2,611,825	\$ 20,000	\$ 8,160	\$ 3,101,859
Residential New Construction	\$ 34,580	\$ 1,625	\$ 55,000	\$ 493,295	\$ 11,500	\$ 4,000	\$ 600,000
Water Heating	\$ 3,500	\$ 256	\$ 4,100	\$ 56,917	\$ 4,207	\$ 1,020	\$ 70,000
Subtotal Residential	\$ 513,580	\$ 10,381	\$ 430,974	\$ 4,962,037	\$ 55,707	\$ 15,680	\$ 5,988,359
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LOST OPPORTUNITY							
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 285,000	\$ 6,500	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,617,612	\$ 12,500	\$ 15,000	\$ 3,136,612
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 285,000	\$ 6,500	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,617,612	\$ 12,500	\$ 15,000	\$ 3,136,612
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LARGE RETROFIT							
Energy Opportunities	\$ 220,084	\$ 1,200	\$ 200,000	\$ 2,016,050	\$ 30,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 2,474,834
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 75,170	\$ 1,500	\$ 15,000	\$ 220,378	\$ 5,000	\$ 7,500	\$ 324,548
Subtotal C&I - Retrofit	\$ 295,254	\$ 2,700	\$ 215,000	\$ 2,236,428	\$ 35,000	\$ 15,000	\$ 2,799,382
Small Business	\$ 25,000	\$ 1,250	\$ 5,800	\$ 179,031	\$ 10,000	\$ 25,000	\$ 246,081
Subtotal C&I	\$ 605,254	\$ 10,450	\$ 420,800	\$ 5,033,071	\$ 57,500	\$ 55,000	\$ 6,182,075
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS & PLANNING							
CHIF Loan Fund			\$ 75,000				\$ 75,000
Residential Financing Subsidies			\$ 135,000				\$ 135,000
C&I Financing Subsidies			\$ 75,000				\$ 75,000
Information Technology			\$ 52,500				\$ 52,500
Planning	\$ 88,500		\$ -				\$ 88,500
Evaluation	\$ 25,270		\$ 400,730				\$ 426,000
Energy Efficiency Board			\$ 24,750				\$ 24,750
Subtotal Other	\$ 113,770	\$ -	\$ 762,980	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 876,750
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS							
Residential	\$ 513,580	\$ 10,381	\$ 640,974	\$ 4,962,037	\$ 55,707	\$ 15,680	\$ 6,198,359
C&I	\$ 605,254	\$ 10,450	\$ 495,800	\$ 5,033,071	\$ 57,500	\$ 55,000	\$ 6,257,075
Other	\$ 113,770	\$ -	\$ 477,980	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 591,750
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 1,232,604	\$ 20,831	\$ 1,614,754	\$ 9,995,108	\$ 113,207	\$ 70,680	\$ 13,047,184

YGS
2012 Gas Conservation
Budget By Expense Class
Increased Savings




Expense Classes	Budget	% of Budget
Labor	\$ 1,232,604	9.4%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 20,831	0.2%
Outside Services	\$ 1,614,754	12.4%
Incentives	\$ 9,995,108	76.6%
Marketing	\$ 113,207	0.9%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 70,680	0.5%
Total	\$ 13,047,184	100.00%

**Table C
CNG 2012 Budget Details
INCREASED SAVINGS**

GAS CONSERVATION BUDGET (\$000)	Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Incentives	Marketing	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL							
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 168,744	\$ 3,500	\$ 44,350	\$ 1,851,750	\$ 7,800	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,078,744
HES Income Eligible - Audits			\$ 25,772				\$ 25,772
HES Income Eligible Total	\$ 168,744	\$ 3,500	\$ 70,122	\$ 1,851,750	\$ 7,800	\$ 2,600	\$ 2,104,516
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 297,920	\$ 5,040	\$ 24,466	\$ 2,479,619	\$ 37,644	\$ 7,560	\$ 2,852,249
Residential New Construction	\$ 33,250	\$ 840	\$ 53,305	\$ 251,545	\$ 8,260	\$ 2,800	\$ 350,000
Water Heating	\$ 5,000	\$ 500	\$ 2,305	\$ 23,800	\$ 6,450	\$ 2,000	\$ 40,055
Subtotal Residential	\$ 504,914	\$ 9,880	\$ 150,198	\$ 4,606,714	\$ 60,154	\$ 14,960	\$ 5,346,820
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LOST OPPORTUNITY							
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 295,320	\$ 6,500	\$ 211,263	\$ 1,811,381	\$ 12,500	\$ 25,500	\$ 2,362,464
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 295,320	\$ 6,500	\$ 211,263	\$ 1,811,381	\$ 12,500	\$ 25,500	\$ 2,362,464
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LARGE RETROFIT							
Energy Opportunities	\$ 202,749	\$ 1,200	\$ 200,595	\$ 1,304,784	\$ 8,200	\$ 17,800	\$ 1,735,328
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 51,347	\$ 1,500	\$ 12,850	\$ 113,818	\$ 3,500	\$ 7,500	\$ 190,515
Subtotal C&I - Retrofit	\$ 254,096	\$ 2,700	\$ 213,445	\$ 1,418,602	\$ 11,700	\$ 25,300	\$ 1,925,843
Small Business	\$ 20,922	\$ 1,250	\$ 5,800	\$ 143,557	\$ 2,200	\$ 18,715	\$ 192,444
Subtotal C&I	\$ 570,338	\$ 10,450	\$ 430,508	\$ 3,373,540	\$ 26,400	\$ 69,515	\$ 4,480,751
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS & PLANNING							
CHIF Loan Fund			\$ 75,000				\$ 75,000
Residential Financing Subsidies			\$ 135,000				\$ 135,000
C&I Financing Subsidies			\$ 75,000				\$ 75,000
Information Technology			\$ 45,000				\$ 45,000
Planning	\$ 76,500		\$ -				\$ 76,500
Evaluation	\$ 25,270		\$ 361,730				\$ 387,000
Energy Efficiency Board			\$ 24,750				\$ 24,750
Subtotal Other	\$ 101,770	\$ -	\$ 716,480	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 818,250
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS							
Residential	\$ 504,914	\$ 9,880	\$ 360,198	\$ 4,606,714	\$ 60,154	\$ 14,960	\$ 5,556,820
C&I	\$ 570,338	\$ 10,450	\$ 505,508	\$ 3,373,540	\$ 26,400	\$ 69,515	\$ 4,555,751
Other	\$ 101,770	\$ -	\$ 431,480	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 533,250
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 1,177,022	\$ 20,330	\$ 1,297,186	\$ 7,980,254	\$ 86,554	\$ 84,475	\$ 10,645,821

CNG
2012 Gas Conservation
Budget By Expense Class
Increased Savings




Expense Classes	Budget	% of Budget
Labor	\$ 1,177,022	11.1%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 20,330	0.2%
Outside Services	\$ 1,297,186	12.2%
Incentives	\$ 7,980,254	75.0%
Marketing	\$ 86,554	0.8%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 84,475	0.8%
Total	\$ 10,645,821	100.00%

Table C
SCG 2012 Budget Details
INCREASED SAVINGS

GAS CONSERVATION BUDGET (\$000)	Labor	Materials & Supplies	Outside Services	Incentives	Marketing	Administrative Expenses	TOTAL
RESIDENTIAL							
HES Income Eligible - Weatherization	\$ 164,994	\$ 3,960	\$ 45,550	\$ 2,091,114	\$ 8,910	\$ 2,970	\$ 2,317,498
HES Income Eligible - Audits			\$ 25,803				\$ 25,803
HES Income Eligible Total	\$ 164,994	\$ 3,960	\$ 71,353	\$ 2,091,114	\$ 8,910	\$ 2,970	\$ 2,343,301
Home Energy Solutions (HES)	\$ 297,920	\$ 5,040	\$ 249,704	\$ 2,495,793	\$ 37,644	\$ 7,560	\$ 3,093,661
Residential New Construction	\$ 33,250	\$ 720	\$ 45,690	\$ 210,860	\$ 7,080	\$ 2,400	\$ 300,000
Water Heating	\$ 5,000	\$ 496	\$ 2,638	\$ 28,600	\$ 7,477	\$ 2,000	\$ 46,211
Subtotal Residential	\$ 501,164	\$ 10,216	\$ 369,385	\$ 4,826,367	\$ 61,111	\$ 14,930	\$ 5,783,173
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LOST OPPORTUNITY							
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 273,145	\$ 618	\$ 200,867	\$ 1,587,227	\$ 6,040	\$ 12,565	\$ 2,080,462
Subtotal C&I - Lost Opportunity	\$ 273,145	\$ 618	\$ 200,867	\$ 1,587,227	\$ 6,040	\$ 12,565	\$ 2,080,462
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL LARGE RETROFIT							
Energy Opportunities	\$ 156,500	\$ 2,250	\$ 119,500	\$ 1,153,576	\$ 6,700	\$ 18,760	\$ 1,457,286
Operations & Maintenance	\$ 47,339	\$ 188	\$ 18,800	\$ 113,045	\$ 940	\$ 3,738	\$ 184,050
Subtotal C&I - Retrofit	\$ 203,839	\$ 2,438	\$ 138,300	\$ 1,266,621	\$ 7,640	\$ 22,498	\$ 1,641,336
Small Business	\$ 20,954	\$ 2,250	\$ 6,300	\$ 137,508	\$ 2,200	\$ 18,551	\$ 187,763
Subtotal C&I	\$ 497,938	\$ 5,306	\$ 345,467	\$ 2,991,356	\$ 15,880	\$ 53,614	\$ 3,909,561
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS & PLANNING							
CHIF Loan Fund			\$ 75,000				\$ 75,000
Residential Financing Subsidies			\$ 135,000				\$ 135,000
C&I Financing Subsidies			\$ 75,000				\$ 75,000
Information Technology			\$ 45,000				\$ 45,000
Planning	\$ 76,500						\$ 76,500
Evaluation	\$ 25,270		\$ 361,730				\$ 387,000
Energy Efficiency Board			\$ 24,750				\$ 24,750
Subtotal Other	\$ 101,770	\$ -	\$ 716,480	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 818,250
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS							
Residential	\$ 501,164	\$ 10,216	\$ 579,385	\$ 4,826,367	\$ 61,111	\$ 14,930	\$ 5,993,173
C&I	\$ 497,938	\$ 5,306	\$ 420,467	\$ 2,991,356	\$ 15,880	\$ 53,614	\$ 3,984,561
Other	\$ 101,770	\$ -	\$ 431,480	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 533,250
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 1,100,872	\$ 15,522	\$ 1,431,332	\$ 7,817,723	\$ 76,991	\$ 68,544	\$ 10,510,984

SCG
2012 Gas Conservation
Budget By Expense Class
Increased Savings



Expense Classes	Budget	% of Budget
Labor	\$ 1,100,872	10.5%
Materials & Supplies	\$ 15,522	0.1%
Outside Services	\$ 1,431,332	13.6%
Incentives	\$ 7,817,723	74.4%
Marketing	\$ 76,991	0.7%
Administrative Expenses	\$ 68,544	0.7%
Total	\$ 10,510,984	100.00%

EXHIBIT I: 2010 PUBLIC COMMENT MATRIX

To be filed at a later date.

This page intentionally blank

EXHIBIT II: ENERGY EFFICIENCY BOARD RESOLUTIONS (Electric and Natural Gas)

The Energy Efficiency Board's Resolutions will be filed at a later date.

This page intentionally blank

EXHIBIT III: PURA COMPLIANCE ORDERS (Electric and Natural Gas)

Orders

In its January 6, 2011 Final Decision (“Decision) in Docket Nos. 10-10-03 and 10-10-04, the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (“PURA” or the “Authority”) issued a series of Orders and compliance dates. The following information provides the Electric Companies and Natural Gas Companies responses to those Orders and, where appropriate, refers to the associated document of record.

Orders - Docket No. 10-10-03

1. On or before September 1, 2011 and annually thereafter, the EDC’s shall submit the 2012 C&LM Plan and budget to the Department for review.

PURA, in their letter dated August 30, 2011, granted an extension to file the 2012 C&LM Plan on October 1, 2011.at the request of the EEB

2. When providing estimates and recommendations to customers, the HES program shall clearly indicate that savings are based on general information and not customer specific data.

*CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated February 25, 2011 in compliance with this Order.
UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.*

3. There shall be no bonus incentives to vendors or the EDCs to promote appliances, A/C or space or hot water heating equipment replacements at this time.

*CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated February 25, 2011 in compliance with this Order.
UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.*

4. The EDC’s shall pay less than 50 percent of the \$500 rebate for gas furnaces with efficient electric fans in the HES program. The allowed incentive should be based on the electric proportion of the total gas and electric avoided cost savings.

*CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated February 25, 2011 in compliance with this Order.
UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.*

5. The Department will require the electric and gas utilities to immediately discontinue the vendor installation requirement for insulation rebates in the HES program.

*CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated February 25, 2011 in compliance with this Order.
UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.*

6. Effective with the date of this Decision, the Energy Efficiency Board shall modify the Evaluation process, as described in Section II.E., herein.

In compliance with this Order, the EEB submitted a revised Evaluation Roadmap and Communications Protocol, which received final approval from the board on July 26, 2011. It was noted that earlier versions of these revisions were approved by the board in June, shortly before the contents of SB 1243 (now PA 11-80) became known. In order to take into account changes included in Section 33 of the new legislation that impact the procedures outlined in the Roadmap and Protocol, the EEB decided to postpone the finalization and submission of these procedures until the appropriate changes could be made and submitted to the membership a second time for approval. On September 15, 2011, the Energy Efficiency Board submitted revised Rules and Roadmap, adopted by board resolution at its regular business meeting on August 10, 2011. The revisions have been made to reflect changes in the organization and responsibilities of the board called for by Public Act 11-80. The new version also includes the Evaluation Roadmap the board created pursuant to DPUC Docket 10-10-03 Decision Order no. 6, likewise reflecting the requirements of PA 11-80. The Evaluation Roadmap was already filed separately with the PURA on July 26, 2011, but is now included as an integral part of the Rules and Roadmap for the board as a whole.

7. A billing analysis shall be performed on at least one Energy Efficiency Fund program in 2011 and annually thereafter. The results of the engineering estimates and billing analysis should be compared and reconciled.

The recently completed evaluation of the Energy Conscious Blueprint Program (Energy Conscious Blueprint Evaluation Final Report, Submitted by Global Energy Partners to the Connecticut Energy Efficiency Board, August 4, 2011) utilized a billing analysis methodology to compare and rectify the program engineering estimates with customer bills.

8. Where appropriate, the Energy Efficiency Board shall recommend to the Legislature, legislation for efficiency requirements that will improve the energy efficiency of products and equipment sold in Connecticut.

This Order is directed to the EEB.

9. The EDCs shall adjust their 2011 performance goals as indicated Section II.G.

CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated March 15, 2011 in compliance with Order No. 15 which included the adjusted 2011 performance goals.

UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 15, 2011 in compliance with Order No. 15 which included the adjusted 2011 performance goals.

10. On or before February 15, 2011, the EDCs shall eliminate the distribution of watt meters under the HES Program as discussed in Section II.C.1.b., herein.

CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated February 25, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

11. On or before March 30, 2011 the Energy Efficiency Board shall submit the proposed ISE work plan and budget to the Department. The ISE shall submit to the Energy Efficiency Board a work plan and budget for 2011 that provides ISE with sufficient resources to implement the K-12 program on a larger scale to increase the number of training sessions for schools and a broader scope to include training for municipalities and/or health care facilities.

In its letter to PURA dated March 15, 2011, the EEB submitted the proposed ISE work plan and budget.

12. On or before February 15, 2011, the Energy Efficiency Board shall submit a recommendation to the Department on EO and SBEA kWh savings, program budget adjustments, and incentive matrix weighting to provide “stretch” incentives for the percentage of comprehensive projects installed, as described in Section II.D.4; herein.

In its letter to PURA dated February 15, 2011, the EEB provided recommendations as required by this Order.

13. On or before March 1, 2011, the EDCs shall post a general, yet accurate description of program incentive levels for each of the C&I programs on their web sites.

CL&P filed a letter with PURA dated February 23, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

14. On or before March 1, 2011, the EDCs shall submit a complete reconciliation of 2009 and 2010 carry forwards for both revenue and budget.

In a letter to PURA dated March 1, 2011, CL&P filed a complete reconciliation of 2009 and 2010 carry forwards for both revenue and budget. In addition, actual Incentive Matrix results for 2010 were filed based on the Authority’s requirement (page 45 of the Decision) “Actual (Incentive Matrix) results for 2010 should be filed by the EDCs in the first quarter of 2011 after all of the 2010 results are final.”

In a letter to PURA dated March 1, 2011, UI filed a complete reconciliation of 2009 and 2010 carry forwards for both revenue and budget. In addition, actual Incentive Matrix results for 2010 were filed based on the Authority’s requirement (page 45 of the Decision) “Actual (Incentive Matrix) results for 2010 should be filed by the EDCs in the first quarter of 2011 after all of the 2010 results are final.”

15. On or before March 15, 2011 the EDCs shall submit a revised budget schedule A1 to include the \$18.3 million in carryover.

In its letter to PURA dated March 15, 2011, CL&P submitted a revised budget schedule A1 including the \$18.3 million in carryover.

In its letter to PURA dated March 15, 2011, UI submitted a revised budget schedule A1 including the \$18.3 million in carryover.

16. On or before March 15, 2011, ISE shall work with the Energy Efficiency Board and the Energy Efficiency Board Evaluation Consultant to incorporate additional program measure data to be included as an ongoing component of the K-12 training program, provided that the cost of collecting the data is not burdensome.

On March 15, 2011, the EEB filed a letter with PURA in compliance with this Order.

17. On or before April 4, 2011, the EDCs shall notify the Department regarding any additional opportunities to offer HPWH rebates as discussed in Section II.C.2., herein.

In a joint letter filed with PURA on April 4, 2011, CL&P and UI provided information regarding additional opportunities for HPWH rebate offerings.

18. On or before April 4, 2011, the EDCs shall report to the Department regarding the development of educational material, including web based information about HPWHs and available rebates as discussed in Section II.C.2., herein.

In a joint letter filed with PURA on April 4, 2011, CL&P and UI reported to the Authority the information required by this Order.

19. On or before April 4, 2011, The ISE shall submit to the Energy Efficiency Board a conceptual plan to extend an O&M training program to municipalities and health care facilities in 2012, as discussed in herein.

In a letter filed with PURA on April 4, 2011, the EEB filed a letter comprised of the ISE's conceptual plan for the 2012 O&M training program for municipalities.

20. On or before April 4, 2011, the Energy Efficiency Board shall submit the manner in which the EDCs will be allowed to count the savings provided under the Partners Program toward the EDC's C&LM goals as discussed in Section II.D.7., herein.

In a letter dated April 18, 2011, the EEB filed a letter with PURA in compliance with this Order.

21. On or before June 2, 2011, the EDCs shall develop, and be prepared to maintain, an interactive tool to provide customers with the information necessary to compare available choices for their end use needs as discussed in Section II.D.6, herein.

In accordance with Section II.D.6, the Companies held a technical session with members of the Authority on August 23, 2011 in which the prototype of the proposed interactive equipment selection tool was presented, including the cost estimate. Prior to the technical session, the Companies filed two letters with the Authority on May 24, 2011 and again on August 5, 2011. Both letters provided a status

update of this order as well as requesting deadline extensions. The Companies were instructed during this technical session that they would receive further direction from the Authority with respect to Interactive Tool at a later date.

22. On or before July 1, 2011, ISE, together with the Energy Efficiency Board, shall develop a code training curriculum that embodies the “hands on” and student engagement components that are appropriate to train the building trades in code compliance, as described in Section II.D.1., herein.

In collaboration with the ISE and EEB, CL&P and UI submitted a letter to PURA in compliance with this Order on April 1, 2011.

23. On or before July 1, 2011, ISE shall implement a delivery mechanism of code training to reach the building trades: electricians, plumbers, building contracts and construction professionals, particularly those involved in the construction of C&I buildings, as described in Section II.D.1., herein. ISE shall report on these efforts on a quarterly basis.

In collaboration with the ISE and EEB, CL&P and UI submitted a letter to PURA in compliance with this Order on April 1, 2011.

24. At the time of the next ISE O&M Training program evaluation, the Energy Efficiency Board shall work with its evaluation consultant to develop an independent evaluation, commensurate with the program costs expended.

This Order is directed to the EEB.

25. The EDCs shall conduct a workgroup to promote best practices and develop a standardized performance contract to submit in the next annual Plan, as described in Section II.D.2., herein. The EDCs shall report quarterly on the milestones of the workgroup toward the goal of developing a standardized performance contract for the 2012 Plan.

The EDCs have provided PURA with quarterly progress updates during 2011 and have included a summary of the final results in this 2012 Plan in the introduction section to Chapter 3. The final draft of the Best Practices Guide, dated September 12, 2011, was summarized and presented to the EEB for comments at the September 14 EEB meeting.

26. On or before September 1, 2011, as part of the 2012 C&LM Plan the EDCs, LDCs, Companies, ECMB and/or ISE (as appropriate) shall:

- a. report on ways to improve the effectiveness of the Kitchen Table Wrap Up as discussed in Section II.A.1.a., herein;

In 2011, the EDCs instituted a requirement for HES vendors to provide customers with a Home Energy Yardstick (HEY) score. The HEY score provides customers a normalized energy consumption ranking, and also provides savings and payback information for possible energy efficiency upgrades.

b. report on the potential to license HES vendors as discussed in Section II.A.1.c., herein;

Currently, the EDCs use minimum standards for HES vendors developed by Building Performance Institute (BPI) and also require vendors be registered by the State of Connecticut as Home Improvement Contractors. The EDCs utilize these criteria for HES vendors because formal licensing requirements for HES vendors can only be made through legislative activity.

c. develop a market transformation plan and timeline for the HES program as discussed in Section II.A.1.,c., herein;

A discussion regarding a market transformation plan and timeline for the HES program is summarized in this 2012 Plan Chapter 2 beginning on page 59.

d. submit a summary of the UI research into storage type HPWHs and recommendations regarding the potential to promote storage type HPWHs to encourage off-peak consumption as discussed in Section II.C.3., herein;

For nearly 50 years, UI's Off Peak Water Heating Program has offered customers a means to control their water heating costs. In UI's service territory there are approximately 46,000 customers using electric water heaters. Of this base, about 24,000 customers have clock controlled water heaters that operate the water heaters during the off peak hours for reduced water heating costs. About 12,000 of these customers rent their tanks through the UI Water Heater Rental Program. These timer controlled tanks, coupled with UI's time-of-day rates, tend to shift the majority of water heating to off-peak hours and save customers money on their water heating bills.

Over the past decade, UI has always kept an eye on the emerging water heating technology of the Heat Pump Water Heater. Over the years, progress and advances to this technology have been steadily advancing forward and UI has participated in several demonstration installations of early HPWH models.

In preparation for increased marketing efforts of HPWH's through its Residential Water Heating Program, UI is currently conducting a 2011 Residential Heat Pump Water Heater impact and customer acceptance study with an independent third party engineering firm. For this study, approximately thirty (30) units will be installed and monitored over a six-month period that includes both summer and winter months. The HPWH's that will be used in this study are integrated units that are comprised of a water storage tank and HPWH in one single manufactured package.

This study will determine the annual energy usage and savings (including savings related to water heating, dehumidification, and air conditioning) associated with the installation. UI will also be seeking to obtain information about customer acceptance of technology and perspectives concerning factors such as savings, comfort, aesthetics, and noise at the end of this HPWH Study.

In 2009, UI conducted a similar pilot using an after-market, add-on HPWH that was piped to existing electric water heaters. Although the energy savings were promising, the added costs of the HPWH unit and associated installation labor, did not result in customer savings.

The results of this current effort will allow UI will also compare performance to manufacturer efficiency or savings claims and thus fine tune customer incentives and future marketing initiatives.

e. develop long term goals as discussed in Section G and submit them at the time of their 2012 C&LM filing;

The 2012 C&LM Plan includes a detailed proposal in Chapter 8 based on a long term goal of achieving annual savings approximately equal to 2 percent of forecasted kWh sales.

f. Report the number of completed EO projects and kW and kWh associated with performance contracts during 2011. The Energy Efficiency Board shall report on the costs and benefits of EO projects that are implemented with performance contracts during 2011, as described in Section II.D.2 herein.

CL&P reports that two performance contract-related projects had 2011 milestone inspections as of September 23, which had an associated 2,254 annual MWh savings, 32,177 lifetime MWh savings, 413 kW summer and 149 kW winter demand savings, respectively. These two projects involved a university and a hospital.

CL&P forecasts that by December 31, 2011, these same two projects will complete milestone inspections for an additional savings of 3,532 Annual MWh, 42,695 Lifetime MWh, 111,174 Annual CCF and 1,078,767 Lifetime CCF. CL&P also forecasts that, by December 31, 2011, two municipalities will complete milestone inspections for performance contract-related projects involving between 12 and 14 individual buildings. CL&P forecasts that these projects will save 2,312 Annual MWh, 27,233 Lifetime MWh, 43,345 Annual CCF and 433,420 Lifetime CCF.

Currently, UI reports that there is one performance contract related project in the process of being installed as of September 23 2011, which has projected savings of 1,583 annual MWh savings, 19,984 lifetime MWh savings, 118 kW summer demand savings, 78 kW winter demand savings, 37,847 CCF and 378,470 lifetime CCF savings respectively. In addition, the Company is expecting the signing of a second performance contract related project. This contract will involve thirty-three (33) municipal buildings with forecasted savings of approximately 156,594 annual CCF, 1913,845 lifetime CCF, 1,470 MWh and 600 kW.

g. As directed in Section II.C.5., herein, the EDCs shall provide in the annual 2012 Plan an update on the planned and achieved milestones in Federal, state and regional efficiency standards as they affect consumer products, appliances and equipment sold in Connecticut.

The EDCs are actively involved in the Northeast Energy Efficiency Partnership (NEEP) Appliance Efficiency Standards Initiative. The NEEP Initiative is a regional coalition of stakeholders advocating for the enactment of state and federal efficiency standards for a wide range of residential and commercial products. In addition, the EDCs currently plan on including efficiency standards as a mechanism to achieve savings in the 2012 Integrated Resource Plan (IRP).

h. Submit a recommendation regarding the SmartLiving Center as discussed in Section II.I., herein.

A recommendation regarding the SmartLiving Center is summarized in this 2012 Plan within Chapter Four; Section SmartLiving Center and Museum Partnerships.

i. The Department requires a forecast through the end of the current year is to be submitted that includes all revenue and spending for each company and broken down in the same design as Tables A1 & A2 in the plan for the current years plan.

Connecticut Light & Power Company
Docket No. 10-10-03
Order 26i
Page 1 of 2

2011 CL&P Program Expenditures Forecast

CL&P C&LM BUDGET	2011 CL&P YTD Results As of 06/30/11	2011 CL&P Year-End Forecast 12/31/11	2011 CL&P Revised Budget 06/30/11	2011 CL&P Variance to Budget
RESIDENTIAL				
Residential Retail Products Note 1	\$ 3,825,562	\$ 6,891,842	\$ 6,132,901	\$ 758,941
Appliance Rebate Program	\$ 3,502	\$ 3,502	\$ -	\$ 3,502
Total - Consumer Products	\$ 3,829,064	\$ 6,895,344	\$ 6,132,901	\$ 762,443
Residential New Construction	\$ 705,716	\$ 1,435,799	\$ 1,460,024	\$ (24,225)
Home Energy Solutions (HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting) Note 4	\$ 9,810,124	\$ 17,184,702	\$ 17,749,370	\$ (564,668)
HES Income Eligible	\$ 4,344,644	\$ 10,721,229	\$ 11,027,047	\$ (305,818)
Subtotal Residential	\$ 18,689,548	\$ 36,237,074	\$ 36,369,342	\$ (132,268)
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL				
C&I LOST OPPORTUNITY				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 5,341,989	\$ 7,620,707	\$ 8,759,606	\$ (1,138,899)
Total - Lost Opportunity	\$ 5,341,989	\$ 7,620,707	\$ 8,759,606	\$ (1,138,899)
C&I LARGE RETROFIT				
Energy Opportunities	\$ 18,134,254	\$ 25,771,561	\$ 25,935,919	\$ (164,358)
O&M (Services, RetroCx, BSC)	\$ 774,429	\$ 3,028,288	\$ 4,729,740	\$ (1,701,452)
PRIME	\$ 217,498	\$ 458,037	\$ 488,087	\$ (30,050)
Total - C&I Large Retrofit	\$ 19,126,181	\$ 29,257,886	\$ 31,153,746	\$ (1,895,860)
Small Business	\$ 7,083,730	\$ 12,716,001	\$ 13,436,752	\$ (720,751)
Subtotal C&I	\$ 31,551,900	\$ 49,594,594	\$ 53,350,104	\$ (3,755,510)
OTHER - EDUCATION *				
SmartLiving Center® - Museum Partnerships	\$ 52,716	\$ 396,256	\$ 400,000	\$ (3,744)
EE Communities / Behavior Pilot	\$ 296,910	\$ 987,681	\$ 850,000	\$ 137,681
K-8 Education	\$ 88,369	\$ 302,145	\$ 225,000	\$ 77,145
Subtotal Education	\$ 437,995	\$ 1,686,082	\$ 1,475,000	\$ 211,082
OTHER - PROGRAMS/REQUIREMENTS				
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$ 200,000	\$ 448,000	\$ 448,000	\$ -
Residential Loan Program (Includes ECLF)	\$ 2,412,280	\$ 3,440,985	\$ 3,650,000	\$ (209,015)
C&I Loan Program	\$ 34,642	\$ 484,697	\$ 475,000	\$ 9,697
C&LM Loan Defaults	\$ 37,200	\$ 137,400	\$ 135,000	\$ 2,400
Subtotal Programs/Requirements	\$ 2,684,122	\$ 4,511,082	\$ 4,708,000	\$ (196,918)
OTHER - LOAD MANAGEMENT				
ISO Load Response Program Note 2	\$ 2,833,144	\$ 5,677,134	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,677,134
Subtotal Load Management	\$ 2,833,144	\$ 5,677,134	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 2,677,134
OTHER - RENEWABLES & RD&D				
Research, Development & Demonstration	\$ 52,361	\$ 213,361	\$ 200,000	\$ 13,361
Subtotal Renewables & RD&D	\$ 52,361	\$ 213,361	\$ 200,000	\$ 13,361
OTHER - ADMINISTRATIVE & PLANNING				
Administration	\$ 447,455	\$ 964,805	\$ 900,000	\$ 64,805
General Awareness	\$ 14,884	\$ 172,039	\$ 176,651	\$ (4,612)
Planning Note 3	\$ 314,339	\$ 676,939	\$ 650,000	\$ 26,939
Evaluation Note 3	\$ 400,351	\$ 1,498,569	\$ 1,800,000	\$ (301,431)
Information Technology	\$ 896,518	\$ 1,761,617	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 61,617
Energy Efficiency Board	\$ 195,141	\$ 400,018	\$ 400,000	\$ 18
Performance Management Fee	\$ -	\$ 4,800,000	\$ 5,216,455	\$ (416,455)
Subtotal Admin/Planning Expenditures	\$ 2,268,688	\$ 10,273,987	\$ 10,843,106	\$ (569,119)
PROGRAM SUBTOTALS				
Residential	\$ 21,481,805	\$ 41,224,985	\$ 41,385,663	\$ (160,678)
C&I	\$ 34,529,788	\$ 56,205,020	\$ 57,245,434	\$ (1,040,414)
Other*	\$ 2,506,165	\$ 10,763,309	\$ 11,314,455	\$ (551,146)
TOTAL C&LM BUDGET	\$ 58,517,758	\$ 108,193,314	\$ 109,945,552	\$ (1,752,238)
TOTAL	\$ 58,517,758	\$ 108,193,314	\$ 109,945,552	\$ (1,752,238)

* OTHER -EDUCATION is primarily allocated to residential programs.

Note 1: Retail Products includes Retail Lighting and ENERGY STAR Appliances.

Note 2: ISO-NE Load Response Customer payments are funded from the Forward Capacity Market

Note 3: Planning and Evaluation activities split into separate budget line items.

Note 4: Residential HVAC program renamed "Home Energy Solutions" and is comprised of HVAC, Duct Sealing, Lighting, Energy Conservation Loan and Residential Audits.

Connecticut Light & Power Company
Docket No. 10-10-03
Order No. 26i
Page 2 of 2

2011 C&LM Fund Balance Forecast (000s)

<u>Revenues</u>	2011 Plan Budget	YTD ACTUAL 6/30/2011	6 Month Forecast	Year End Forecast	<u>Variance</u>
2010 Unspent Funds	\$ 23,812	\$ 23,687	\$ -	\$ 23,687	\$ (125)
Collections	66,368	32,734	\$ 34,097	66,831	463
ISO-NE FCM	6,400	4,489	\$ 3,364	7,853	1,453
ISO-NE FCM Demand Response	3,000	3,685	\$ 1,763	5,448	2,448
Class III REC's	4,000	753	\$ 2,847	3,600	(400)
Carrying Charges	1,500	1,109	\$ 729	1,838	338
RGGI	4,865	2,147	\$ 2,718	4,865	-
Stimulus Funding	<u>-</u>	<u>2,416</u>	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>2,416</u>	<u>2,416</u>
 Total	 <u>\$ 109,945</u>	 <u>\$ 71,020</u>	 <u>\$ 45,518</u>	 <u>\$ 116,538</u>	 <u>\$ 6,593</u>
 Year End Expenditures Forecast				 <u>\$ 108,193</u>	
 Year End C&LM Fund Balance Forecast				 <u>\$ 8,345</u>	

2011 Program Expenditures Forecast (000s)

	2011 YTD Actual Expenses @ 6/30/2011	2011 Year End Forecast	2011 Budget 3/15/2011	2011 Year End Forecast vs Budget
C&LM Programs:				
<i>Residential Programs</i>				
Retail Products	\$2,725	\$2,906	\$2,133	\$773
Residential New Construction	128	215	215	0
Home Energy Solutions	2,183	2,961	2,961	(0)
Low Income (UI Helps)	888	2,499	2,499	(0)
Total Residential	\$5,925	\$8,581	\$7,808	\$773
<i>Commercial & Industrial</i>				
Energy Blueprint*	\$2,064	\$3,175	\$3,175	(\$0)
Energy Opportunities**	3,534	5,377	4,377	1,000
Small Business Energy Advantage	737	2,718	2,718	(0)
Total Commercial & Industrial	\$6,335	\$11,269	\$10,270	\$1,000
<i>Education/Other</i>				
SmartLiving Center	\$233	\$459	\$459	\$0
K-8 Education	134	402	402	(0)
EE Communities	29	177	177	(0)
Total Education/Other	\$396	\$1,038	\$1,038	(\$0)
<i>Other Expenditures</i>				
Institute for Sustainable Energy (ECSU)	\$56	\$112	\$112	\$0
Residential Loan Program	229	429	589	(160)
Administration	309	647	647	(0)
Planning & Evaluation	229	739	739	(0)
Information Technology	156	243	243	0
Research, Development & Demonstration	10	125	125	0
General Awareness	0	50	50	0
CLM Loan Defaults	31	50	50	0
UI CLM Shareholder Incentive	542	1,083	1,083	0
EEB	51	210	210	0
Total Other Expenditures	\$1,614	\$3,687	\$3,848	(\$161)
<i>Sub-Total C&LM Programs</i>	\$14,269	\$24,575	\$22,964	\$1,612
<i>ARRA Programs:</i>				
Home Energy Solutions	\$23	\$310	\$0	\$310
<i>Sub-Total ARRA Programs</i>	\$23	\$310	\$0	\$310
GRAND TOTAL	\$14,292	\$24,885	\$22,964	\$1,922

*Includes Energy Blueprint, Motors and Cool Choice

**Includes EO, Municipal Energy, C&I Financing and O&M RFP Programs

2011 C&LM Fund Balance Forecast (000s)

<u>Revenues</u>	2011 Plan <u>Budget</u>	YTD ACTUAL <u>6/30/2010</u>	6 Month <u>Forecast</u>	Year End <u>Forecast</u>	<u>Variance</u>
2010 Unspent Funds	\$ 2,181	\$ 2,181	\$ -	\$ 2,181	\$ -
Collections	16,182	8,058	8,842	16,900	718
ODR	1,500	1,105	1,045	2,150	650
Class III	1,000	210	915	1,125	125
RGGI	2,100	724	376	1,100	(1,000)
Stimulus Funding	<u>-</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>300</u>
 Total	 <u>\$ 22,963</u>	 <u>\$ 12,578</u>	 <u>\$ 11,178</u>	 \$ 23,756	 <u>\$ 793</u>
 Year End Expenditures Forecast				 <u>\$24,885</u>	
 Year End C&LM Fund Balance Forecast				 <u>\$ (1,129)</u>	

Combined Gas Company Results
Docket No. 10-10-03

2011 Program Expenditures Forecast (000s)

	2011 YTD Actual Expenses @ 6/30/2011	2011 Year End Forecast	2011 Budget 10/1/2010	2011 Year End Forecast vs Budget
C&LM Programs:				
<i>Residential Programs</i>				
HES Income Eligible	\$1,918	\$4,795	\$2,682	\$2,113
Home Energy Solutions	2,563	5,644	4,600	1,044
Residential New Construction	521	1,286	1,150	136
Water Heating	106	318	363	(45)
Total Residential	\$5,107	\$12,044	\$8,795	\$3,249
<i>Commercial & Industrial</i>				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$1,620	\$3,662	\$3,670	(\$8)
Energy Opportunities	745	3,414	2,480	934
O&M	132	327	400	(73)
Total Commercial & Industrial	\$2,496	\$7,402	\$6,550	\$852
<i>Other - Programs/Requirements</i>				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$0	\$150	\$150	\$0
Residential Financing Subsidies	0	135	270	(135)
C&I Financing Subsidies	0	75	150	(75)
Total Education/Other	\$0	\$360	\$570	(\$210)
<i>Other Expenditures</i>				
Information Technology	\$0	\$80	\$95	(15)
Planning	52	139	161	(22)
Evaluation	19	650	650	0
Energy Efficiency Board (EEB)	14	49	50	(1)
Total Other Expenditures	\$85	\$918	\$956	(\$38)
Total	\$7,688	\$20,725	\$16,871	\$3,854

2011 Program Expenditures Forecast (000s)

	2011 YTD Actual Expenses @ 6/30/2011	2011 Year End Forecast	2011 Budget 10/1/2010	2011 Year End Forecast vs Budget
C&LM Programs:				
<i>Residential Programs</i>				
HES Income Eligible	\$664	\$1,795	\$930	\$865
Home Energy Solutions	781	1,777	1,600	177
Residential New Construction	88	680	500	180
Water Heating	29	122	137	(15)
Total Residential	\$1,562	\$4,374	\$3,167	\$1,207
<i>Commercial & Industrial</i>				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$973	\$1,472	\$1,480	(\$8)
Energy Opportunities	390	1,393	1,020	373
O&M	2	74	200	(126)
Total Commercial & Industrial	\$1,365	\$2,939	\$2,700	\$239
<i>Other - Programs/Requirements</i>				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$0	\$50	\$50	\$0
Residential Financing Subsidies	0	45	90	(45)
C&I Financing Subsidies	0	25	50	(25)
Total Education/Other	\$0	\$120	\$190	(\$70)
<i>Other Expenditures</i>				
Information Technology	\$0	\$35	\$35	\$0
Planning	21	37	59	(22)
Evaluation	15	234	234	0
Energy Efficiency Board (EEB)	(0)	15	16	(1)
Total Other Expenditures	\$36	\$321	\$344	(\$23)
Total	\$2,963	\$7,754	\$6,401	\$1,353

Note 1 - 2011 Budget does not reflect July 2011 PURA approval of \$1.2 million increased funding for YGS Residential programs.

2011 Program Expenditures Forecast (000s)

	2011 YTD Actual Expenses @ 6/30/2011	2011 Year End Forecast	2011 Budget 10/1/2010	2011 Year End Forecast vs Budget
C&LM Programs:				
<i>Residential Programs</i>				
HES Income Eligible	\$319	\$1,177	\$826	\$351
Home Energy Solutions	1,150	2,182	1,500	682
Residential New Construction	233	362	350	12
Water Heating	41	102	105	(3)
Total Residential	\$1,743	\$3,823	\$2,781	\$1,042
<i>Commercial & Industrial</i>				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$179	1,140	1,140	(\$0)
Energy Opportunities	57	760	760	0
O&M	6	128	100	28
Total Commercial & Industrial	\$242	\$2,028	\$2,000	\$28
<i>Other - Programs/Requirements</i>				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$0	50	50	\$0
Residential Financing Subsidies	0	45	90	(45)
C&I Financing Subsidies	0	25	50	(25)
Total Education/Other	\$0	\$120	\$190	-\$70
<i>Other Expenditures</i>				
Information Technology	\$0	30	30	\$0
Planning	16	51	51	0
Evaluation	3	208	208	0
Energy Efficiency Board (EEB)	7	17	17	0
Total Other Expenditures	\$26	\$306	\$306	\$0
Total	\$2,011	\$6,277	\$5,277	\$1,000

Note 1 - 2011 Budget does not reflect July 2011 PURA approval of \$1.0 million increased funding for CNG Residential programs.

2011 Program Expenditures Forecast (000s)

	2011 YTD Actual Expenses @ 6/30/2011	2011 Year End Forecast	2011 Budget 10/1/2010	2011 Year End Forecast vs Budget
C&LM Programs:				
<i>Residential Programs</i>				
HES Income Eligible	\$934	\$1,823	\$926	\$897
Home Energy Solutions	632	1,685	1,500	185
Residential New Construction	200	245	300	(55)
Water Heating	36	94	121	(27)
Total Residential	\$1,802	\$3,847	\$2,847	\$1,000
<i>Commercial & Industrial</i>				
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$469	\$1,050	\$1,050	\$0
Energy Opportunities	297	1,261	700	561
O&M	124	124	100	24
Total Commercial & Industrial	\$889	\$2,435	\$1,850	\$585
<i>Other - Programs/Requirements</i>				
CHIF Loan Fund	\$0	\$50	\$50	\$0
Residential Financing Subsidies	0	45	90	(45)
C&I Financing Subsidies	0	25	50	(25)
Total Education/Other	\$0	\$120	\$190	(\$70)
<i>Other Expenditures</i>				
Information Technology	\$0	\$15	\$30	(\$15)
Planning	15	51	51	0
Evaluation	1	208	208	0
Energy Efficiency Board (EEB)	7	17	17	0
Total Other Expenditures	\$23	\$291	\$306	(\$15)
Total	\$2,714	\$6,694	\$5,193	\$1,501

Note 1 - 2011 Budget does not reflect SCG request of PURA approval of \$350K increased funding for SCG Residential programs.

27. HES and Limited Income Programs shall continue to be tracked and evaluated separately.

As directed by this Order, CL&P continues to track and evaluate HES and HES-IE programs separately.

UI filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011, in compliance with this Order.

Orders - Docket No. 10-10-04

1. Once finalized, the EDCs and LDCs shall submit to the Department the effective unit rate caps and publish these on their respective websites.

The EDC's and LDC's filed a joint letter with the Authority on December 21, 2010 which lists the C&I program unit incentive caps. CL&P and Yankee published these rates on their respective websites on February 1, 2011.

The Companies filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

2. The LDCs shall comply with the directives regarding conservation program evaluations as stated in the Decision in Docket No. 10-10-03, DPUC Review of The Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund's Conservation and Load Management Plan for 2011.

Yankee filed a letter with PURA dated February 25, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

CNG and SCG filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

3. Effective January 1, 2011, the LDCs shall require a \$75 co-payment from all customers participating in HES. Based on program demand, program administrators may modify the co-payment intra-year from a minimum of \$25 to a maximum of \$100.

The LDC's filed a letter with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

4. No later than January 14, 2011, the LDCs shall provide the Department with an updated 10-year forecast summary of energy and peak-day demand and the costs of supply side options it is considering for the next 10 years.

On January 26, 2011, the LDCs made a joint filing in compliance with Order No. 4. On May 2, 2011, the Department issued a letter finding the LDCs' 10-year forecast and the source for their commodity cost estimates to be reasonable. However, the Department requested supplemental supply-side information. On May 20, 2011, the LDCs jointly submitted a filing in compliance with the Department's May 2, 2011 request.

5. No later than March 1, 2011, the LDCs shall provide a forecast of demand, supply options and demand reduction goals as discussed in more detail in Section II.A.3. Program Goals and outlined in

Attachment 1 along with a request for a technical meeting to discuss its integrated resource planning strategy for the next annual conservation filing.

The LDC's filed a letter with PURA on March 8, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

6. No later than March 1, 2011, the LDCs shall develop an attic insulation rebates appropriate for inclusion in the 2011 Plan as discussed in Section II.A.2. Home Energy Solutions.

The LDCs filed letters with PURA dated March 1, 2011 in compliance with this Order.

7. On or before September 1, 2011, and annually thereafter, the LDCs shall submit a proposed annual conservation plan and budget to the Department for review.

PURA, in their letter dated August 30, 2011, granted an extension to file the 2012 C&LM Plan on October 1, 2011 at the request of the EEB.

8. No later than January 1, 2012, the LDCs shall incorporate gas measures directly through the SBEA program, and begin to offer on-bill financing for qualifying gas measures, beginning in January 2012 as discussed in Section II.B. Commercial and Industrial Programs.

As part of their 2012 C&LM Plan filed on October 1, 2011, the LDC's and EDC's have incorporated gas measures directly through the SBEA program and will begin to offer on-bill financing for qualifying gas measures beginning January 2012.

Order - Docket No. 09-10-03

15i. Provide a summary of Wise Use calls as part of the C&LM Plan Standard Filing Requirement as discussed for the EDCs in Section II.G.9., herein;

The following table from CL&P provides a summary of Wise Use calls as ordered.

2011 Wise Use Energy Calls - CL&P											
2011	Alternate Suppliers	CCEF	"Green"	HES	Commercial	Industrial	SBEA	Smart Liv Center	State	HES-IE	MONTHLY TALLY
January	33	0	2	1028	152	3	115	0	3	897	2233
February	31	0	2	927	144	1	111	0	2	660	1878
March	25	0	3	846	167	0	130	0	2	598	1771
April	28	0	0	650	144	3	89	0	1	661	1576
May	37	0	6	586	136	0	63	0	2	732	1562
June	24	0	3	613	137	0	47	0	3	596	1423
July	16	0	3	649	162	5	44	0	1	393	1273
August	26	0	0	960	139	0	39	0	7	732	1903
September	22	0	0	903	120	0	45	0	5	654	1749
October	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	242	0	19	7162	1301	12	683	0	26	5923	15368

Note Calls reflect Wise use and Wrap Line calls combined.

The following table from UI provides a summary of Wise Use calls as ordered.

2011 Wise Use Energy Calls - United Illuminating											
2011	Alternate Suppliers	CCEF	"Green"	HES	Other Res.	Other	SBEA	Smart Liv Center	Technical	HES-IE	MONTHLY TALLY
January	27	0	4	377	46	10	3	1	2	333	803
February	23	0	2	405	86	12	7	2	7	213	757
March	12	0	4	368	74	38	10	4	2	228	740
April	14	0	3	202	90	24	4	3	0	277	617
May	22	0	0	184	101	17	4	2	0	337	667
June	15	0	1	250	123	11	14	0	0	236	650
July	12	1	0	236	119	14	18	1	0	260	661
August	20	0	0	216	86	15	7	1	0	349	694
September (wk ending 9/23)	5	0	0	163	51	13	6	0	0	291	529
October	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
November	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
December	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	150	1	14	2401	776	154	73	14	11	2524	6118

CL&P Specific Issues:

CL&P currently provides separate quarterly filings to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (“PURA” or “Authority”) for each of the following orders in their respective dockets:

1. 99-09-30: Order No. 8 - Requires CL&P to submit a quarterly report on the status of conservation program participation (C&LM's Quarterly Performance Report)
2. 07-10-03RE01: Order No. 1 - CL&P and UI shall develop reports and communicate budgets, goals and actual expenditures with program vendors on a regular basis throughout the year as discussed herein.
3. 07-10-03RE01: Order No. 8 - Effective the first quarter of 2009, CL&P and UI shall file quarterly reports to the ECMB and the [Authority] regarding C&LM actual expenditures, commitments and offers to date, comparing such figures to the [Authority] -authorized budget. The quarterly filings should be submitted as compliance filings in the annual docket in which each quarter’s budget is approved.
4. 05-07-19: Order No. 4 - During the PURA’s hearings in this docket, the Companies were asked to provide on a quarterly basis the amount of Class III Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) generated as well as the amount of REC sales transferred to the C&LM fund. CL&P uses Order No. 4 for the purposes of providing this information to the PURA. The quarterly report is due within 45 days from the close of each quarter.
5. 10-10-03RE01: Order No. 3 - On or before September 7, 2011, and quarterly thereafter for one year, CL&P shall provide the [Authority] an update on its progress regarding this lending program. The update shall include, but not be limited to, the development of a contractor network, transfer of loan origination and marketing services to CHIF, establishment of on-bill payment features, the dollar value and number of loans originated, interest rates thereto, and loan losses.

CL&P will continue to provide the information required for each of the orders listed above, however we respectfully request that PURA issue an Order that would consolidate the four quarterly order filings and

CL&P will submit it as one filing on a quarterly basis in the annual C&LM docket approved by PURA. CL&P requests a due date of forty-five days from the end of the quarter.

CL&P suggests that a review by PURA of the quarterly filings provided in the requested integrated format would achieve the following:

- Increase the understanding of the integrated information being provided
- Decrease any potential inefficiencies or misunderstandings that might result from multiple separate filings
- Result in a more efficient review process

CL&P Standard Filing Requirement

2011 Carrying Charges Summary

	@ 12/31/10				
		Jan	Feb	Q1 March	
Monthly C&LM Balance	\$ (35,672,748)	\$ (36,790,716)	\$ (36,840,250)	\$ (36,176,803)	
Average C&LM Balance				\$ (35,924,776)	
Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	40.36250%			\$ (14,500,138)	
Net Balance				\$ (21,424,638)	
Quarterly Rate of Return *				2.7225%	
Total First Quarter Carrying Charges				\$ (583,286)	
		Apr	May	Q2 June	
Monthly C&LM Balance		\$ (35,676,065)	\$ (34,777,336)	\$ (28,522,503)	
Average C&LM Balance				\$ (32,349,653)	
Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	40.36250%			\$ (13,057,129)	
Net Balance				\$ (19,292,524)	
Quarterly Rate of Return *				2.7225%	
Total Second Quarter Carrying Charges				\$ (525,239)	
		Jul	Aug	Estimate Q3 September	
Monthly C&LM Balance		\$ (29,696,060)	\$ (27,061,313)	\$ (24,426,566)	
Average C&LM Balance				\$ (26,474,534)	
Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	40.36250%			\$ (10,685,784)	
Net Balance				\$ (15,788,751)	
Quarterly Rate of Return *				2.7225%	
Total Third Quarter Carrying Charges				\$ (429,849)	
		Estimate Oct	Estimate Nov	Estimate Q4 December	
Monthly C&LM Balance		(21,291,819.00)	(17,657,072.00)	(12,431,325.00)	
Average C&LM Balance				\$ (18,428,946)	
Accumulated Deferred Income Tax	40.36250%			\$ (7,438,383)	
Net Balance				\$ (10,990,562)	
Quarterly Rate of Return *				2.7225%	
Total Fourth Quarter Carrying Charges				\$ (299,218)	
Total Year End Estimated Carrying Charges				\$ (1,837,592)	

*10.89% annual pretax ROR per Docket 09-12-05

Estimate Assumptions

- 2011 C&LM total spending estimated to be \$108.2 M

UI Interest Calculation on CLM Fund Balance

	C&M Fund Cumulative Balance	C&M Fund Cumulative Running Balance Tax Affected	Interest Rate*	Interest
2003: January	1,191,353.70		11.80%	5,857.49
February	1,966,096.23		11.80%	15,524.12
March	477,736.93		11.80%	12,015.51
April	213,267.88		11.80%	3,397.44
May	1,110,772.48		11.80%	6,509.87
June	2,017,969.99		11.80%	15,382.98
July	3,461,910.70		1.01%	2,306.12
August	4,014,197.79		1.03%	3,208.50
September	5,002,054.66		1.00%	3,756.77
October	5,850,089.75		1.00%	4,521.73
November	6,953,660.45		1.01%	5,388.24
December	6,806,709.58		1.03%	5,905.49
2004: January	7,102,899.99		1.02%	5,911.58
February	8,046,215.43		1.00%	6,312.13
March	8,579,925.73		0.98%	6,789.01
April	9,341,573.83		0.97%	7,243.27
May	9,736,065.39		0.97%	7,710.55
June	9,720,913.51		11.84%	95,987.76
July	9,876,524.00		11.84%	96,680.69
August	9,593,191.36		11.84%	96,050.60
September	8,993,746.72		11.84%	91,695.56
October	7,569,826.49		11.84%	81,713.63
November	7,352,918.65		11.84%	73,618.88
December	7,115,053.17		11.84%	71,375.33
2005: January	7,116,627.65		11.67%	69,201.55
February	7,130,686.17		11.67%	69,277.56
March	7,125,904.06		11.67%	69,322.67
April	7,011,488.36		11.67%	68,743.07
May	6,835,084.77		11.67%	67,328.96
June	6,571,986.52		11.67%	65,191.88
July	6,345,178.61		11.67%	62,809.72
August	5,947,163.03		11.67%	59,771.51
September	5,688,023.32		11.67%	56,576.09
October	5,086,020.06		11.67%	52,388.79
November	4,299,404.43		11.67%	45,636.63
December	960,217.68		11.67%	25,574.91
2006: January	1,288,154.13	664,955.96	10.17%	5,635.50
February	1,466,966.34	814,826.88	10.17%	6,905.66
March	1,362,194.27	836,724.25	10.17%	7,091.24
April	1,485,963.48	842,342.65	10.17%	7,138.85
May	1,208,566.42	796,907.22	10.17%	6,753.79
June	1,091,682.47	680,298.61	10.17%	5,765.53
July	1,255,015.72	694,035.99	10.17%	5,881.96
August	1,185,922.47	721,907.47	10.17%	6,118.17
September	1,310,766.76	738,395.84	10.17%	6,257.90
October	1,259,440.80	760,138.89	10.17%	6,442.18
November	(713,314.11)	161,516.97	10.17%	(1,368.86)
December	(887,516.85)	(473,445.76)	10.17%	(4,012.45)
2007: January	(940,596.87)	(564,607.64)	9.99%	(4,700.76)
February	(1,116,626.57)	(633,483.75)	9.99%	(5,273.75)
March	(2,456,558.06)	(1,074,188.63)	9.99%	(8,942.62)
April	(3,639,310.60)	(1,832,570.52)	9.99%	(15,256.15)
May	(2,167,778.45)	(1,745,756.15)	9.99%	(14,533.42)
June	(1,817,186.68)	(1,197,980.14)	9.99%	(9,973.18)
July	(3,407,008.01)	(1,570,523.53)	9.99%	(13,074.61)
August	(4,452,790.57)	(2,362,851.95)	9.99%	(19,670.74)
September	(5,752,725.97)	(3,068,033.41)	9.99%	(25,541.38)
October	(5,074,372.04)	(3,254,896.34)	9.99%	(27,097.01)
November	(4,593,462.24)	(2,906,392.68)	9.99%	(24,195.72)
December	(4,606,244.51)	(2,765,661.84)	9.99%	(23,024.13)
2008: January	(5,208,676.21)	(2,950,610.54)	10.20%	(25,080.19)
February	(4,836,177.24)	(3,019,734.07)	10.20%	(25,667.74)
March	(5,643,232.38)	(3,150,372.52)	10.20%	(26,778.17)
April	(6,487,358.62)	(3,646,758.92)	10.20%	(30,997.45)
May	(6,312,873.20)	(3,848,069.69)	10.20%	(32,708.59)
June	(3,320,028.89)	(2,895,891.19)	10.20%	(24,615.08)
July	(3,090,646.66)	(1,927,209.34)	10.20%	(16,381.28)
August	(1,601,137.80)	(1,410,467.70)	10.20%	(11,988.98)
September	(1,776,219.28)	(1,015,317.97)	10.20%	(8,630.20)
October	(1,936,386.59)	(1,116,102.14)	10.20%	(9,486.87)
November	(2,142,250.76)	(646,535.35)	10.20%	(6,495.55)
December	185,574.37	(8,620.84)	10.20%	(73.28)
December Final	(162,264.88)			347,839.25
2009: January	25,666.44	(41,064.91)	10.56%	(361.37)
February	88,143.65	34,214.16	10.56%	301.08
March	3,491,950.15	1,076,265.70	10.56%	9,471.14
April	3,133,529.88	1,991,784.93	10.56%	17,527.71
May	5,356,535.00	2,552,325.75	10.56%	22,460.47
June	5,727,161.02	3,332,036.12	10.56%	29,321.92
July	5,411,114.33	3,348,444.03	10.56%	29,466.31
August	6,574,463.27	3,603,164.27	10.56%	31,707.85
September	5,435,069.74	3,610,365.86	10.56%	31,771.22
October	4,319,441.73	2,932,450.01	10.56%	25,805.56
November	3,523,193.89	2,357,692.33	10.56%	20,747.69
December	5,887,200.17	2,828,999.71	10.56%	24,731.32
2010: January	5,192,881.40	3,303,914.12	10.70%	29,459.90
February	3,511,609.45	2,595,548.60	10.70%	23,143.64
March	4,325,256.57	2,336,835.89	10.70%	20,836.79
April	4,102,814.37	2,513,124.33	10.70%	22,408.69
May	2,257,785.99	1,896,635.62	10.70%	16,911.67
June	1,723,456.56	1,187,147.41	10.70%	10,585.40
July	1,307,009.80	903,640.21	10.70%	8,057.46
August	1,763,201.58	915,490.98	10.70%	8,163.13
September	2,497,835.26	1,270,577.27	10.70%	11,329.31
October	3,289,425.82	1,725,674.45	10.70%	15,387.26
November	1,515,012.74	1,432,611.51	10.70%	12,774.12
December	1,756,049.04	975,381.56	10.70%	8,697.15
December Final				(430,705.39)
2011: January	2,186,645.20	1,175,652.28	10.72%	10,502.49
February	2,380,926.57	1,361,981.39	10.72%	12,167.03
March	2,369,960.25	1,416,643.19	10.72%	12,655.35
April	589,333.41	882,416.98	10.72%	7,882.93
May	(2,021,948.57)	(427,184.35)	10.72%	(3,816.18)
June	(1,688,030.55)	(1,106,260.12)	10.72%	(9,882.59)
TOTAL				29,509.03

*Period January 1, 2003 - June 30, 2003 - pre-tax allowed weighted cost of capital
 Period July 1, 2003 - May 31, 2004 - short-term borrowing interest rate
 (Weighted Average Temporary Cash Investments in Money Market Fund)
 Period June 1, 2004 forward - pre-tax allowed weighted cost of capital

EXHIBIT IV: PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE MATRIX


THE CONNECTICUT LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY

2012 Management Incentive Performance Indicators and Incentive Matrix

CL&P and the EEB recognize that having clear indicators and metrics of performance are helpful in delivering quality programs to Connecticut consumers. The following is a table of performance and incentive metrics developed by the utilities with input from the EEB, the Board consultants and the Department. These performance and incentive metrics apply to the programs delineated in this Plan. The projected CL&P Performance Incentive is **\$3,982,940** and is based on achieving **100%** of all performance targets and earning an incentive of **5%** of the total C&LM program budget of **\$79,658,809** as shown on Table A (exclusive of Energy Efficiency Board costs, management incentives and audit costs). The actual earned amount will be calculated on a sliding scale based on the percent of goal achieved and the actual total expenditures, based on the following performance range:

<u>Performance %</u>	<u>Pre-tax Incentive</u>	<u>Pre-tax Incentive</u>
<u>Minimum</u>	<u>Incentive</u>	<u>Illustration-</u>
70	2%	\$1,593,176
80	3%	\$2,389,764
90	4%	\$3,186,352
100	5%	\$3,982,940
110	6%	\$4,779,529
120	7%	\$5,576,117
130	8%	\$6,372,705
Maximum		
Incentive Basis Budget		\$79,658,809

Goals will be prorated based on actual over/under spend of budget in the event actual spending is over/under 5% of budget.



SECTOR Program	Performance Indicators				Incentive Metric	Incentive Metrics	
	Program Name	LT-kWh	kW	% (1)		Target Goal	Weight
RESIDENTIAL	\$27,268 Residential Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget	Retail Products 214,581,337 3,271 35.7% New Construction 29,900,570 356 4.8% HES 259,148,882 2,631 41.3% HES Income Eligible 116,400,232 929 18.2% Total 620,031,021 7,187			Sum of Electric System Benefit from Residential programs	0.1650	\$716,929
		Savings Rate \$ 0.06820 / kWh \$ 652.90 / kW Savings \$ 42,285 \$ 4,692 (1) percent of target goal				\$46,977	
Net Electric System Benefit - Res.	\$11,757	Electric System Benefit less Program Costs \$19,709				0.1650	\$716,929
Home Energy Solutions		Electric Savings LTKWh : 259,148,882 Demand Savings kw : 2,631 Increase average HES Participant savings by 20% for all fuels For 10% of HES participants achieve 25% overall reduction in total energy savings; based on the average energy usage of HES participants			Energy Savings included in appropriate sector level metric Increase average HES Savings by 20% Achieve deep savings of 25%	0.0800	\$318,635
EE Communities	\$1,000	HES Coordination with community tasks forces and vendors to bring in more HES Projects (projects completed from outside of the utilities)			Increase customer participation	0.0400	\$159,318
Residential New Construction	\$1,261	Electric Savings LTKWh : 29,900,570 Demand Savings kw : 356			Energy Savings included in appropriate sector level metric		
HES Income Eligible	\$9,400	Electric Savings LTKWh : 116,400,232 Demand Savings kW : 929 Fully expend 2012 HES-IE Budget. This is a penalty metric. Companies must expend at least 88% of budget to avoid the penalty. Above 88% the penalty is scaled with a 10% reduction in the penalty for each one percent increase in budget spent above 88%. Expending 98% will avoid the penalty. The budget will be adjusted and pro-rated based on final year-end spending, net of ARRA spending impacts. The EEB acknowledges the high priority for the spending of any remaining ARRA federal stimulus monies through March 2012 and the important support and resources the Companies are dedicating to that effort. Any under-expended HES-IE funding from 2012 will be carry forward to 2013, which would be in addition to the parity-level of HES-IE funding in 2013.			Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric Fully expend 2012 HES-IE Budget The penalty below 88% is -.05	0	\$0
Retail Products	\$4,850	Alignment of HES and HES-IE BPI Certifications One person in each crew with both BPI Building Analyst 1 and Envelop Specialist certifications by 6/30/12. By 9/30/12 each crew will have received training and be able to provide duct sealing services as per HES guidelines. Each crew will have the necessary testing and diagnostic equipment to perform duct sealing.	214,581,337 3,271		HES-IE Crew member Certifications and Duct Sealing Training 1 member of each crew certified by June 30, 2012 Duct Sealing Training and able/equipped by 9/30/12	0.03	\$119,489

SECTOR Program	Performance Indicators				Incentive Metrics																																														
	Program Name	LT-kWh	kW	% (1)	Incentive Metric	Target Goal	Weight	Incentive																																											
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL (C&I)	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Program Name</th> <th>LT-kWh</th> <th>kW</th> <th>% (1)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Energy Conscious Blueprint</td> <td>307,731,964</td> <td>4,375</td> <td>23.4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Energy Opportunities</td> <td>521,131,463</td> <td>6,027</td> <td>38.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>O&M</td> <td>144,420,641</td> <td>2,349</td> <td>11.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PRIME</td> <td>9,479,141</td> <td>-</td> <td>0.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Small Business</td> <td>344,348,911</td> <td>4,828</td> <td>26.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>1,327,112,120</td> <td>17,579</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Savings Rate</td> <td>\$ 0.06815 / kWh</td> <td>\$ 921.89 / kW</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Savings</td> <td>\$ 90,446</td> <td>\$ 16,206</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4">(1) percent of target goal</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							Program Name	LT-kWh	kW	% (1)	Energy Conscious Blueprint	307,731,964	4,375	23.4%	Energy Opportunities	521,131,463	6,027	38.5%	O&M	144,420,641	2,349	11.3%	PRIME	9,479,141	-	0.6%	Small Business	344,348,911	4,828	26.2%	Total	1,327,112,120	17,579		Savings Rate	\$ 0.06815 / kWh	\$ 921.89 / kW		Savings	\$ 90,446	\$ 16,206		(1) percent of target goal				Total Electric System Benefit from C&I programs	Electric System Benefit from C&I programs \$106,651	0.2100	\$836,417
	Program Name	LT-kWh	kW	% (1)																																															
Energy Conscious Blueprint	307,731,964	4,375	23.4%																																																
Energy Opportunities	521,131,463	6,027	38.5%																																																
O&M	144,420,641	2,349	11.3%																																																
PRIME	9,479,141	-	0.6%																																																
Small Business	344,348,911	4,828	26.2%																																																
Total	1,327,112,120	17,579																																																	
Savings Rate	\$ 0.06815 / kWh	\$ 921.89 / kW																																																	
Savings	\$ 90,446	\$ 16,206																																																	
(1) percent of target goal																																																			
Net Electric System Benefit- C&I	Electric System Benefit less Program Costs					\$68,611	0.2100	\$836,417																																											
C&I Market Segmentation	The Companies will develop a plan which includes a protocol for defining market penetration and segmentation and establishing long term goals in collaboration with the EEB (EO and SBEA)																																																		
Energy Opportunities	\$13,242	1) Percentage of EO signed projects that incorporate performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital)				10% of the signed projects will incorporate performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital)	0.0200	\$79,659																																											
	\$8,503	2) Percentage of signed projects participating in the Comprehensive Initiative receiving comprehensive incentive				12% of the signed projects will be comprehensive projects	0.0200	\$79,659																																											
Energy Conscious Blueprint	1) Number of new construction/major renovation projects that exceed the new construction State Energy Code baseline by at least 30 % or follow the whole building performance track.				30% of signed contracts exceed code or are whole building performance track project	0.020	\$79,659																																												
	2) The companies will develop a plan to transition into IECC 2012 (ASHRAE 2010) in collaboration with the EEB: a) Awareness: Prepare the market by working with the AVE community, the trade communities, specifiers and inspectors b) Develop and deliver a series of code training sessions for the AVE and trade c) Develop and deliver a series of training sessions on a variety of subjects relating to Integrated Design and High Performance Buildings (including Net Zero buildings) and code																																																		
Small Business	\$11,640	Electric Saving LTkWh : Demand Saving kW :	344,348,911 4,828		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric		0.02	\$79,659																																											
	Percentage of projects participating in the "Comprehensive" initiative. (i.e., 2 or more end uses) receiving comprehensive performance incentive																																																		
O&M / RCx	\$4,171	1) The Companies will develop and promote a Sustainable Energy Management Plan and Guide which includes benchmarking, the use of dashboards, and an implementation plan including Retro-commissioning in collaboration with the EEB.				Develop the Sustainable Energy Mgmt Guide and enroll 25 customers	0.02	\$79,659																																											
Total of Incentives							1.00000	\$3,982,940																																											

THE UNITED ILLUMINATING COMPANY
2012 Management Incentive Performance Indicators and Incentive Matrix


Provided below is the 2012 Incentive Matrix with Performance Indicators.

The weights applied to each of the individual and sector level metrics were developed in collaboration with ECMB consultants. The Utility Performance Incentive is \$1,003,333. This calculated is based on achieving 100% of all performance targets and earning a target incentive of 5% of C&LM budgets (not including ECMB costs, Audit Costs or Management Incentive). Goals will be prorated based on actual over/under spend of budget.

The actual incentive earned will be determined by the performance achieved in each of the Incentive Metrics identified below, based on the following Performance Index:

<u>Performance %</u>	<u>Pretax Incentive</u>	<u>Pre-tax Incentive</u>
70	2%	\$401,333
80	3%	\$602,000
90	4%	\$802,667
100	5%	\$1,003,333
110	6%	\$1,204,000
120	7%	\$1,404,667
130	8%	\$1,605,333

Total Original Budget* \$20,066,667



SECTOR Program		Performance Indicators			Incentive Metrics			
				Incentive Metric	Target Goal	Weight	Incentive	
RESIDENTIAL	All Residential Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget	\$ 6,332,935	Residential Products & Services Lifetime kWh Residential Products & Services kW Homes Lifetime kWh Homes kW Home Energy Solutions Lifetime kWh Home Energy Solutions kW HES Income Eligible Lifetime kWh HES Income Eligible kW Total Residential Lifetime kWh Total Residential kW Present Value of Res Lifetime kWh Present Value of Res Lifetime kW @ Customer Meter Total Res Lifetime kWh @ Present Value Factor Total Res kW @ Present Value Factor Total Electric System Benefit The Net Electric System Benefit from all Res programs	72,381,047 1,326 2,941,285 103 41,625,954 734 40,277,158 210 157,225,443 2,373 \$0.0683 \$690.99 \$10,742,077 \$1,639,441 \$12,381,518 \$6,048,584	Total Electric System Benefit from all Res programs Total Electric System Benefit: \$12,381,518	Electric System Benefit from all Res programs Total Electric System Benefit: \$12,381,518	0.165	\$165,550
	All Residential Programs (Sector Level)		Total Net Electric System Benefit	\$6,048,584	Electric System Benefit from all Res programs Total Electric System Benefit: \$12,381,518	0.165	\$165,550	
	Residential New Construction	\$ 177,329			Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric			
	HES	\$ 2,281,658	Increase average HES Participant savings by 20% for all fuels		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric	Achieve 20% average increase in HES per participant savings across all fuels	0.08	\$80,267
	HES - Income Eligible	\$ 2,118,093	For 10% of HES participants achieve 25% overall reduction in total energy savings; based on the average energy usage of HES participants		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric	Achieve minimum savings of 25% across all fuels in 10% of HES participants	0.04	\$40,133
			Fully expend 2012 HES-IE Budget. This is a penalty metric. Companies must expend at least 88% of budget to avoid penalty. Above 88% the penalty is scaled with a 10% reduction in the penalty for each one percent increase in budget spent above 88%. Expending 98% will avoid the penalty. The budget will be adjusted and pro-rated based on final savings. HES acknowledges the high priority for the spending of any remaining ARRA federal stimulus monies through March 2012 and the important support and resources the Companies are dedicating to that effort. Any under-expended HES-IE funding from 2012 will be carry forward to 2013, which would be in addition to the parity-level of HES-IE funding in 2013.		Fully expend 2012 HES-IE Budget	Note: the penalty below 88% is -.05		
	Retail Products	\$ 1,755,855	Alignment of HES and HES-IE BPI Certifications. One person in each crew with both BPI Building Analyst 1 and Envelop Specialist certifications by 6/30/12. By 9/30/12 each crew will have received training and be able to provide duct sealing services as per HES guidelines. Each crew will have the necessary testing and diagnostic equipment to perform duct sealing.		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric	1 member of each crew certified by June 30, 2012. Duct Sealing Training and able/equipped by 9/30/12	0.03	\$30,100
	EE Communities	\$ 300,000	HES Coordination with community tasks forces and vendors to bring in more HES Projects (projects completed from outside of the utilities)		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric	Increase customer participation		
	All Other Residential Programs		Electric savings		Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric			

SECTOR Program		Performance Indicators			Incentive Metrics		
				Incentive Metric	Target Goal	Weight	Incentive
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL (C/I) All C/I Programs (Sector Level) Sector Budget	\$ 8,368,616	Energy Blueprint Lifetime kWh Energy Blueprint kW Energy Opportunities Lifetime kWh Energy Opportunities kW O&M (RetroCk, BOC, RFP) O&M RFP kW	103,249,390 1,093 113,819,163 1,172 13,903,656	Total Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs.	Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs Benefit: \$25,259,648	0.21	\$210,700
		Small Business Lifetime kWh Small Business kW Total C&I Lifetime kWh Total C&I kW Present Value of C&I Lifetime kWh @ Customer Meter Total C&I kWh @ Present Value Factor Total Electric System Benefit The net Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs: Total Net Electric System Benefit from all C&I programs.	64,551,988 861 295,524,197 3,303 \$0.0735 \$1,069.45 \$21,727,726 \$3,531,922 \$25,259,648 \$16,891,032 \$16,891,032	Electric Savings LT kWh: 64,551,988 Demand Savings kW: 860.9	Energy savings included in appropriate sector level metric		
Energy Conscious Blueprint	\$ 2,227,636	1) Number of new construction/major renovation projects that exceed the new construction State Energy Code baseline by 30% or follow the whole building performance track. 2) The Companies will develop a plan to transition into IECC 2012 (ASHRAE 2010) in collaboration with the EEB: a) Awareness: Prepare the market by working with the A/E community, the trade communities, specifiers and inspectors, to develop a series of code training sessions for the A/E and trade communities c) Develop and deliver a series of training sessions on a variety of subjects relating to Integrated Design and High Performance Buildings (including Net Zero buildings) and code issues.			Plan completion for the end of 2nd Qr. Produce awareness collateral Conduct joint training sessions with CL&P Conduct joint training sessions with CL&P	0.02	\$20,067
Energy Opportunities	\$ 3,007,319	1) Number of projects participating in the Comprehensive Initiative based on the agreed definition of comprehensiveness. 2) Number of signed projects that incorporate performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital).			12% signed projects will be comprehensive 10% signed project that incorporates performance contracting (and/or 3rd Party Financing, including utility capital)	0.02	\$20,067
Business & Energy Sustainability (formerly O&M RFP) Includes funds for programs that may result from the public input	\$ 747,439	The Companies will develop and promote a Sustainable Energy Management Plan and Guide which includes benchmarking, the use of dashboards, and an implementation plan including Retro-commissioning in collaboration with the EEB.			Develop the Sustainable Energy Management Guide and enroll 5 customers.	0.02	\$20,067
C&I Market Segmentation		The Companies will develop a plan which includes a protocol for defining market segmentation and market penetration for the purposes of establishing long term goals in collaboration with the EEB (EO and SBEA).			Develop goals for inclusion for the 2013 plan Electric Savings include in appropriate sector level metric		
All Other C&I Programs		Electric Savings					
Non-Electric Benefits		Dollar savings associated with fossil fuel savings, water savings, maintenance savings, labor savings and any other identified benefit	\$500,000 in benefits				
Total Incentive \$ Residential and C&I						1.0000	\$1,003,333

This page intentionally blank

EXHIBIT V: PROGRAM EVALUATIONS



The EEB Program Evaluation Plan, 2012

October 1, 2011

Preface

The EEB Evaluation Committee is pleased to present its Evaluation Plan for the Public Utility Regulatory Authority's consideration. Also contained within its pages is the Evaluation Roadmap as ordered in the PURA's decision for Docket 10-10-03 and refined by the provisions in PA 11-80.

The Evaluation Plan is designed to provide cost effective studies of all the C&LM programs. Programs offering the most savings or the most uncertainty are expected to be evaluated most frequently. The Plan integrates gas and electric programs and takes advantage of opportunities to cooperate with others in the Northeast that offer the same types of measures as does CT.

Most importantly, the Plan provides for an independent evaluation process. It is critical that the programs be evaluated, measured, and verified in a way that provides confidence to the public at large that the savings are real and in a way that enables the Companies to use those savings estimates and other results with full confidence. There is a need to ensure both the reality and the perception of the independence and objectivity of EM&V activities.

Offered by the EEB Evaluation Committee;
Jamie Howland, Chair
Shirley Bergert
Jeffrey Gaudiosi
Richard Rodrigue
Richard Steeves

Table of Contents

Preface	i
Table of Contents	ii
Introduction.....	3
Guiding Principles	3
The EEB Evaluation Roadmap - Revised 07-2011.....	3
Summary	3
Evaluation Process.....	4
Evaluation Planning.....	4
Study Development	5
Contractor Selection Process	5
Project Initiation	7
Project Management and Completion	9
Project Completion	10
Regional Studies	12
Evaluation Studies 2011 - 2014.....	13
Research Area Approach to Organizing Evaluation	13
Evaluation and Research Types.....	14
Current and Planned Studies	15
Evaluation Studies 2012 - 2014 (Preliminary)	16
EM&V Forum Evaluation 2012	17
Communications Protocol for Evaluation.....	18
A. Confidential Customer Data	18
B. Communications Prior to Study Inception	18
C. Communications During the Study.....	19
D. Communications with Contractors	19
E. Site Reports	20
F. Communications Concerning Study Results/Review of Draft Materials	20
Conclusion.....	20

The EEB Program Evaluation Plan, 2012

Introduction

The Companies have a long history of providing efficiency programs to Connecticut energy consumers. An integral part of creating, delivering and maintaining quality programs is performing independent evaluations of programs and the markets they serve.

In 1998 the Energy Conservation Management Board (now the Energy Efficiency Board or EEB) was formed and charged with responsibility to advise and assist the utility distribution companies in the development and implementation of comprehensive and cost-effective energy conservation and market transformation plans. Since that time, the EEB has worked closely with the Companies to ensure all evaluations are relevant, independent, cost-effective and meet the needs of program administrators and planners. In 2005, The EEB formed an Evaluation Committee to work directly with an EEB Evaluation Consultant in overseeing evaluation planning and completion. In 2009, the Department's decision in Docket No. 08-10-03 ordered the EEB's Evaluation Committee and their consultant to be independent from and totally responsible for all aspects of the evaluation process.

The EEB and the Electric and Natural Gas Companies recognize the importance of conducting thorough, timely, and independent evaluations. The various types of evaluation studies exist to support continuous improvement in program offerings and to measure the results of those programs. The audiences for evaluation are many - regulatory bodies, the regional electric system operator (ISO-New England), utility management, and program planners and administrators all need the information gained through evaluation in order to make decisions about program efficacy. Evaluation research can also provide the basis for determining program direction or focus. Evaluations can be used to increase participation and savings, reduce costs, and fine-tune procedures. The research provides intelligence to be used to expand the reach of the programs, using messages more relevant to the non-participating customers. Appropriate evaluation can provide the information that program administrators need to enhance existing cost-effective programs or to take a non-cost-effective program and reconstitute it as a successful one.

The evaluation process is a critical tool to measure energy savings, as well as other key attributes of each program, to allow optimum program design and careful management of consumer conservation funds.

Guiding Principles

All members of the EEB recognize the importance of evaluation. Program evaluation provides a vital function in assessing program results and supporting continuous improvement in program performance. Evaluation should not be used to "prove" non-performance, but rather to point to areas where improvement would strengthen an otherwise viable program. It is critical that the programs be evaluated, measured, and verified in a way that satisfies regional jurisdictional requirements, provides confidence to the public at large that the savings are real, and enables the Companies³³ to use those savings estimates and other results with full confidence. There is a need to ensure both the reality and the perception of the independence and objectivity of Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V) activities.

Program evaluations, market assessments and other studies should be performed on a statewide basis to the maximum extent possible, while enabling, to the extent necessary, results at the Company level. It is recognized that circumstances could occur where a service territory specific or non-statewide evaluation or study would be appropriate. Electric and natural gas program evaluation efforts should be fully integrated to the maximum extent possible. Because of the statewide focus of program evaluation in Connecticut, it is important to continue to coordinate program procedures, measures and data collection processes.

The EEB Evaluation Roadmap - Revised 07-2011

In accordance with the Act [PA 11-80 § 33, to be codified at Conn. Gen. Stat. § 16-245m(d)(4)] and the Final Decision in Docket 10-10-03, this revised Evaluation Roadmap is presented.

Summary

The Energy Efficiency Board (EEB) Evaluation Committee, which consists of non-utility EEB members, represents the EEB in the efficiency program evaluation process. The EEB Evaluation Committee and the EEB Evaluation Consultant are independent from the EEB Technical Consultants and the Program Administrators. The EEB Evaluation Consultant reports directly to the EEB Evaluation Committee. Absent payment through the CEEF, the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) requires that the EEB Evaluation Consultant have no financial or business ties to CL&P, UI, Yankee, SCG, CNG, any EEB members, or any other EEB Technical Consultants who plan the efficiency programs.

³³ Whenever the terms "Company" or "Companies" are used, they should be understood to include only those Electric and Natural Gas Companies that offer the program being evaluated.

The EEB Evaluation Committee, and specifically the EEB Evaluation Consultant, will execute the following responsibilities: evaluation planning, study development, contractor selection, project initiation, project management and completion, and finalization of evaluation reports. All RFPs will be issued by the EEB Evaluation Consultant and responses will also be sent to the EEB Evaluation Consultant. The EEB members and the Program Administrators (PAs) may provide initial insights into the scope of work, review proposals that have been submitted, and may submit preferences for contractor selection, but final decisions rest with the EEB Evaluation Consultant, with the advisement of the Evaluation Committee. The Program Administrators review the final work products conducted and provided by third party evaluators and may provide comments on the final Draft report in writing. After completion of the report, the Evaluation Consultant, through the EEB Executive Secretary, files the evaluation report with the board and with the PURA in its most recent uncontested proceeding and the Board will post a copy of each report on its Internet web site. The Board and its members, including electric distribution and gas Program Administrator representatives, may file written comments regarding any evaluation with the PURA or for posting on the Board's Internet web site within 30 days of receipt of the report. The Program Administrators may also file written exceptions with the PURA. In addition, the Program Administrators must file with the PURA a description of how the results and recommendations will be implemented.

The Evaluation Committee may add to, reduce or alter the roles of the Evaluation Consultant and/or the Companies at its discretion at any time so long as those changes comport with the requirements of the Act and the Decision above or subsequent.

The EEB Evaluation Consultant communicates and coordinates with the EEB Evaluation Committee, and then with interested EEB members, the Companies, and the public through scheduled Committee meetings and retention of documents as described herein. These communications continue throughout the course of all evaluation activities. The EEB Evaluation Consultant schedules and coordinates all stages of the evaluation process to address the research and design concerns of the EEB Evaluation Committee and, as appropriate, the Companies to assure the highest quality of studies and the best allocation of ratepayer dollars among the studies.

The EEB revised program evaluation roadmap is independent and transparent, with the EEB Evaluation Consultant communicating progress through the scheduled events of the EEB Evaluation Committee. Through the EEB Executive Secretary, the EEB Evaluation Consultant posts all EEB Evaluation Committee meeting dates and conference calls in a way that allows all interested EEB members and members of the public to attend events, participate in calls, and provide input as appropriate.

Evaluation Process

The EEB Evaluation Committee and the EEB Evaluation Consultant lead the conduct and performance of the evaluation process. While the Companies no longer hold a primary role in evaluation, their role is still vital to the success of the programs. Program administrators are in a strong position to identify aspects of their programs (savings, market, process) that would benefit from evaluation activities. The Program administrators have intimate knowledge of program procedures and program data collection that are necessary to evaluation. Moreover, the Program Administrators have a strong interest in ensuring program improvements.

Evaluation Planning

With consultation and input from the EEB Technical Consultants and the Program Administrators, the EEB Evaluation Consultant determines which evaluations might be done, sets priorities, and establishes the evaluation budget in line with those priorities. Program and measure evaluation, measurement and verification shall be conducted on an ongoing basis, with emphasis on impact and process evaluations, programs or measures that have not been studied, and those that account for a relatively high percentage of program spending. These plans and budget are approved by the EEB Evaluation Committee. The EEB Evaluation Committee will present the proposed evaluation plan to the PURA after budgetary approval by the Board. Voting members of the Board determine the budget for evaluation, which will be included in the Annual Plan filed with the PURA. The electric distribution and gas Program Administrator representatives and the representative of a municipal electric energy cooperative may not vote on board plans, budgets, recommendations, actions or decisions regarding such factors or on program evaluations and their implementation. The Evaluation Consultant:

- Provides Evaluation Committee with a package of programs evaluations, priorities and costs;
- When the evaluation plan is approved by the EEB Evaluation Committee, establishes resulting budget to submit to the full EEB for vote;
- Writes Evaluation Report to be filed at the time of the Companies' Annual Plan;
- Revises the plan periodically to reflect changes in opportunity, circumstances, remaining budget or other considerations.

The Companies, separately and together, provide important programmatic information that helps ensure that needed information on evaluation issues, program structure, and ex ante estimates are available to the Evaluation Consultant in a timely manner.


For evaluation planning, the Companies and the EEB Technical Consultants provide the EEB Evaluation Consultant with:

- Lists of studies each entity would like to be included in the evaluation plan;
- Suggested priorities for those studies that consider both the need for the information and availability of funds;
- Budgets that are sufficient to support the final plan as determined by the EEB Evaluation Committee and approved by the EEB;

Study Development

In the study development phase, the EEB Evaluation Consultant, the EEB Technical Consultants and the Companies develop the Scope of Work for the particular study to be undertaken. The Program Administrators and EEB Technical Consultants provide the EEB Evaluation Consultant with suggested issues to be included in the scope and focus of the RFP. The Evaluation Consultant finalizes the RFP after review and written comment by the Companies and Technical Consultants. After the initial scoping process, the Evaluation Consultant requests suggestions for bidders to be included in the issuance. The Companies may also suggest that inclusion of some contractors may be inadvisable, providing reasons for those beliefs. The RFPs explicitly identify the EEB Evaluation Committee as the entity requesting proposals and the EEB evaluation consultant, who works on behalf of the EEB, as the sole contact for additional information and for receipt of the proposals. See [Figure 1](#).

Figure 1: Study Development Process




Contractor Selection Process

It is especially important the selection of 3rd party contractors be transparent. The EEB process ([Figure 2](#)) for selection of an evaluation contractor is:

- The EEB Evaluation Consultant develops the scope of work with input and assistance from appropriate Program Administrator staff and EEB Technical Consultants. The EEB Evaluation Consultant develops the RFP and includes information for and instructions to contractors on procedures for conducting the evaluation. The Companies provide their Terms and Conditions documents for inclusion in the RFP.
- The EEB Evaluation Committee releases the RFP.
- Contractor proposals are submitted directly to the EEB Evaluation Consultant. The Evaluation Consultant and EEB Executive Secretary then provide proposals to EEB Technical Consultants and a staff person or persons from each appropriate Program Administrator who may review the proposals. Any reviews will be provided to the EEB Evaluation Consultant in writing.

Figure 2: Contractor Selection Process



- The EEB Evaluation Consultant then scores the proposals based primarily on the proposed work plan and approach, the contractors' experience and qualifications, and the proposed price. The top 2 or 3 finalist proposals are identified.

- The EEB Evaluation Consultant sends a summary of the finalist proposals, proposal analysis, and the EEB Consultant recommendations to the EEB Evaluation Committee members.
- The EEB Evaluation Committee reviews the summary and selects the evaluation contractor.
- A public summary of the basis for selecting the winning contractor is drafted by the EEB Evaluation Consultant and approved by the EEB Evaluation Committee. Each Program Administrator's purchasing agent retains this summary as the basis for the bid award.
- The EEB Evaluation Committee notifies the winning contractor and the other proposers.
- The Program Administrators then issue contracts and execute Purchase Orders.

EEB Evaluation Committee reports to the full EEB at the regularly scheduled EEB meetings. The report shall include information on the evaluation contractors selected since the previous EEB meeting.


Project Initiation

Kick-off Meetings

Projects will be initiated through two kick-off meetings. In one meeting, the EEB Evaluation Consultant, the Program Administrators and the selected evaluation Contractor meet to discuss the proposed approach and establish data availability and processes for acquiring data. The EEB Evaluation Consultant organizes date, time, location and needed personnel for the meeting, apprising the Program Administrators of the final schedule. Representatives of the Program Administrators attend this first kick-off meeting, typically by phone, since meetings will be held either in the presence of the Evaluation Consultant or by telephone. This requirement is set in order to ensure the selected Contractor understands the project management structure and need for the study to be independent of those who administer the programs studied. The Program Administrators may raise questions relative to the scope of work and will describe data availability, format and transfer to the Contractor.

The other meeting will take place between the EEB Evaluation Consultant and the Contractor. In this meeting, direction on content and provision of the Final Workplan will be developed. Evaluation work plans must be developed to assure use of statistically valid monitoring and data collection techniques appropriate for the programs or measures being evaluated. All evaluations must contain a description of any problems encountered in the process of the evaluation, including, but not limited to, data collection issues, and recommendations regarding addressing those problems in preparation for future evaluations. The Contractor will also be apprised of all reporting relationships and procedural requirements. Following this meeting, the EEB Evaluation Consultant will supply the EEB Evaluation Committee and the Program Administrators with notes summarizing the meeting as provided by the Contractor. See [Figure 3](#).

Figure 3: Kick-Off Meeting Process




Development of the Final Work Plan

The kick-off meeting may identify scope changes to improve accuracy, align the plan with data availability, or reduce costs. These scope changes may impact the budget as well as changing the workplan.

The Program Administrators review potential changes to the work plan and provide comments in writing. The Evaluation Consultant considers these comments and then finalizes the workplan with the selected evaluation Contractor. The final work plan and budget will be provided to the Program Administrators for incorporation into Purchase Orders (or revised Purchase Orders). The Final Workplan will take precedence over the proposed work plan or any draft workplan in guiding the conduct of the study. See [Figure 4](#).

Figure 4: Final Workplan Development



Project Management and Completion

Project Management

Once the evaluation Contractor has been selected and the evaluation has begun, the relationship between (1) the evaluation Contractor and Energy Efficiency Board Evaluation Consultant and (2) the Program Administrators, all Energy Efficiency Board members, and the EEB Technical Consultants will be treated in a similar fashion to a contested proceeding. There shall be no informal communications regarding the design or outcomes of the evaluation between the Program Administrators, the Energy Efficiency Board and the Evaluation Consultant or Evaluation Contractor. The EEB Evaluation Consultant may continue to consult with the EEB Evaluation Committee for administrative purposes, including issues regarding data requests. EEB Board members, including the Evaluation Committee, shall not communicate directly with the Evaluation Contractor conducting an active evaluation without the Evaluation Consultant being present. Input from the Program Administrators/Energy Efficiency Board shall be limited to responding to the Evaluation Consultant’s request for data or technical assistance. Any communications shall be in writing and include a copy to the EEB Evaluation Consultant.

The EEB Evaluation Consultant leads the project management process (Figure 5) and is responsible for determining what information needs to be developed. In particular the Consultant will:


- Work with the Contractor to resolve issues and expedite solutions.
- Review and approve all deliverables and milestones.
- Review all interim work products and any issues of importance that may impact the results or cost of the evaluation. Provide Final Draft report to the Program Administrators for comment.
- Retain all communications from the Contractor and from Program Administrator representatives.

- Assess the EEB Technical Consultants and Program Administrators' written comments and provide any changes needed as a result of that review to the Contractor.
- Review and approve Contractor invoices for payment by the Program Administrators from the CEEF.
- Provide the full EEB reports on evaluation schedules and internal project deadlines through monthly reports to the Board.

The Program Administrators act as CEEF contract administrators and conduits for program information. Specifically, the Program Administrators:

- Initiate administrative actions necessary to support contract maintenance and payment.
- Issue payments to the independent evaluation contractors on approval of the EEB Evaluation Consultant.
- Provide required program, billing, customer data and any other information needed for the completion of the study.
- Provide materials, including stationary, envelopes, incentive checks and more as needed.

Figure 5: Project Management



Project Completion

The Program Administrators and Energy Efficiency Board may no longer be permitted to comment on internal draft evaluation reports. When the Draft report is ready for the review, the EEB Evaluation Consultant provides it to the EEB Executive Secretary who then notices the draft and provides it to the EEB Technical Consults and those Program Administrator representatives the PAs have designated. All Other Persons are invited to provide comments in writing. After the review comments are considered, the EEB Evaluation Consultant will do one or more of the following:

- Finalize the report with no additional changes
- Provide written direction to the Contractor on how to incorporate those changes that are accepted.
- Require a new Draft

The Evaluation Consultant will consider the Program Administrator and EEB Technical Consultant comments and work with the Contractor to finalize the evaluation report. The Evaluation Consultant will then summarize the final report and submit that summary with the final report to the EEB Evaluation Committee.


Records of all communications during the evaluation, the draft report and written comments will be kept on file and maintained after the evaluation has been completed. This information shall be available to the public without protective status. The EEB Evaluation Committee is responsible for maintaining all evaluation products, both interim and final. Neither

the third party contractor nor the Program Administrators may release preliminary or final data without prior approval from the EEB Evaluation Committee or its designee.

When the final report is ready, the Evaluation Consultant, through the EEB Executive Secretary, will file the evaluation report with the Board and with the PURA in its most recent uncontested proceeding. The board shall post a copy of each report on its Internet web site.

The board and its members, including electric distribution and gas Program Administrator representatives, may file written comments regarding any evaluation with the PURA or for posting on the board's Internet web site. The Program Administrators will be required to indicate how they intend to implement each of the recommendations and incorporate the results into the PSD. The Program Administrators and the members of the EEB may also provide written exceptions to the report. Within fourteen days of the filing of any evaluation report, the PURA, members of the board or other interested persons may request in writing, and the PURA shall conduct, a transcribed technical meeting to review the methodology, results and recommendations of any evaluation. Participants in any such transcribed technical meeting shall include the Evaluation Consultant, the evaluation contractor and the Office of Consumer Counsel at its discretion. See Figure 6.

Figure 6: Project Completion



Regional Studies

The EEB Evaluation Consultant shall represent the EEB in all regional evaluation studies, either with the EM&V Forum or with individual states and groups of states. The EEB Evaluation consultant will assume the leadership role for the EEB in all discussions and negotiations involving the regional parties and bring any substantial issues before the Evaluation Committee. No other entity will hold itself out as representing Connecticut's interests. To the extent applicable and for all regional studies, the EEB Evaluation Consultant and the Program Administrators shall exercise responsibilities in an equivalent fashion as those identified in this document.

For evaluations where Connecticut is the minority participant in the study, the EEB evaluation consultant will represent the EEB's interests and contribute to all processes (including scoring and selection) as appropriate based on the level of participation and any processes governing the study outlined by the participating parties. For some of these smaller Regional Studies, the EEB Evaluation Consultant may delegate responsibility for monitoring the study to the Program Administrators, if appropriate and if they wish to accept that delegation.

Evaluation Studies 2011 - 2014

In planning which and how many evaluations to conduct each year, the EEB Evaluation Committee considers many factors, including but not limited to: the magnitude of cost and energy savings associated with the program, how recently comparable studies were done, needs expressed by program administrators, requirements of outside organizations, market conditions, recent or planned program changes, and any gaps identified. The EEB also works in a broad regional manner when planning evaluation activities for the up-coming program years. Through collaboration with regional agencies and utilities with similar interests, the EEB takes full advantage of opportunities to gather information in the most cost-effective manner. Occasionally, opportunities to participate in evaluation studies are unforeseen and, therefore, are not included in the planning process. If an unplanned opportunity proves to be in the best interest of Connecticut customers, the EEB Evaluation Committee will commit resources to those efforts as well. There are also occasions when a planned evaluation study no longer offers the value expected. The EEB Evaluation Committee assesses those conditions with the assistance of the Evaluation Consultant and determines whether changes should be made to the Program Evaluation Plan.

Research Area Approach to Organizing Evaluation

In 2011, due to the unprecedented need for new evaluation and market assessment studies, the Evaluation Committee instituted a Research Area Approach to managing and structuring the overall evaluation function.

Under a research area approach, expected and potential studies are divided among a number of research areas. For example, all Residential Retrofit and Retail Products studies through 2014 will be completed within one such research area. An RFP/RFQ is released for each research area. Respondents provide detailed information on work scope and budgets for the near-horizon studies, understanding of the issues and broad approach to addressing those issues, and a guaranteed set of rates for the full time period – in this case through 2014. After assessment of the expertise each team brings to the set of studies, a team of Contractors is selected. That team, and any additions required to meet the needs of the project, is then expected to complete any studies assigned to them.

Organizing evaluation in this fashion provides clear benefits and few potential risks. First, this approach allows substantial flexibility in study selection and timing. At times like this when substantial new program requirements and aggressive new goals are being fast-tracked, it is essential to be able to meet identified needs as they arise. When new studies are needed, other studies can be put on the back burner for a while to free up personnel and resources for supporting research.

Second, using this approach greatly reduces the lead time required to start new studies. Under typical approaches, lead time is required to:

- Develop RFP including provision of contract structure, scope of work, program descriptions and explanatory data, followed by review by interested parties
- Release of RFP to bidders list, providing time for response to questions and time for bidders to prepare their proposals
- Review and assess the proposals by interested parties. Follow-up questioning and reference checks are part of that process
- Selection and contract development

All told, the lead time requirements prior to selection sum to at least 2 months. When contract development is considered, an additional 6 months has been required for some projects. Use of the research area approach still requires the same upfront timeframe. However, that process is only required to be completed once for each research area. After selection, lead time is reduced to a discussion of the requirements of a particular study; discussion of data availability and development of an abbreviated workplan. Lead time with review of approximately 1 week is anticipated.

Related to these first two benefits is the ability to co-develop a study. Under the typical approach, a RFP goes out with study objectives described. The bidder then interprets those objectives and develops a

proposal that describes their preliminary workplan. At that point, it becomes much more difficult to ensure that the goals are clearly understood and to repurpose the workplan as needed. Better studies are likely to result when the discussion starts at the project objectives rather than having an existing workplan as the starting place for discussion. The difference can be described as “we need the study to produce this,” rather than “we need your proposal to change that.”

On a simple and pragmatic front, this approach provides an incentive to attract more bids. Since contractors are bidding on a multi-year project, they face reduced risk in hiring/increased certainty of profitability. The approach reduces the time and energy cost to CEEF of educating Contractors on how the system works in Connecticut, how programs are structured and how to capture information needed for the study. Finally, the CEEF is provided better cost-certainty. Bidders are asked to guarantee a set of hourly rates over the time frame of the contract.

The winning bidder would be the sole evaluation contractor for their particular research area. That team will be expected to handle all evaluation issues and therefore are responsible to do what is needed to make sufficient resources available for negotiated studies. However, the research area approach does not guarantee that the contractor will be provided any particular volume of work, nor does it guarantee the contractor team will retain the contract if their work is unsatisfactory or the research area is no longer needed.

While additional research areas may be needed in 2012, the following areas have been developed³⁴ thus far:

- Residential Retrofit and Retail Products
- Residential New Construction and Emerging Measures
- Small C&I
- Cross-Sector Studies
- Large C&I – no contract yet awarded

Because of substantial overlap in the teams, the two Residential Research Areas will be administratively and operationally combined when it is practicable and efficient to do so.

Evaluation and Research Types

Early in the program planning process and periodically throughout the programs’ evolutions, **Market Assessments** examine pre-existing market conditions and ascertain the extent to which efficiency programs are likely to influence customer adoption of measures and practices. Careful market assessments are conducted to identify effective ways to influence key market players to take efficiency actions and to increase the breadth and depth of the actions taken.

Market assessments examine overall market conditions related to energy efficiency products and services, including current standard practices, average efficiency of equipment, consumer purchasing practices, and identification of market barriers.

Impact Support evaluation research encompasses all foundational research important as a basis for future evaluation.

Assessment of the adequacy of engineering methodologies and background assumptions supporting the PSD provides the foundation against which evaluations will assess program performance. **Baseline studies** provide direct impact support by assessing pre-conditions that will no longer be measureable after program interventions have occurred.

After the program is fielded, **Process Evaluations** are used to determine the efficacy of program procedures and measures. Process evaluations assess the interactions between program services and procedures and the customers, contractors, and ancillary businesses that participate in them. Process evaluation is essential to provide for improved program delivery, increased cost effectiveness and customer satisfaction.

Impact evaluations verify the magnitude of energy savings and sources for differences between projected and realized savings; reporting the results and value of energy efficiency programs to regulatory bodies, ISO-New England, utility management, and program planners and administrators. Many different types of impact studies may be completed including end-use metering, engineering modeling, billing analyses, participant interview, surveys, and combinations of all of these.

Cost effectiveness assessment is part of impact evaluation, pointing the way to improve, expand, or reassess program offerings. These evaluations are conducted under the supervision of the EEB to provide credible, unbiased and transparent results.

³⁴ Contracts for the selected Contractor teams for the first 4 research areas are currently being developed.

Current and Planned Studies

The Tables below indicate evaluation studies either completed or beginning/underway in 2011. Table 1 highlights activities and studies that are not part of the Research Area Process.

Table 1: Evaluation Studies During 2011

Project Name- Residential	Project Type	Project Name Non-Res	Project Type
Home Energy Solutions (Complete)	Impact	Awareness of CEEF by CT Customers (Complete)	Market Assessment
CL&P Home Energy Report (Complete in 2012)	Impact and Process	Energy Conscious Blueprint (Complete)	Impact and Process
UI Home Energy Report (Complete in 2011)	Market Acceptance	O&M Services/RCx/BSC (Complete in 2012)	Impact
Residential New Construction Baseline (Complete Dec 2011)	Baseline/Impact Support		

Table 2 outlines those 2011 projects that are included in the Research Areas.

Table 2: Research Area Studies During 2011

Project Name- Residential	Project Type	Project Name Non-Res	Project Type
Residential Retrofit & Retail Products Research Area		Small C&I Research Area	
Measure Persistence HES and HES-IE (Complete in 2012)	Impact	Engineering and Billing Analysis for SBEA (Complete in 2012)	Impact
Residential Lighting Saturation (Complete in 2012)	Market Assessment	Cross Sector Studies Research Area	
Opportunities in Multifamily (Complete in 2012)	Market Assessment	PSD Assessment and Needs Analysis (Complete in 2011)	Impact Support
Lighting after EISA – Multipart project (Part 1 will be complete in 2011)	Market Assessment	Free Rider and Spillover – C&I (Complete in 2011)	Impact
Res New Construction and Emerging Measures		Large C&I	
Early Replacement Gas Water Heater – On-Demand Units (Complete in 2012)	Market Assessment	ISE Evaluation*	Impact
Heat Pump Water Heaters (Complete in 2012)	Market Assessment		
Ground Source Heat Pumps	Impact		
EM&V Forum – C&I		EM&V Forum - Other	
Measure Persistence C&I Lighting (Complete)	Impact	Incremental Cost Study (Complete in 2012)	Impact Support
C&I Unitary HVAC Loadshapes (Complete)	Impact Support	Development of Common Reporting Guidelines (Part 1 Complete)	Protocol Development
C&I Lighting Loadshapes (Complete)	Impact Support	Common EM&V Methods and Savings Assumptions (Complete)	Protocol Development
		Emerging Technologies (Part 1 Complete in 2012)	Impact Support

* Timing depends upon ISE's plans and is therefore uncertain

Evaluation Studies 2012 – 1214 (Preliminary)

As indicated above, many of the 2011 study will continue into 2012. Additionally, as with other years, changes in priorities and opportunities to participate in regional studies may eliminate studies or move them either earlier or later than is presented below. At this time, many programmatic changes are anticipated. Therefore it is much more likely that additional studies will be needed and, therefore, that priorities may change from those presented.

Table 3 indicates evaluation studies being considered to begin in 2012 or 2013. These studies are listed according to current priorities.

Table 3: Research Area Evaluation Studies Proposed to Begin in 2012 -2013

Residential Retrofit & Retail Products Research Area		Small C&I Research Area	
Low Income Opportunities and Means to Target the Markets	Market Assessment	New Construction Baseline	Impact Support
HES-IE	Impact and Process	Measure Persistence	Impact
Weatherization Baseline	Impact Support	Market for Finance Option	Market Assessment
HES Evaluation	Impact and Process	SBEA Opportunities for Programming Expansion	Market Assessment
Assessment of Methods to Reach 80% Weatherization Goal	Market Assessment	Sub-Market Segmentation	Market Assessment
Targeting Hard to Reach Communities	Market Assessment	Identification of Case Study Sectors	Market Assessment
PSD Developmental – Research Needs Identified in 2011 Cross-Sector Study	Impact Support	Opportunities for Small C&I BSC	Market Assessment
Quality Installation Verification	Impact and Process		
Cross Sector Studies		Large C&I	
Free Rider and Spillover – All Programs	Impact	Business Sustainability Challenge	Process
Data Mining – All Sectors	Impact and Process	Energy Opportunities	Impact and Process
Codes and Standards Potential	Market	Opportunities and Barrier in Municipal, Government, Schools and Hospitals	Market Potential
Assessing Bills Reductions	Impact	Assessment of Commercial Real Estate	Impact Support
Non-Energy Benefits – Jobs, Economy, Environmental	Impact	State Buildings – Metric Development, Comprehensive Projects	Market and Impact
Res New Construction and Emerging Measures		Performance Contracting in Municipal, Government, Schools and Hospitals	Market Assessment
Ductless Heat Pump	Impact	C&I HVAC Opportunities to Bundle Measures	Market Assessment
Phantom Loads	Market Assessment		
Baseline and Metrics to Ramp Up Efficiency in RNC	Impact Support		

EM&V Forum Evaluation 2012

Projects initiated within the Regional EM&V Forum also affect evaluation activities in 2012 and beyond. The Forum determines, in consultation with its membership, the studies that will be completed and the budgets for each project. This planning process is not expected to be completed until October. Ten states and the District of Columbia participate in the Forum, but not all subscribe to every study commissioned by the Forum.

Connecticut has been an active participant since the Forum's inception and intends to continue doing so. Participation in the Forum provides cost-effective solutions for projects that might be too costly to do without regional support, and provides opportunities to achieve consistency in reporting results across the region.

Communications Protocol for Evaluation

The purpose of this document is to provide communication procedures for Connecticut Energy Efficiency Fund evaluations in accordance with the provisions of Public Act 11-80.

A. Confidential Customer Data

Processes for protection of confidential customer information are important since substantial quantities of this information are typically exchanged during the course of evaluation studies. Confidential customer data is defined as any personally identifiable customer information, including but not limited to name, account number, telephone number, email address, and service or billing address. The purpose of these procedures is to identify any correspondence that contains confidential customer data. If correspondence that has been identified as containing confidential customer data is requested for public release through a Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) process, a request from the general public, or any other request, the EEB Evaluation Consultant will submit the document(s) to the PURA for a determination regarding the need for a protective order, redaction, or other methodology to protect the privacy of customers while assuring transparency of the evaluation process.

The following procedures will be employed when dealing with confidential customer data during the evaluation process. The evaluation consultant, program administrators, and evaluation contractors will all observe the following for communications between each other:

- All documents that contain confidential customer information must be clearly labeled as such. It is unacceptable for these documents to contain statements that they “may” contain confidential information. Documents containing confidential customer data must include the word “confidential” or “contains confidential customer information” on every page.
- Email that contains confidential customer information in the body or attachments must use the word “confidential” in the subject line. In addition, any attachments that contain confidential customer information must include the word “Confidential” on every page.
- When responding to an email that contains confidential customer information and for which the confidential information is not required for the response, all confidential customer information must be removed. The confidential label must then be removed from the subject line.
- If confidential customer information is transmitted by the one of the program administrators without the labeling described above, that program administrator is solely responsible in the event that information is re-transmitted or otherwise made available to other parties by one of the recipients.

B. Communications Prior to Study Inception

1) When an Evaluation Contractor has not yet been selected for a given evaluation, there are no restrictions on communications between the Evaluation Consultant, members of the Board, the Board Technical Consultants and Program Administrators (collectively, “Other Persons”). As provided in the Evaluation Roadmap, anyone in these organizations may offer suggestions, information and opinions concerning the focus of studies, issues and methods that might be included in a Request for Proposal or Request for Qualifications, and on the quality of Contractor submissions in response to RFPs. These persons may provide recommendations on which Contractor will be selected, although they have no vote in the final Contractor selection.

During the development of the Annual Evaluation Plan, these Persons may suggest studies to be included in the Plan, provide rankings of study priority, and outline important issues to consider.

Communications prior to study inception will generally be in written form and will be retained. Should meetings or conference calls be needed, either the EEB Executive Secretary will be part of the call and will take minutes, or the call will be recorded.

2) After the Contractor has been selected, the Other Persons may attend the open portion of Kick-off meetings to better understand the methods that will be employed, ask questions, make suggestions, and provide information on data availability and procedures to access that data.

C. Communications During the Study

There shall be no informal communications regarding the design or outcomes of an active evaluation between the Program Administrator staff, Energy Efficiency Board members and the Evaluation Consultant and Contractor. The EEB Evaluation Consultant may continue to consult with the EEB Evaluation Committee for administrative purposes, including issues regarding data requests. EEB Board members, including members of the evaluation committee, shall not communicate directly with an Evaluation Contractor conducting an active evaluation without the Evaluation Consultant being present. Any communications between the Program Administrators and an Evaluation Contractor conducting an active evaluation shall be in writing and include a copy to the EEB Evaluation Consultant and shall be limited to data and technical assistance requests and responses and other information requested by the EEB Evaluation Consultant. Records of all communications during the evaluation, reviews of the draft report and written comments on the final report shall be kept on file and maintained after the evaluation has been completed. These records, with the exception of documents or emails containing confidential information, shall be made available to members of the public upon request.

To meet these requirements:

- 1) The EEB Evaluation Consultant will initiate requests for technical assistance, data and administrative action whenever needed. The requests will most frequently be made in writing; however some telephone communication is likely to be needed in order to clarify needs and reduce delays.
- 2) When these requests are made, the Other Person can respond with the materials, data, and/or other action required. The Other Person may also respond with any clarifying questions. Clarifying questions may not include questions regarding the need for the materials, data, and/or action, except to suggest that there may be a superior solution, which the EEB Evaluation Consultant will consider.
- 3) Other Persons will not initiate these discussions.

D. Communications with Contractors

Determining appropriate Communications protocols between the EEB Evaluation Consultant, the Contractor that performs the evaluation study, and Other Persons can be difficult. While the Act makes clear that Other Persons generally should not be in direct communication with Contractors, there are times when such communications are important and solutions involving intermediaries inefficient. A careful balance follows:

- 1) Under nearly all circumstances, Other Persons may not communicate directly with the Contractor, either by phone, in writing, or in person. Board members, including Program Administrators' representatives, may not communicate with an evaluation contractor about an ongoing evaluation except with the express permission of the EEB Evaluation Consultant, which may only be granted if the EEB Evaluation Consultant believes the communication will not compromise the independence of the evaluation.
- 2) Any allowed communications that can be conducted in writing will be conducted in writing. Those written communications will be sent to the EEB Evaluation Consultant for transmission to the Contractor. Responses will also be transmitted through the EEB Evaluation Consultant.

Exceptions

- As described in Section B (2), the Kick-off meeting is an exception to the written comment requirement.
- Communications concerning data collection. When discussions must be made by phone, most often concerning secure data transfer, either the EEB Evaluation Consultant or the EEB Executive Secretary will also be on the phone. In cases where time is of the essence and neither the EEB Evaluation Consultant nor the EEB Executive Secretary can be available, the Contractor will record the call and provide that recording to the EEB Evaluation Consultant.
- Direct communications concerning data transfer to be held between Program Administrator IT personnel and their IT counterparts for the Contractor so long as no other Program Administrator staff is participating in the meeting in any way, including as an inactive participant.
- Contract issues that extend beyond the study start date. Utility purchasing agents may communicate with the Contractor for the purpose of resolving contract issues *that do not in any way affect the study or outcomes*.

Contractors will be fully apprised of these requirements and must agree to adhere to them.

E. Site Reports

Site Reports may become available (depending on the nature of study) prior to completion of the Draft report. Site Reports provide detailed information on what the Contractor's team found at each of the customer premises inspected during the study. Findings may include things such as differences between tracking system equipment and that found in the facility, logger locations, conditions of operations and more. The site reports reflect the Contractors' collection of data. Because the site reports may contain information that would help the Program Administrators better serve their participants or prevent ongoing problems, it is important that the site reports be provided to the Program Administrators as soon as they are generated. Provision of site reports and response to questions concerning information in a site report will be completed using the protocols described in the "Communications with Contractors" section. These reports will contain confidential data and will be treated as such.

- 1) The EEB Evaluation Consultant will provide site reports to the Program Administrators (each Program Administrator receiving the reports for their customers) when all site reports are completed.
- 2) If the Program Administrators have questions concerning a site report, they will submit those questions in writing to the EEB Evaluation Consultant. The EEB Evaluation Consultant will review the questions submitted and, if appropriate, provide the questions to the Contractor.

F. Communications Concerning Study Results/Review of Draft Materials

The Decision in 10-10-03 provides, "The Companies and Energy Efficiency Board will no longer be permitted to comment on internal draft evaluation reports. When the Evaluation group is ready, the Evaluation Committee will issue the report to the Companies, EEB members and the Program Technical Consultants for written comment that shall become part of EEB's public record. At that time, the EDCs and the Energy Efficiency Board may make public written comments. The Evaluation group will then make modifications at their discretion then issue either a final report or another draft report."

Records of all written/email communications during the evaluation, the draft report and written comments on the planning and draft reports are kept on electronic file and maintained after the evaluation has been completed. This information is available to the public upon request.

As study results become available, it is especially important to maintain careful communications. For this reason, at this stage the EEB Executive Secretary becomes more closely involved and maintains redundant documentation of materials and reviews.

- 1) When the Draft report is ready for the review, the EEB Evaluation Consultant provides it to the EEB Executive Secretary who then notices the draft and provides it to the appropriate EEB Technical Consultants and those Program Administrator representatives the Program Administrators have designated. All Other Persons are invited to provide comments in writing.
- 2) Written comments are returned to the EEB Executive Secretary and to the EEB Evaluation Consultant. The Evaluation Consultant will assess the comments. If clarifying questions arise, those questions will be submitted to the originating reviewer with copy to the EEB Executive Secretary. If a phone meeting is prudent, both the EEB Executive Secretary and the EEB Evaluation Consultant will attend. If both cannot be available, the meeting will be recorded and the recording preserved.
- 3) After the review comments are considered, the EEB Evaluation Consultant will do one or more of the following:
 - Finalize the report with no additional changes
 - Provide written direction to the Contractor on how to incorporate those changes that are accepted.
 - Require a new Draft

- 4) When the final report is ready, the EEB Evaluation Consultant, through the EEB Executive Secretary, will file the evaluation report with the Board and with the PURA in its most recent uncontested proceeding. The Board shall post a copy of each report on its Internet web site.

The Board and its members, including Program Administrator representatives, may file written comments regarding any evaluation with the PURA or for posting on the Board's Internet web site.

Conclusion

The EEB Evaluation Committee takes its responsibility for program evaluation very seriously. It is critical that the programs be evaluated, measured, and verified in a way that provides confidence to the public at large that the savings are real and in a

way that enables the Companies to use those savings estimates and other results with full confidence. There is a need to ensure both the reality and the perception of the independence and objectivity of EM&V activities. Moreover, the current and future efficiency programs are supported and improved through careful research into current use and equipment, customer segments and the associated barriers for each, ownership patterns, and examination of best practices in other jurisdictions. Research completed within the evaluation group provides that information. These research studies assist regulators, the Energy Efficiency Board and the program administrators to maintain excellent practices and develop new programming options to meet Connecticut's efficiency needs. We are convinced that the Plan outlined in this document will provide these critical studies with objectivity, with excellence, and with the best interests of Connecticut rate payers in the forefront.