

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND**

UTILITY SERVICE PROTECTION PROGRAM (USPP)

ANNUAL REPORT

WINTER 2009-2010

Submitted to the
Maryland General Assembly
Annapolis, Maryland

In compliance with § 7-307 of
the Public Utility Companies Article,
Annotated Code of Maryland

William Donald Schaefer Tower
6 Saint Paul Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202
www.psc.state.md.us

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND.....	3
DATA REPORTING.....	5
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION.....	5
EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE.....	7
SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND ARREARAGES.....	9
PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE	10
HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....	13
HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION	14
PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE.....	14
MEAP GRANTS.....	15
CONCLUSION	16

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	NUMBER OF USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	17
TABLE 2	USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH OF THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS.....	18
TABLE 3	PERCENTAGE OF 2009-2010 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON.....	19
TABLE 4	AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL	20
TABLE 5	PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL	21
TABLE 6	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	22
TABLE 7	AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	23
TABLE 8	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS BY POVERTY LEVEL DURING THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS.....	24
TABLE 9	NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS	25
TABLE 10	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY DURING THE MOST RECENT HEATING SEASON	26
TABLE 11	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	27
TABLE 12	AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Consumers' energy bills during the 2009-2010 winter heating season were generally lower than in recent years. Relief from higher heating bills was due to lower gas prices and to weather conditions that were slightly warmer than normal. Consumers, however, entered the 2009-2010 heating season under considerable financial stress caused by general economic conditions and from much larger energy bills experienced over the past several years. As a result, the number of customers that received energy assistance was significantly higher than in the previous year. The number of customers whose energy service was terminated in 2009-2010 was approximately the same as during the previous year. While the total Maryland Energy Assistance Program ("MEAP") funding remained essentially unchanged in 2009-2010, the number of participants rose significantly. As a result, Utility Service Protection Program ("USPP") participants received significantly lower MEAP grants during the 2009-2010 heating season, and participants emerged from the heating season with higher arrearage levels.

The data collected for the 2009-2010 winter heating season show that the USPP continues to accomplish its goal of minimizing the number of service terminations among low-income customers despite increasing numbers of customers participating in the program. Service for only 1.2 percent of the USPP population was terminated during the 2009-2010 winter heating season compared to 1.4 percent whose service was terminated during the 2008-2009 heating season. After falling by 31 percent from \$578 in 2007-2008 to \$399 in 2008-2009, the average arrearage for participating customers increased by 46 percent to \$584 during the 2009-2010 heating season. There were 84,538 USPP participants for the 2009-2010 winter heating season, compared to 70,644 in 2008-2009 and 67,916 in 2007-2008. The average MEAP grant provided to USPP participants during 2009-2010 was \$276 compared to \$470 in 2008-2009 and \$331 in 2007-2008.

The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations during the winter, and the 2009-2010 data reported by the participating utility companies indicate that the percentage of terminations among the USPP population was low. As explained

below, the low percentage of terminations indicates that the USPP contributes to keeping low-income customers' service connected during the winter. Results for the 2009-2010 winter heating season reflect the capability of the USPP and the utilities managing the program to provide this benefit to low-income customers.

The data in this USPP report and the USPP report for the previous heating season provide information on Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4¹ while USPP reports filed previously provided data on Poverty Levels 1, 2, and 3.² These changes are consistent with changes in the poverty levels used by the Department of Human Resources ("DHR") to establish eligibility for grants from MEAP. As a result of these changes in the formal Poverty Level definitions, comparisons between the 2009-2010 winter heating season and the previous two heating seasons are consistent, but comparisons with previous heating seasons are not consistent.

As was the case for each of the two previous years, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company's ("BGE") reported information on USPP participants for a fifth poverty level category, which is not identified as one of the above-mentioned Poverty Levels.³ Data recorded for this additional poverty level category was included in the analysis to be consistent with previous reports.⁴ In addition to this characteristic, the BGE data is also unique among the reporting utilities in that it alone combines electric and natural gas customers.

¹ Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 represent households with incomes measured against the federal poverty levels as follows: 0% up to 75%; more than 75% up to 110%; more than 110% up to 150%; and more than 150% up to 175%, respectively.

² Poverty Levels 1, 2 and 3 previously represented households with incomes measured against the federal poverty levels as follows: 0 up to 50%; more than 50% up to 100%; and more than 100% up to 150%, respectively.

³ The fifth Poverty Level extends to households with gross income between 175 percent and 200 percent of the federal poverty level. This income group received energy assistance through "Project Heat Up," which was funded through general state funds for approximately two years.

⁴ The Poverty Level 5 data reported by BGE is included in the "Total" columns in each of the tables, but do not appear as a separate poverty level category. As a result, the figures reported in the "Total" columns for BGE in the tables are not equal to the summation of data for Poverty Levels 1 through 4.

BACKGROUND

On March 1, 1988, the Maryland Public Service Commission (“Commission”) issued Order No. 67999 in Case No. 8091, which established the USPP as required by § 7-307 of the Public Utility Companies Article (“PUC Article”), *Annotated Code of Maryland*. PUC Article § 7-307 provides for the promulgation by the Commission of regulations relating to when, and under what conditions, there should be a prohibition against or a limitation upon the authority of a public service company to terminate, for nonpayment, gas or electric service to low-income residential customers during the heating season. Regulations governing the USPP are contained in COMAR 20.31.05.

In response to numerous customer complaints and inquiries related to high energy bills during the 2008-2009 heating season, the Commission initiated an investigation into the utilities’ practices in handling customers’ arrearages, requests for payment plans, collection practices and termination policies.⁵ Data provided by the utilities indicated dramatic increases in the number of customers with arrearages, average arrearage balances, and potential customer terminations following the end of the 2008-2009 heating season. In order to protect residential consumers from having their electric or gas service terminated following the lapse of the winter restrictions under COMAR 20.31.03.03, the Commission issued an Order directing all utilities to refrain from terminating a residential customer’s gas or electric service for delinquent payment or outstanding balances.⁶ The temporary delay of customer terminations was lifted by Commission Order No. 82628, issued April 24, 2009. However, the Commission ordered the large investor-owned utilities to offer alternate payment plans to all customers prior to termination. Many of the plans offered to customers, including USPP participants, were of 12 months in duration and thus were in effect during the 2009-2010 heating season.

⁵ Case No. 9175: *In the Matter of Arrearage Collection and Termination Practices of Maryland Electric, Gas, or Electric and Gas Utilities*.

⁶ See Order No. 82509, issued March 11, 2009 (Case No. 9175).

The USPP is available to utility customers who are eligible and have applied for a grant from MEAP, which is administered by the Office of Home Energy Programs (“OHEP”). The USPP is designed to protect eligible low-income residential customers from utility service termination during the winter. The USPP helps low-income customers avoid the accumulation of arrearages, which could lead to service terminations, by requiring timely equal monthly utility payments for participants based on the estimated cost of annual service to the household. The USPP allows customers in arrears to restore service by accepting the USPP equal payment plan and by bringing outstanding arrearages to no more than \$400. The program encourages the utility to establish a supplemental monthly payment plan for customers with outstanding balances to reduce those arrearages. Maryland’s gas and electric utilities are required to publicize and offer the USPP prior to November of each year. *See* COMAR 20.31.05.03.

PUC Article § 7-307 requires the Commission to submit an annual report to the General Assembly addressing terminations of service during the previous heating season. To facilitate the compilation of this report, the Commission directs all gas and electric utilities to collect specific data (COMAR 20.31.05.09). Through a data request issued by Commission Staff, the utilities are asked to report the following: 1) the number of USPP participants, MEAP eligible non-participants, total utility customers, and current participants who also participated the previous year; 2) the number of customers for whom the utility’s service is the primary heating source; 3) the number of customers making supplemental payments, average supplemental payment amounts, and the amount of arrearage leading to those payments; 4) the number of USPP participating and eligible non-participating customers in arrears, the amount of the arrearage, and the amount of the average monthly payment obligations; 5) the average MEAP grant amount; 6) the number of customers dropped from the USPP for non-payment of bills; 7) the number of service terminations for USPP participants; 8) the number of USPP customers consuming more than 135 percent of the system average for the heating season; and 9) the average cost of actual usage for the heating season. This report provides an analysis and summary of that information.

DATA REPORTING

Utilities serving residential customers in Maryland submitted data for this report. The Commission's March 2010 data request contained the same questions as those in the USPP Data Request issued for the 2008-2009 heating season and was similar to previous USPP data requests.⁷ The eligible income brackets are separated into four categories: Poverty Level 1; Poverty Level 2; Poverty Level 3; and Poverty Level 4, with Poverty Level 1 being the lowest income bracket. The poverty levels are based on Federal Guidelines. Some of the questions in this year's data request were broken down to include snapshot data (as of March 31, 2010) and cumulative data (for the period November 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010). Some companies were unable to differentiate the responses for this year, and, therefore, did not provide responses for cumulative data. Such occurrences are indicated in the respective tables.

Pursuant to COMAR 20.31.05.01C, Hagerstown Electric Light Plant ("Hagerstown") operates an approved alternative program that allows MEAP-eligible customers to receive USPP-type assistance as needed during the heating season. As such, Hagerstown does not distinguish between USPP participants and all MEAP-eligible customers and does not maintain records indicating the number of individual customers who received assistance beyond that provided under MEAP.

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Table 1 shows the number of USPP participants for each utility by Poverty Level. The data collected show that during the 2009-2010 heating season, there were 84,538 participants in the USPP program. That figure represents the number of MEAP-eligible customers that actually enrolled in the USPP. This represents an increase of 13,874 or 20 percent over that recorded for the 2008-2009 heating season (70,664). The number of eligible non-participants statewide rose by over 2,148 customers.

⁷ The USPP Data Request was expanded in 2007.

Notably, over 75 percent of the increase in USPP participation was attributable to increased enrollment by BGE. In 2009-2010, BGE accounted for 50,674 or 60 percent of all the 2009-2010 USPP participants. BGE's 2009-2010 USPP participant level increased by 26 percent from the 40,082 enrollment figure recorded in 2008-2009. Delmarva Power & Light ("DPL") enrolled 11,105 customers in the USPP during 2009-2010, which was the second highest number enrolled by any utility company. This number represented 13.1 percent of all USPP 2009-2010 participants, and it was an increase of 13.9 percent compared with the number enrolled in the 2008-2009 heating season. Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco") had the third highest USPP participation level, with 8,811 customers enrolled for the 2009-2010 winter heating season, representing 10.5 percent of the total number enrolled by all companies. Washington Gas Light Company ("WGL") reported participation by 4,249 customers during 2009-2010 which was 38.5 percent higher than its enrollment of 3,067 customers in 2008-2009. The largest percentage increase in USPP enrollment was recorded by Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative ("SMECO") which saw its USPP enrollment increase by 88 percent from 987 during the previous year to 1,859 during the 2009-2010 heating season.

Table 2 presents USPP participation as a percentage of the total number of MEAP-eligible customers for the 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 heating seasons. The overall rate of customer participation in the USPP for all utility companies for the 2009-2010 winter heating season was 82 percent, which is one percentage point higher than in 2008-2009. With the exception of The Potomac Edison Company d/b/a Allegheny Power ("Allegheny"), whose USPP participation rate fell from 52 percent in 2008-2009 to 48 percent in 2009-2010, all other major utilities reported equal or higher USPP participation rates during the last heating season.

As was the case for the 2008-2009 heating season, Pepco, Choptank Electric Cooperative ("Choptank"), and Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative ("Somerset") reported that one hundred percent of eligible customers participated in the USPP during

2009-2010. Ninety-three percent of eligible BGE customers participated in the USPP program, compared to 90 percent in 2008-2009.

Table 3 shows the percentage of USPP participants in the 2009-2010 heating season who were also enrolled in the program during the 2008-2009 heating season. Overall, there was an eight percentage point increase in the “consecutive year participation rate.” Fifty-seven percent of the USPP participants during the 2009-2010 heating season were also enrolled in the USPP during the 2008-2009 heating season. That figure is up from the 49 percent of USPP participants that enrolled in both the 2008-2009 and 2006-2007 heating seasons.

Among the major utilities, the highest percentages of consecutive year enrollments were recorded by BGE (63 percent), and Pepco (59 percent). Notably, the smaller utilities not only reported the highest consecutive year enrollment participation rates, but also registered the largest year to year increases in that measure. For example, Easton Utilities Commission-Electric (“EUC-Electric”) and Easton Utilities Commission-Gas (“EUC-Gas”) recorded consecutive year participation rates of 82 percent and 85 percent respectively. Those figures were significantly higher than the 48 percent and 36 percent consecutive year enrollment figures reported last year. Similarly, Choptank recorded a consecutive year participation rate of 72 percent during the most recent heating season compared to a 34 percent rate last year.

EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE

Table 4 provides a comparison of the average equal monthly billings to actual energy usage measured in dollars for USPP participants. The average monthly payments are calculated based on the previous year’s actual usage and are an average of five billing months, November 2009 – March 2010. The differences between the average monthly usage and the average monthly payment amounts represent unpaid utility bill balances by USPP participants and result in arrearages if not covered by the average monthly payment during the spring and summer.

Average monthly usage for USPP participants fell by approximately 11 percent during the 2009-2010 heating season from levels one year earlier. More specifically, during the 2009-2010 heating season, average monthly usage for USPP participants fell to \$228 on a statewide basis from average monthly usage of \$257 during the prior heating season. Year-over-year decline in usage were reported across all Poverty Levels and for all utilities with the exception of Choptank and Allegheny. On a Poverty Level basis, usage fell by 13 percent for Poverty Level 2 participants, by 11 percent for Poverty Level 1 participants and by 9 percent for participants in Poverty Levels 3 and 4. Among the major utilities, usage by USPP participants in BGE's service territory fell by 14 percent from \$318 in 2008-2009 to \$274. Similarly, DPL recorded a decline in usage among USPP participants of 11 percent from \$200 to \$179. Usage by USPP participants for Choptank and Allegheny rose by approximately 1 percent and 11 percent, respectively.

In contrast to average monthly usage, average monthly payments by USPP participants rose for all Poverty Levels by approximately 5 percent from \$142 in 2008-2009 to \$149 in 2009-2010. Average monthly payments increased for all Poverty Levels and for each of the major utilities in 2009-2010 as compared with the 2008-2009 heating season.

The data indicates that the payment gap across all Poverty Levels fell during the most recent heating season. For all USPP participants, the average monthly payment was \$148.70 while the overall average monthly usage for the 2009-2010 heating season was \$228.04, thus leaving a payment gap of \$79.34 per month. In contrast, during the 2008-2009 winter heating season, the overall average monthly payment was slightly smaller at \$141.60 while the overall average monthly usage was significantly larger at \$257.29, thus generating a payment gap of \$115.69 per month. Despite the decrease in the year-over-year payment gap, as will be discussed more thoroughly in connection with Table 7, the arrearage balance for USPP participants rose on a year-over-year basis.

SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND ARREARAGES

Table 5 shows the percentage of USPP participants making supplemental payments (also known as alternate payments), the average monthly amount of those payments, and the average “supplemental arrearage” which led to those payments. The USPP encourages utilities to offer customers who have outstanding arrearages with the utility to place all or part of those arrearages in a special agreement or an alternate payment plan, to be paid off over an extended period of time. While the deferred payment arrangements vary across utilities, all utilities provide for enrollment in supplemental payment plans. Placing outstanding arrearages in such special agreements allows customers to enroll in USPP and to be considered current in their utility payments as long as they continue to make their USPP equal monthly payments and their supplemental payments in a timely fashion.

The data indicated that at the end of the 2009-2010 heating season, the average supplemental arrearage levels and monthly supplemental payments were higher than previous year levels for all Poverty Levels, while the percentage of USPP participants making supplemental payments was lower for all Poverty Levels.

Average supplemental arrearage balances during the 2009-2010 heating season were approximately 13 percent higher for all Poverty Levels. Poverty Level 1 customers had an average supplemental arrearage balance of \$820 during 2009-2010 compared to \$765 during 2008-2009, while comparable figures for Poverty Level 2, 3, and 4 participants were \$709 in 2009-2010 (compared to \$661 in 2008-2009), \$813 (compared to \$702 in 2008-2009) and \$913 (compared to \$753 in 2008-2009), respectively.

Similarly, average monthly supplemental payments rose by approximately 12 percent across all Poverty Levels in 2009-2010. The average monthly supplemental payment level for Poverty Level 1 participants rose by approximately 7 percent or by \$4.00 per month from \$54 in 2008-2009 to \$58 in 2009-2010. Average supplemental payment levels increased by 8 percent or by \$4.00 per month for Poverty Level 2

participants, by 11 percent or \$6.00 per month for Poverty Level 3 participants and by 22 percent or approximately by \$12.00 per month for Poverty Level 4 participants.

As previously indicated, the percentage of USPP participants making supplemental payments declined on a year-over-year basis during the 2009-2010 heating season. Twenty-four percent of Poverty Level 1 and Poverty Level 2 USPP recipients for all utilities made supplemental payments, while 25 percent of Poverty Level 3 participants and 29 percent of Poverty Level 4 participants made supplemental payments. Those figures are six to nine percentage points lower than comparable Poverty Level figures recorded during the prior heating season.

PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

Table 6 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-participants, and all other utility residential customers that were in arrears on their utility bills as of March 31, 2010. This means that the customer has failed to pay the total amount due on at least one equal monthly billing.

Similar to the case in previous years, USPP participants during 2009-2010 were less likely to be in arrears to the utility than eligible non-participants, but much more likely to be in arrears than non-MEAP eligible customers. For all utilities, 36 percent of USPP participants, 38 percent of eligible non-participants, and 17 percent of non-MEAP eligible customers were in arrears as of March 31, 2010. In comparison with the 2008-2009 winter heating season, the proportion of USPP participants that were in arrears on March 31, 2010 was higher while the proportion of eligible non-participants and non-MEAP customers that were in arrears remained about the same.

With the exception of DPL, each of the major electric utilities recorded higher proportions of USPP participants that were in arrears on March 31, 2010 when compared to the same date last year. DPL reported that 28 percent of USPP participants were in arrears in 2009-2010 compared to 31 percent in 2008-2009. In contrast, BGE reported

that 40 percent of its USPP participants were in arrears, which is eighteen percentage points higher than the 22 percent reported for the 2008-2009 heating season. Similarly, 41 percent of Allegheny's USPP customers (compared to 30 percent in 2008-2009), 44 percent of Pepco's USPP customers (compared to 34 percent in 2008-2009) and 57 percent of SMECO's USPP customers (compared to 51 percent in 2008-2009) were in arrears on March 31, 2010.

Table 7 presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-eligible customers that are in arrears. Average arrearage balances for USPP customers and non-MEAP eligible customers rose from prior year levels, while arrearage balances for eligible non-participants fell. For the 2009-2010 heating season, the overall average arrearage for USPP participants was \$584, which is an increase of 46 percent over the 2008-2009 amount of \$399. Similarly, the average arrearage level for non-MEAP eligible customers that were in arrears increased by 5 percent from \$405 in 2008-2009 to \$425 in 2009-2010. Overall average arrearage balances for MEAP-eligible non-participants fell by approximately 2 percent to \$612 in 2009-2010 from \$623 in 2008-2009.

SMECO recorded the highest overall average arrearage for USPP customers during the 2009-2010 heating season. During that period of time, SMECO's average arrearage balance for USPP customers was \$714. The next highest average arrearage balance for USPP customers was recorded by BGE (\$708), followed by Choptank (\$657), and DPL (\$606). The highest average arrearage balance for MEAP-eligible non-participants was recorded by BGE (\$929), followed by DPL (\$804), and SMECO (\$708.10). BGE and DPL also recorded the highest and second highest average arrearage balance for non-MEAP eligible customers during the 2009-2010 heating season, with average arrearage balances of \$715 and \$480, respectively.

Table 8 presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for the 2009-2010 heating season and compares that data to the previous year's results. According to the USPP provisions, a customer can be

removed from the program and a customer's service may be terminated if the amount due on two consecutive monthly bills is not paid. As was the case for the 2008-2009 heating season, BGE reported that, as a matter of company policy, it did not remove customers from the program if the customer fell out of compliance with the USPP payment rules during the 2009-2010 heating season. Because it does not enforce this provision of the program, BGE does not track the percentage of customers that complied with the program rules. Also, for that reason, the compliance percentage of approximately 92 percent shown on Table 8 overstates the proportion of customers whose continuity of service is at risk as a result of payment issues.

The most recently available data indicates that there were no meaningful differences in the compliance percentage for the 2009-2010 heating season and the prior year. The overall compliance percentages for the 2009-2010 and 2008-2009 heating seasons were 92 percent and 93 percent, respectively. As was the case during the prior heating season, the compliance percentage during 2009-2010 did not vary by material amounts across poverty levels. During 2009-2010, the compliance percentages ranged from 89 percent for Poverty Levels 1 and 4 to 91 percent for Poverty Level 2 participants. During the previous heating season, the compliance rates ranged from 89 percent for Poverty Level 4 participants to 92 percent for Poverty Level 2 participants. Somerset achieved 100 percent compliance with the USPP payment obligations during 2009-2010 while Allegheny, Pivotal Utilities, Inc. d/b/a Elkton Gas ("Elkton") and SMECO all reported compliance rates that were very close to 100 percent.

HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

Table 9 presents the number of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers who had their service terminated during the heating season. The primary purpose of the USPP is to prevent service terminations during the heating season. The data indicate that the USPP program was successful in mitigating utility service terminations. Termination rates overall were 1.2 percent for USPP participants, 1.7 percent for MEAP eligible non-participants, and 4.9 percent for non-MEAP eligible customers.

Seven of the 16 utilities for which data is available did not terminate any USPP participants during the 2009-2010 winter heating season. The utilities with no USPP terminations were Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. (“Columbia”), EUC-Electric and EUC-Gas, WGL, Mayor and Council of Berlin (“Berlin”), Allegheny, Somerset, and SMECO. During the 2009-2010 winter heating season, 1,061 USPP participants, 305 MEAP eligible non-participants, and 5,101 non-MEAP customers had their service terminated. By comparison, during the 2008-2009 heating season, the utility service of 1,003 USPP participants, 230 MEAP eligible non-participants, and 9,419 non-MEAP customers were terminated.

Four utilities accounted for 97 percent of the USPP participant terminations during the 2009-2010 heating season. Of the total number of USPP terminations, BGE terminated 626 USPP participants (59 percent of all USPP participant terminations); Pepco terminated 172 USPP participants (representing 16 percent of the total number of USPP participant terminations); Delmarva terminated 157 USPP participants (representing 15 percent of the total) and Choptank terminated 75 USPP participants (representing 7 percent of the total).

Of the total number of USPP participants (84,538), Maryland’s utilities collectively terminated 1,061 USPP participants. This is equivalent to 1.2 percent or

approximately one termination for every 83 customers who were enrolled in the USPP program. BGE's termination rate was 1.2 percent, which is equivalent to the statewide average termination rate. The termination rate for Pepco was 1.95 percent, while those for DPL and Choptank were 1.4 percent and 2.6 percent, respectively.

There were no MEAP eligible non-participant terminations for Choptank, Columbia, EUC, WGL, Berlin, Allegheny, Pepco, Somerset, and SMECO. Of the number of each utility's MEAP eligible non-participants, Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Citizens Gas Division terminated 8.2 percent, DPL terminated 4.9 percent, and BGE terminated 0.9 percent.

HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Table 10 presents the percentage of USPP participants who consumed more than 135 percent of the respective utility's system average use. For the 2009-2010 heating season, 35 percent of USPP participants consumed more than 135 percent of the respective utility's system average usage. That figure is up from the 29 percent reported for the prior heating season. The proportion of USPP customers reporting more than 135 percent of system average use does not vary much across poverty levels. Consumption exceeding 135 percent of system average use was reported by 35 percent of Poverty Level 1 participants, 34 percent of Poverty Level 2 participants, 36 percent of Poverty Level 3 participants, and 39 percent of Poverty Level 4 participants. Allegheny, Pepco, and BGE reported the highest overall percentages of USPP customers consuming more than 135 percent of the system average in 2009-2010.

PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE

Table 11 presents the percentage of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers whose primary heat source is provided by the indicated utility. While the data reported for this statistic varies greatly across the utilities, it does not vary much over time for any utility.

For all utilities in 2009-2010, 77 percent of USPP customers, 66 percent of eligible non-participants, and 86 percent of non-MEAP customers receive their primary heat source from the utility responding to the data request. These results for the most recent heating season are very similar to the prior season's percentage of customers obtaining the primary heat source from the serving utility. Chesapeake Utilities Corporation—Citizens Gas Division, Columbia, EUC-Electric and EUC-Gas, Elkton, and WGL reported that all or very nearly all of both USPP participants and eligible non-participants received their primary heat source from the utility during 2009-2010. BGE provides the primary heat source to 84 percent of its USPP participants, 80 percent of its eligible non-participants and 79 percent of its non-MEAP customers. DPL provides the primary heat source for approximately 65 percent of its USPP customers while the percentages for Allegheny and Pepco are approximately 100 percent and 45 percent respectively.

MEAP GRANTS

Table 12 presents the average MEAP grant payable to the utility at the time of customer enrollment in the USPP program. OHEP's benefit calculation methodology provides for larger MEAP grants as a customer's poverty level reflects lower income.

The data indicates that the overall level of benefit fell from \$470 per USPP customer in 2008-2009 to \$276 in 2009-2010. As was the case in previous years, the size of the MEAP benefit that was awarded to customers in 2009-2010 decreased as the Poverty Level increased. Customers in Poverty Level 1 received an average MEAP benefit of \$323, while those in Poverty Levels 2, 3 and 4 received benefit amounts of \$279, \$247 and \$201, respectively. Viewed from the perspective of specific utilities, the data show that customers of SMECO and Choptank received the largest average MEAP benefit of all utilities (about \$375) while customers of Pepco received MEAP grants of \$339 followed by customers of Delmarva (\$287) and BGE (\$271).

CONCLUSION

The data collected for the winter 2009-2010 winter heating season show that the USPP continues to accomplish its goal of minimizing the number of service terminations, even though the number of customers participating in the program increased. There were 84,538 USPP participants during the 2009-2010 heating season which is an increase of 13,871 or 19.7 percent. Of that total, 1.2 percent or 1,061 customers were terminated during the 2009-2010 heating season. The percentage of terminations for USPP participants was lower than it was for both eligible non-participants and for non MEAP-eligible customers. The relatively low number of terminations indicates that the USPP contributes to keeping low-income customers' service connected during the winter. However, the overall average arrearage for participating customers increased by 46 percent from \$399 in 2008-2009 to \$584 in 2009-2010. During the same period, the average arrearage level for MEAP eligible non-participants fell by 1.8 percent from \$623 to \$612.

In addition to the winter protections offered by USPP to low-income customers and the financial assistance to low income customers from the MEAP and Electric Universal Service Program, utilities providing electric or gas service in Maryland operated other specific programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers during the 2009-2010 heating season. These programs varied from utility to utility, but all are focused on helping low-income customers with billing or related issues. In addition, the Commission has taken other specific actions, particularly in Case No. 9175 to protect consumers during the heating season. The survey results of the 2009-2010 heating season reflect the capability of the USPP, as well as other Commission and Commission-approved initiatives, to benefit low income customers.

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL

	USPP Participants					Eligible Non-Participants					Overall
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Total
Baltimore Gas & Electric¹	10,650	7,386	8,199	4,266	50,674	1,519	664	674	310	3,768	54,442
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	91	56	37	12	196	99	49	37	21	206	402
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	59	23	26	9	117	288	239	176	74	777	894
Choptank Electric Cooperative	914	891	835	284	2,924	3	0	1	1	5	2,929
Columbia Gas of Maryland	438	454	433	158	1,483	276	307	410	142	1,135	2,618
Delmarva Power & Light	4,188	3,180	2,735	1,002	11,105	1,427	854	952	346	3,579	14,684
Easton Utilities-Electric	45	56	62	14	177	83	101	106	30	320	497
Easton Utilities-Gas	22	25	12	7	66	40	43	41	16	140	206
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	333	*	*	*	*	51	384
Washington Gas²	1,666	1,099	992	492	4,249	748	496	456	240	1,940	6,189
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	162	188	125	28	503	503
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	204	*	*	*	*	33	237
Potomac Edison	812	637	526	205	2,180	785	736	637	227	2,385	4,565
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,827	2,090	2,465	1,429	8,811	0	0	0	0	0	8,811
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	41	33	57	29	160	0	0	0	0	0	160
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	733	484	480	162	1,859	1,357	898	822	300	3,377	5,236
TOTALS:	22,486	16,414	16,859	8,069	84,538	6,787	4,575	4,437	1,735	18,219	102,757

* Not available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. Therefore the entries shown for the first 4 poverty levels do not sum to the total.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 2
USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE
FOR EACH POVERTY LEVEL FOR EACH OF THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS

UTILITY	2009 - 2010 Participation					2008 - 2009 Participation				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	88%	92%	92%	93%	93%	83%	87%	87%	89%	90%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	48%	53%	50%	36%	49%	12%	13%	9%	11%	12%
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	17%	9%	13%	11%	13%	26%	20%	22%	23%	23%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	*	*	*	100%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	61%	60%	51%	53%	57%	62%	54%	51%	48%	55%
Delmarva Power & Light	75%	79%	74%	74%	76%	76%	80%	73%	76%	76%
Easton Utilities-Electric	35%	36%	37%	32%	36%	60%	38%	44%	33%	45%
Easton Utilities-Gas	35%	37%	23%	30%	32%	53%	53%	55%	57%	54%
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	87%	*	*	*	*	73%
Washington Gas ²	69%	69%	69%	67%	69%					
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Edison	51%	46%	45%	47%	48%	49%	49%	51%	100%	52%
Potomac Electric Power Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	35%	35%	37%	35%	36%	27%	27%	31%	29%	28%
TOTALS:	77%	78%	79%	82%	82%	77%	77%	78%	82%	81%

* Not available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE OF 2009 - 2010 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN
THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON

UTILITY	Poverty Level				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric¹	58%	65%	62%	56%	63%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	25%	22%	15%	33%	23%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	70%	77%	71%	65%	72%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	47%	54%	50%	39%	49%
Easton Utilities-Electric	96%	57%	95%	79%	82%
Easton Utilities-Gas	100%	80%	92%	43%	85%
Elkton Gas Service	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Washington Gas²	32%	36%	28%	43%	34%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Edison	34%	45%	56%	140%	53%
Potomac Electric Power Company	73%	58%	55%	43%	59%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	13%	16%	14%	14%	14%
TOTALS:	52%	56%	54%	0%	57%

* Not available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

*** Municipality owned utility having less than 5,000 customers and is not required to submit data

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels.

The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 4

**AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE
FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL**

UTILITY	Average Monthly Payments (\$)					Average Actual Monthly Usage (\$) ³				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	160.00	161.00	146.00	186.00	160.12	273.82	272.27	272.51	280.39	273.86
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	126.00	121.00	103.00	136.00	120.68	180.80	191.60	173.80	131.40	177.83
Choptank Electric Cooperative	116.00	105.00	127.00	150.00	119.09	**	**	**	**	174.03
Columbia Gas of Maryland	61.94	63.69	69.42	73.69	65.91	151.26	150.66	151.57	148.03	150.81
Delmarva Power & Light	155.00	141.00	152.00	159.00	150.61	184.00	167.00	179.00	187.00	178.90
Easton Utilities-Electric	120.00	208.00	147.00	282.00	170.11	102.00	160.00	127.00	125.00	130.74
Easton Utilities-Gas	148.00	169.00	234.00	226.00	179.86	198.00	103.00	354.00	320.00	228.45
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	44.00	**	**	**	**	70.00
Washington Gas ²	117.71	123.79	130.81	133.13	124.13	124.55	122.82	130.39	132.25	126.43
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mayor & Council - Berlin	****	****	****	****	****	****	****	****	****	****
Potomac Edison	153.00	139.00	138.00	144.00	144.44	103.20	93.00	93.00	95.80	96.62
Potomac Electric Power Company	96.00	103.00	123.00	141.00	112.51	185.00	182.00	186.00	198.00	187.75
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	238.13	216.29	240.71	240.83	233.35	107.79	97.70	109.25	119.69	106.52
TOTALS:	145.36	141.54	141.44	167.22	148.70	207.50	197.90	207.33	222.97	228.05

** Not available or not available by peverty levelby poverty level

*** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

**** Municipality owned utility having less than 5,000 customers and is not required to submit data

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

³ Average monthly usage for five billing months of November 2009 - March 2010.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS*, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	Percentage of USPP Customers Making Supplemental Payments				Average Monthly Amount of Supplemental Payments (\$)				Average Supplemental Arrearage (\$)			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	13%	11%	13%	18%	111.00	109.00	112.00	113.00	1514.00	1474.00	1524.00	1475.00
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	1%	0%	3%	0%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	5%	9%	19%	11%	45.00	67.00	58.00	57.00	247.00	400.00	326.00	338.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Columbia Gas of Maryland	61%	47%	40%	58%	30.54	26.57	23.98	28.69	288.74	250.98	193.63	255.40
Delmarva Power & Light	38%	36%	40%	45%	11.27	11.76	14.83	16.12	564.00	473.00	533.00	557.00
Easton Utilities-Electric	20%	9%	19%	0%	125.00	120.00	164.00	0.00	294.00	279.00	198.00	0.00
Easton Utilities-Gas	9%	24%	8%	14%	120.00	143.00	322.00	300.00	220.00	264.00	404.00	288.00
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Washington Gas ²	6%	6%	6%	7%	55.90	63.69	55.26	52.81	298.29	382.58	235.77	357.49
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mayor & Council - Berlin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Potomac Edison	51%	63%	69%	75%	71.00	73.00	76.00	56.00	89.00	41.00	40.00	36.00
Potomac Electric Power Company	47%	53%	53%	53%	61.00	53.00	55.00	55.00	858.00	765.00	825.00	859.00
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	33%	28%	30%	29%	53.78	50.04	55.07	44.17	464.61	416.58	471.28	401.83
TOTALS:	24%	24%	25%	29%	57.99	53.88	60.25	65.97	819.50	708.99	813.36	913.21

* Under COMAR 20.31.01.08

** Not available or not available by poverty level

*** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 6
PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS
IN ARREARS* BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants					Eligible Non-Participants					Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	56%	48%	50%	59%	40%	43%	37%	37%	42%	39%	13%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	8%	2%	3%	0%	5%	56%	43%	38%	48%	49%	27%
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	3%	0%	4%	0%	3%	51%	40%	44%	28%	44%	17%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	6%	8%	5%	13%	7%	0%	0%	100%	0%	20%	18%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	36%	25%	18%	23%	26%	31%	16%	12%	20%	19%	15%
Delmarva Power & Light	28%	25%	30%	35%	28%	44%	38%	34%	40%	39%	15%
Easton Utilities-Electric	11%	4%	2%	0%	5%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	27%
Easton Utilities-Gas	9%	12%	0%	0%	8%	3%	0%	0%	0%	1%	NA
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	33%	**	**	**	**	33%	24%
Washington Gas ²	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	86%	89%	82%	87%	86%	NA
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	***	***	***	***	***	43%	29%	34%	43%	36%	13%
Mayor & Council - Berlin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Potomac Edison	50%	34%	35%	49%	41%	2%	1%	1%	0%	2%	15%
Potomac Electric Power Company	41%	46%	47%	45%	44%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	25%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	20%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	61%	53%	53%	62%	57%	58%	49%	45%	59%	53%	35%
TOTALS:	42%	37%	40%	47%	36%	45%	37%	34%	42%	38%	17%

* Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2008

** Not Available or not available by poverty level

*** Operates approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 7
AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP
CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS* BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants (\$)					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants (\$)					Non-MEAP Customers (\$)
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	693.00	674.00	711.00	785.00	707.61	946.00	929.00	920.00	856.00	928.56	715.00
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	147.00	0.00	104.00	0.00	132.67	200.00	161.00	159.00	147.00	176.54	219.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	724.00	692.00	593.00	571.00	657.49	0.00	0.00	44.66	0.00	44.66	175.47
Columbia Gas of Maryland	207.30	158.01	163.73	231.34	186.22	254.77	200.35	276.62	256.72	247.81	208.06
Delmarva Power & Light	629.00	547.00	625.00	621.00	606.31	758.00	849.00	829.00	846.00	804.02	480.00
Easton Utilities-Electric	275.00	326.00	420.00	0.00	305.88	0.00	346.00	0.00	0.00	346.00	289.00
Easton Utilities-Gas	250.00	370.00	0.00	0.00	322.00	228.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	228.00	**
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	0.00	**	**	**	**	0.00	**	137.00
Washington Gas ²	91.59	83.59	94.39	94.85	90.81	419.83	273.15	384.78	472.17	379.76	256.98
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	***	***	***	***	***	376.00	365.00	347.00	563.00	378.35	404.00
Mayor & Council - Berlin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Potomac Edison	301.00	306.00	282.00	251.00	292.80	352.00	461.00	335.00	317.00	372.56	**
Potomac Electric Power Company	226.00	226.00	240.00	275.00	238.21	**	**	**	**	**	344.00
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	759.59	685.38	681.29	663.87	713.69	732.63	660.94	661.98	812.77	708.10	226.07
TOTALS:	550.85	519.33	551.29	590.95	583.52	633.73	571.31	569.54	605.35	611.93	424.72

* Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2008

** Not available or not available by poverty level

*** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 8
PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS
BY POVERTY LEVEL DURING THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS

UTILITY	Compliance 2009-2010					Compliance 2008-2009				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	40%	59%	41%	58%	46%	54%	36%	83%	33%	51%
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	42%	61%	69%	56%	53%	58%	54%	42%	71%	55%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	79%	86%	85%	80%	83%	84%	90%	89%	83%	87%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	79%	85%	81%	80%	81%	82%	86%	83%	79%	83%
Easton Utilities-Electric	29%	54%	63%	36%	49%	55%	62%	67%	47%	60%
Easton Utilities-Gas	14%	40%	33%	0%	26%	54%	55%	88%	54%	61%
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	96%	**	**	**	**	92%
Washington Gas ²	94%	90%	89%	81%	90%	90%	86%	88%	76%	87%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Edison	99%	98%	99%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Potomac Electric Power Company	62%	67%	68%	67%	65%	74%	81%	77%	71%	76%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	98%	99%	97%	99%	98%	97%	98%	96%	99%	97%
TOTALS:	89%	91%	90%	89%	92%	90%	92%	91%	89%	93%

* Not available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an alternative USPP program to all MEAP eligible customers

*** BGE does not remove customers from USPP for failure to pay the amount due on two consecutive monthly bills

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

UTILITY	USPP Participants					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants					Non-MEAP
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Customers
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	198	92	126	98	626	20	5	6	4	37	1234
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	10	5	4	1	20	15	2	2	2	21	51
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	8	0	0	1	9	28	17	17	2	64	172
Choptank Electric Cooperative	28	17	22	8	75	0	0	0	0	0	39
Columbia Gas of Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Delmarva Power & Light	72	38	37	10	157	88	35	43	10	176	870
Easton Utilities-Electric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Easton Utilities-Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	2	*	*	*	*	1	40
Washington Gas ²	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	58
Mayor & Council - Berlin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Potomac Edison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
Potomac Electric Power Company	82	25	37	28	172	0	0	0	0	0	2067
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432
TOTALS:	398	177	226	146	1061	153	61	70	18	305	5101

* Not available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. Therefore the entries shown for the first 4 poverty levels do not sum to the total.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 10
PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF
SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY DURING THE MOST RECENT HEATING SEASON

UTILITY	Poverty Level				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	46%	45%	44%	46%	41%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	31%	30%	38%	33%	32%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	7%	6%	5%	10%	6%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	26%	24%	27%	29%	26%
Easton Utilities-Electric	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Easton Utilities-Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	11%
Washington Gas ²	2%	3%	3%	6%	3%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Edison	65%	65%	64%	68%	65%
Potomac Electric Power Company	46%	48%	48%	47%	47%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	7%	3%	7%	7%	6%
TOTALS:	35%	34%	36%	39%	35%

* Not available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an alternative USPP program to all MEAP eligible customers

*** Municipality-owned utility with less than 5,000 customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010.

This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 11
PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS
WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants					Eligible Non-Participants					Non-MEAP
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Customers
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	81%	83%	85%	87%	84%	79%	81%	81%	81%	80%	79%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	89%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	45%	41%	40%	40%	42%	*	*	*	*	40%	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	96%	97%	97%	97%	91%
Delmarva Power & Light	65%	63%	63%	62%	64%	87%	87%	88%	89%	87%	88%
Easton Utilities-Electric	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%
Easton Utilities-Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	100%	*	*	*	*	100%	93%
Washington Gas ²	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council - Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Edison	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	66%	60%	60%	59%	62%	96%
Potomac Electric Power Company	38%	46%	45%	44%	43%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	97%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	89%	89%	88%	86%	89%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTALS:	74%	75%	75%	76%	77%	65%	63%	66%	69%	66%	86%

* Not Available or not available by poverty level

** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

*** Municipality owned utility with less than 5,000 customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.

TABLE 12
AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT² FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS
BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS

UTILITY	Average 2009-2010 Grant (\$)					Average 2008-2009 Grant (\$)				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	329.00	275.00	234.00	188.00	270.67	646.00	539.00	442.00	308.00	522.86
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	196.00	203.00	124.00	109.00	174.68	480.00	412.00	337.00	208.00	404.21
Choptank Electric Cooperative	418.00	360.00	358.00	343.00	375.91	331.00	298.00	301.00	275.00	306.95
Columbia Gas of Maryland	305.79	277.75	239.57	155.31	261.84	658.45	618.98	507.46	342.20	568.98
Delmarva Power & Light	**	**	**	**	287.00	**	**	**	**	281.00
Easton Utilities-Electric	234.00	226.00	240.00	211.00	231.75	176.00	168.00	142.00	161.00	162.49
Easton Utilities-Gas	154.00	145.00	151.00	70.00	141.14	362.00	318.00	309.00	203.00	318.05
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	94.00	**	**	**	**	251.00
Washington Gas ³	256.07	263.19	248.34	194.87	249.02	293.00	303.00	289.00	201.00	285.93
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mayor & Council - Berlin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Potomac Edison	226.00	194.00	184.00	190.00	203.13	191.00	155.00	167.00	163.00	172.25
Potomac Electric Power Company	**	**	**	**	339.00	**	**	**	**	320.00
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	411.57	345.20	358.31	366.34	376.60	265.34	264.30	242.60	231.00	255.72
TOTALS:	323.17	278.50	246.98	200.56	275.85	568.24	475.33	403.08	294.23	469.79

** Not available or not available by poverty level

*** Offers an approved alternative USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

¹ BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

² Average grant payable to the utility at the time of customer enrollment plus supplemental awards (if any).

³ Washington Gas reported combined data for both Frederick Gas and Maryland Divisions for 2009-2010. This data is not comparable to that provided for prior years.