

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND**

UTILITY SERVICE PROTECTION PROGRAM

ANNUAL REPORT

WINTER 2013-2014

Submitted to the
Maryland General Assembly
Annapolis, Maryland

In compliance with § 7-307 of
The Public Utilities 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

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION..... 5

EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE..... 8

SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND ARREARAGES..... 9

PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE10

HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....12

HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION13

PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE14

MEAP GRANTS.....14

CONCLUSION15

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	NUMBER OF USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL	16
TABLE 2	USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH POVERTY LEVEL FOR EACH OF THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	17
TABLE 3	PERCENTAGE OF 2013-2014 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON	18
TABLE 4	AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL	19
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	20
TABLE 6	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELEGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL	21
TABLE 7	AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL	22
TABLE 8	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS BY POVERTY LEVEL DURING THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	23
TABLE 9	NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS	24
TABLE 10	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY DURING THE MOST RECENT HEATING SEASON	25
TABLE 11	PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELEGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY PROVERTY LEVEL	26
TABLE 12	AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2013-2014 winter heating season marked the lowest participation for the Utility Service Protection Program (“USPP” or “Program”) in the past seven years. The number of program participants and the average monthly payment obligation were both lower in 2013-2014 as compared to the 2012-2013 heating season.¹ This year’s report is based on 59,982 USPP participants. The following table presents the variation in USPP participation for the past seven years:

Program Year	Number of USPP Participants
2013-2014	59,982
2012-2013	63,389
2011-2012	70,892
2010-2011	84,826
2009-2010	84,538
2008-2009	70,664
2007-2008	67,916

The average Maryland Energy Assistance Program (“MEAP”) grant available to USPP participants during 2013-2014 was \$339.77. The following table presents how this amount compares to average MEAP grants awarded during the previous six years:

Program Year	Average MEAP Grant	% Change to Current Year
2013-2014	\$339.77	N/A
2012-2013	\$240.55	41%
2011-2012	\$288	18%
2010-2011	\$418	-19%
2009-2010	\$276	23%
2008-2009	\$293	16%
2007-2008	\$332	2%

¹ The average monthly payment obligation was reduced by 0.57 % to \$112.50 this year from \$113.15 in 2012-2013.

The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations during the winter. The 2013-2014 data reported by the participating utilities indicate that the percentage of terminations among the USPP participants was 3%, representing a 0.5% decrease from the previous milder winter. The total number of terminations among USPP participants was 1,788 in 2013-2014, representing a 19% decrease in the number of terminations reported in 2012-2013.

After experiencing a total of 1,927 terminations in 2012-2013, a sharp increase of 1,606 over its 321 terminations in 2011-2012, Baltimore Gas Electric Company (“BGE”) decreased its terminations among USPP participants to 1,568 for the current reporting year. However, BGE contributed 88%² of the total USPP terminations in the 2013-2014 heating season. Excluding BGE, service for 0.8% of the USPP population was terminated during the 2013-2014 winter heating season, compared to 1.1% in 2012-2013, 1% in 2011-2012, 0.97% in 2010-2011 and 1.2% during the 2009-2010 heating season.

The data in this report provides information on Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 grouped by household incomes measured against the federal poverty level (“FPL”) as follows:

Poverty Level	Household Income
Poverty Level 1	0%-75% of the FPL
Poverty Level 2	>75%-110% of the FPL
Poverty Level 3	>110%-150% of the FPL
Poverty Level 4	>150%-175% of the FPL

The Poverty Level 5 data reported by BGE is comprised of participants that receive subsidized housing allowances. These participants usually have household incomes that are at 0% to 75% of the federal poverty level. Because residents of subsidized housing receive an allowance to defray the cost of utilities, these participants receive a separate and lower benefit than other USPP participants. In addition, the BGE data are also unique among the reporting utilities in that it includes gas and electric customers and combines the data for these two groups of customers.

² BGE reported 1,568 terminations out of 1,788 terminations for all utilities.

BACKGROUND

On March 1, 1988, the Public Service Commission of Maryland (“Commission”) issued Order No. 67999 in Case No. 8091,³ which established the Utility Service Protection Program, as required by Article 78 §54K, which has since been re-codified as Section 7-307 of the Public Utilities Article (“PUA”), *Annotated Code of Maryland*. PUA §7-307 directed the Commission to promulgate 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 Section 20.31.05 of the Code of Maryland Regulations (“COMAR”).

The USPP is available to utility customers who are eligible and have applied for a grant from the 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 heating season, which extends from November 1 to March 31. 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 lowering any 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 20.31.05.03C.

³ *In the Matter of Regulations Governing Terminations of Gas or Electric Service to Low Income Residential Customers during the Heating Season.*

PUA §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 under 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 in 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% of the system average for the heating season; and (9) the average cost of actual usage for the heating season.⁴ Utilities serving residential customers in Maryland submitted data for this report.⁵ The Commission's March 2014 data request contained the same questions as those in the USPP Data Request issued for

⁴ The data request was issued to A&N Electric Cooperative ("A&N"), BGE, Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Cambridge Gas Division ("CUC-Cambridge"), Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Citizens Gas Division ("CUC-Citizens"), Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Choptank"), Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. ("Columbia" or "CMD"), Delmarva Power & Light Company ("Delmarva" or "DPL"), The Easton Utilities Commission ("EUC" or "Easton Utilities"), Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elkton Gas ("Elkton" or "Elkton Gas"), Washington Gas Light Company ("Washington Gas" or "WGL"), Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant ("Hagerstown"), Mayor and Council of Berlin ("Berlin"), The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison" or "PE"), Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco"), Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative ("Somerset"), Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative ("SMECO"), Thurmont Municipal Light Company ("Thurmont"), UGI Central Penn Gas, Inc. f/k/a PPL Gas Utilities Corporation ("UGI"), and Williamsport Municipal Light Plant ("Williamsport").

⁵ Neither A&N nor Somerset responded to Staff's Data Request, and no data were available from these companies for this report. CUC-Cambridge, Berlin, Easton, Hagerstown, Thurmont, UGI, and Williamsport provided partial or no USPP data due to either the company's size (<5,000 customers), the fact of municipal ownership, or lack of capability to track data by poverty level.

the 2012-2013 heating season, and was similar to previous USPP data requests.⁶ This report provides an analysis and summary of that information.⁷

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Table 1 shows the number of USPP participants and USPP eligible non-participants for each utility by poverty level. The utilities reported 59,982 USPP participants during the 2013-2014 heating season, which represented 1.8% of the State’s residential customers (3,319,711) and 78.56% of total USPP eligible residential customers. The following table presents a breakdown of number of residential customers, number of USPP participants, and % of USPP participants by utility:⁸

Utility	Number of Customers⁹	Number of USPP Participants	% of USPP Participants
BGE	612,202	31,794	1.84%
Choptank	47,332	2,529	5.34%
DPL	174,110	7,202	4.14%
Easton	8,227	757	9.20%
PEPCO	486,127	6,588	1.36%
SMECO	140,733	3,379	2.40%
PE	223,537	2,279	1.02%
WGL	424,426	3,750	0.88%

The USPP participants’ number represents a decrease in participation by approximately 5% when compared with the 63,389 participants during the 2012-2013

⁶ The USPP Data Request was expanded in 2007.

⁷ Pursuant to COMAR 20.31.05.01C, 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.

⁸ Chesapeake, Columbia, Elkton, Hagerstown, Berlin, Thurmont, Williamsport were omitted due to lack of enrollment numbers.

⁹ Number of Residential Customers reported by the Utilities as of December 31, 2013.

heating season, a decrease in participation of 16% when compared with the 70,892 participants in the 2011-2012 heating season, and a 30% decrease when compared with the 84,826 participants in the 2010-2011 heating season. The decreases were observed at all poverty levels for USPP participants and showed a 3% decrease at Poverty Level 2, 4% at Poverty Level 4, and a 5% decrease at Poverty Levels 1 and 3. The number of USPP eligible non-participants in MEAP was 16,368 during the 2013-2014 heating season, a 22% increase from 13,381 in the 2012-2013 heating season, and a 3% increase from the 15,845 MEAP eligible non-USPP participants reported for the 2011-2012 heating season. The total number of MEAP-certified customers during the 2013-2014 heating season was slightly decreased from the previous heating season (2013-2014: 76,350 vs. 2012-2013: 76,770).

During the 2013-2014 heating season, three major utilities kept the same rankings for their USPP participants as in the previous heating season. BGE reported 31,974 USPP participants, which represents 1.82% of BGE's residential population. BGE's USPP participants accounted for approximately 54% of the State's total USPP participants, a 4% decrease from the 60% of overall State USPP participants from the previous heating season. Delmarva reported the second largest participation, reporting 7,202 participants and accounting for 4.39% of its total residential customers, which represented 461 fewer than the 7,663 participants for the 2012-2013 heating season. DPL accounted for 12% of the State's USPP participants, the same percentage as in the previous heating season. Pepco reported 6,588 participants or approximately 11% of the total State's participants with an increase by 454 customers from the previous heating season. Pepco reported 5,934 participants and represented 9% of the State's participation rate in the previous report. These three utilities account for 77% of the USPP customers. Washington Gas moved to fourth place from seventh in 2012-2013 and reported 3,750 USPP participants, accounting for about 6% or an increase of 1,907 participants as compared with the last heating season. SMECO reported 3,379 participants for the 2013-2014 heating season, the second largest increase in participation for any company. SMECO reported 1,102 more USPP participants as compared with the 2012-2013 heating season, resulting in approximately 6% of the State's total USPP participants. Washington

Gas and SMECO together accounted for about 12% of total USPP participants. PE reported 2,277 or about 4% of the State's USPP customers, a slight decrease from the 2,890 USPP customers reported by the Company in the 2012-2013 heating season.

Table 2 presents USPP participation as percentage of the total number of MEAP-eligible customers for the 2013-2014 and 2012-2013 heating seasons. The overall participation rate in the USPP for all utility companies for the 2013-2014 winter heating season was 79%, 4% lower than in 2012-2013. The participation rate varied among the utilities. With the exception of Elkton, there were no large changes in year-over-year participation rates among the reporting utilities. Elkton reported a sharp decrease in USPP participation from 67% in 2012-2013 to 36% in 2013-2014. BGE and Pepco noted decreased USPP enrollment from the previous heating season by 1% and 2%, respectively. DPL increased its USPP participation by 1% in 2013-2014 from 81% in the 2012-2013 heating season, while PE maintained the same level at 52% for the current report and the previous heating season. Columbia Gas of Maryland and Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Gas Division each showed reduced participation of 9% as compared to 2012-2013. Choptank's program participation level has been 100% among its USPP eligible customers since 2010-2011 and was again 100% level the current year.

Table 3 shows the percentage of customers that were USPP participants in the 2012-2013 heating season and also participants in the 2013-2014 heating season. Overall, 46% of the USPP customers who participated in the 2012-2013 heating season also enrolled in the USPP during the 2013-2014 heating season. This was a 5% decrease from the 51% repeat enrollment in the previous heating season and an 11% decrease from the 57% repeat enrollment in the 2011-2012 heating season. Based on the data available for two reported heating seasons, there were five utilities (CUC–Citizens, DPL, PE, SMECO, and Washington Gas) reporting an increase, and three utilities (BGE, Choptank, and Pepco) reporting a decrease in repeat enrollment. The utilities with the highest repeat enrollment rates were Choptank at 73%, DPL at 59%, Washington Gas at 57%, and BGE at 49%.

EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE

Table 4 compares the average equal monthly billings to actual energy usage measured in dollars for USPP participants. The average monthly billings represent customers’ payment obligations and are based on the average usage during the five billing months of the heating season. The differences between the average monthly actual usage and the average monthly payment obligations represent the fact that the USPP attempts to keep heating bills affordable during the heating season. Unpaid utility bill balances that accrue during the heating season must be paid during the non-heating season to keep arrearage levels from increasing. The following table presents the declining trend in the statewide average monthly payment obligation for the previous five heating seasons:

Program Year	Average Monthly Payment	Year Over Year% Change
2013-2014	\$112.50	-0.57%
2012-2013	\$113.15	-7.76%
2011-2012	\$122.67	-4.91%
2010-2011	\$129	-12.84%
2009-2010	\$148	N/A

By poverty level, the reduction of monthly payment obligations ranged from 5% at Poverty Level 3 to 7% at Poverty Level 4. Among utilities, the statistics are mixed. Three utilities (Choptank, Columbia Gas, and PE) reported an overall reduction in the current heating season, and seven utilities (BGE, DPL, Pepco, SMECO, Washington Gas, CUC-Citizens, and Easton) reported an increase from the previous heating season. Overall, the statewide monthly obligation decreased slightly, despite the fact that 2013-2014 was relatively colder than the previous winter.

Despite the reduction in the average monthly payment obligation, the statewide average monthly usage actually increased by \$11.99, a 6% increase from 2012-2013 heating season. Actual usage increased across all poverty levels, with 15%, 11%, 12%,

and 5% increases for Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. The increases are likely due to the cold temperatures experienced during the polar vortex that occurred during the 2013-2014 heating season. Among the utilities, SMECO reported the highest actual usage increase, approximately 126% from \$210.21 in the 2012-2013 season to \$475.94 in the 2013-2014 report; Washington Gas and Columbia Gas reported, respectively, 67% and 30% increases from the 2012-2013 heating season. The lowest increase was reported by Choptank, which saw only a 4% increase in actual usage.

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” that led to those payments. The USPP encourages utilities to offer customers with outstanding arrearages to place all or part of those arrearages in a special agreement sometimes referred to as an alternate payment plan, to be paid off over an extended period of time. Although the deferred payment arrangements vary, all utilities provide for enrollment in supplemental payment plans. Placing outstanding arrearages in 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 number of customers who were participants in USPP and also made supplemental payments in the 2013-2014 heating season is 11,625, representing a 5% decrease from the 2012-2013 heating season (12,239). The average monthly supplemental payment balances during the 2013-2014 heating season remained at the same level of \$48 as in 2012-2013.¹⁰ Among the poverty levels, the average monthly supplemental payment increased for Poverty Levels 1 and 2 by \$1.31 and \$2.95, respectively, decreased for Poverty Level 3 by \$4.55, and remained unchanged for Poverty Levels 4 and 5.

¹⁰ This is a weighted average calculation for all poverty levels across all utilities.

At the end of the 2013-2014 heating season, the statewide weighted average level of supplemental arrearages increased by approximately 33%, from \$762 in 2012-2013 to \$1,014 in 2013-2014%.¹¹ The increases across poverty levels ranged from 30% to 38% as follows: \$223.27 or 30% for Poverty Level 3; \$271.8 or 35% for Poverty Level 4; \$277.49 and \$285.45, or 38% for Poverty Levels 1 and 2, respectively. Seven utilities reported increased supplemental arrearages in at least two of the four poverty levels. CMD, DPL, PE, and Pepco reported increases in supplemental arrearages in all four poverty levels. SMECO reported an increase in three poverty levels. CUC-Citizens and Washington Gas reported increases in two poverty levels. DPL's reported arrearage increase was the highest among the utilities showing an increase. DPL reported increases of 74% for Poverty Level 2; 77% for Poverty Levels 1 and 3; and 80% for poverty level 4 when compared to the 2012-2013 heating season. By contrast, BGE reported average supplemental arrearage decreases across four poverty levels.

PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

Table 6 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-USPP participants, and all other residential customers who were in arrears on their utility bills as of March 31, 2014.

As was the pattern experienced over the previous four heating seasons, USPP participants were more likely to be in arrears to the utility than either MEAP-eligible non-USPP participants or non-MEAP-eligible customers. Non-MEAP eligible customers exhibited the lowest percentage for number of customers in arrears during the 2013-2014 heating season. For all utilities, the percentages of customers in arrears were 54% for USPP participants, 31% for MEAP-eligible non-USPP participants, and 18% for non-MEAP-eligible customers as of March 31, 2014. The proportion of USPP participants that were in arrears also increased slightly from last year, 1% higher than the previous heating season, 3% higher than in 2011-2012, and 23% higher than in 2010-2011.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

Among the utilities in 2013-2014, six utilities recorded higher levels of USPP participant arrearages; three utilities reported lower levels of arrearages, and two utilities reported no change from the 2011-2012 heating season. Delmarva reported a 13% increase in its USPP participant arrearage rate from 49% in 2012-2013 to 62% in 2013-2014, the highest increase among the reporting utilities. Choptank and Pepco followed with a 7% and a 6% increase, respectively. Pepco had reported the highest USPP participant arrearage rate in three consecutive reports: 76% for 2013-2014; 70% for 2012-2013, and 80% for 2011-2012. BGE followed Pepco with a 64% and DPL with a 62% participant arrearage rate in 2013-2014.

Table 7 presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP-eligible customers. Average arrearage balances for both USPP customers and MEAP-eligible non-participants increased. For the 2013-2014 heating season, the overall average arrearage for USPP participants is \$713, which is 2% higher than the 2012-2013 heating season and 14% higher than the 2011-2012 heating season. In 2013-2014, the average arrearage balance was \$486.28 for MEAP-eligible non-participants who were in arrears, an increase of 23% and close to the arrearage level of 2011-2012 (\$484.64). Among the major utilities, BGE, Choptank, and PE reported that the average arrearage balance for USPP participants decreased, whereas CUC-Citizens, CMD, DPL, Elkton Gas and SMECO reported an arrearage increase in 2013-2014 as compared with the 2012-2013 heating season. Among the utilities reporting an increase, DPL reported the highest increase in the average arrearage balance with an increase of approximately 98% as compared with the previous heating season. DPL also had the highest average arrearage balance (\$1,383) among all reporting utilities in 2013-2014, up from second place in the previous heating season for USPP participants. DPL was followed by BGE (\$780), SMECO (\$577), and Choptank (\$348). BGE and DPL also reported the highest and second highest average arrearage balances for MEAP-eligible non-participants as well as for non-MEAP customers during the 2013-2014 heating season, where average arrearage balances for the two companies were \$1,041 and

\$750 for MEAP-eligible non-participants; and \$440 and \$539 for non-MEAP customers, respectively.

Table 8 presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for the 2013-2014 heating season and compares those data to the previous season'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 in previous years, BGE reported that, as a matter of company policy, it did not remove customers from the program if the customer did not comply with the USPP payment rules during the 2013-2014 heating season. Because it does not enforce this provision of the program, BGE does not track the percentage of customers who complied with the program rules. Also, for that reason, the statewide compliance percentage of approximately 95% shown on Table 8, likely overstates the proportion of customers that comply with the USPP payment provisions. When compared with the previous heating seasons, the statewide compliance rate increased by 4% from 90% in 2012-2013 and is 1% higher than the 93% experienced in 2011-2012. The compliance rates across all poverty levels were up in 2013-2014 from the 2012-2013 heating season with a 6% to 7% increase. As in the previous heating season, all four poverty levels had almost identical compliance rates, ranging from 94% (Poverty Levels 1 and 4) to 95% (Poverty Levels 2 and 3). Elkton, Pepco, and SMECO each reported compliance rates of 98%.

HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

Table 9 presents the number of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible USPP non-participants, and non-MEAP customers whose services were terminated during the heating season. The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations during the heating season. The data indicate that, in the 2013-2014 winter heating season, the USPP program aided in mitigating utility service terminations.

Of the 59,982 USPP participants, Maryland's utilities collectively terminated 1,788 in 2013-2014, down from 2,208 USPP participants during the 2012-2013 heating season. The terminations represented approximately 3% of total USPP participants, slightly decreasing from 3.5% in 2012-2013. BGE continues to have the highest number of terminations (1,568), even though its terminations decreased by 359 as compared to its 2012-2013 heating season's terminations (1,927). BGE's USPP terminations accounted for approximately 88% of statewide total USPP terminations. Excluding BGE's USPP terminations, all remaining reporting utilities had a combined termination rate of approximately 0.8%, including several utilities that reported no terminations (Berlin, CMD, CUC-Cambridge, CUC-Citizen, SMECO, Washington Gas, and Williamsport). Choptank, Pepco, and PE each reported fewer terminations in 2013-2014 than in 2012-2013. DPL was the only utility that reported an increase in the number of terminations from the previous heating season.

HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Table 10 presents the percentage of USPP participants who consumed more than 135% of the respective utility's system average use. Data in this table show the proportions of USPP customers by Poverty Level who consume greater than average levels of energy. Due to this higher consumption, these customers will have higher than average heating bills, and may tend to generate higher arrearages, thereby running a higher risk of defaulting on payment plans, and may have a greater risk of termination.

For the 2013-2014 heating season, 44% of USPP participants consumed more than 135% of the respective utility's system average usage, which was 14, 24, and 32 percentage points above the rates recorded for the 2012-2013, 2011-2012, and 2010-2011 heating seasons, respectively. As indicated in Table 10, the proportion of USPP customers reporting more than 135% of a utility's system average use does not vary much across poverty levels. CMD, DPL, Pepco, Potomac Edison, and SMECO reported that over 50% of USPP customers consumed more than 135% of the system average in the 2013-2014 heating season. USPP participants reporting higher than average system consumption present an upward trend since the 2010-2011 heating season.

PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE

Table 11 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers whose primary heat source is provided by the indicated utility.

The data for primary heating source vary greatly across utilities. For all utilities in 2013-2014, 76% of USPP customers, 55% of MEAP-eligible non-participants, and 50% of non-MEAP customers received their primary heating source from the utility responding to the data request. These figures were almost the same as those recorded during the previous heating season (74% for USPP, 59% for MEAP-eligible non-participants, and 50% for non-MEAP customers). The percentages of USPP customers reporting that they received their primary heating source from the reporting utilities ranged from 41% to 100% among utilities. This variation was primarily due to the three types of utilities: electric only, gas only, and electric and gas utilities. The lowest percentages reported are from the utilities that provide electric service only: Pepco (41%) and Choptank (44%). Four gas companies reported that they were the sole heating source for their entire customer base (100%). These gas utilities are CUC-Citizens, CMD, Elkton, and WGL. PE, an electric-only utility reported an increase from 50% in 2012-2013 to 84% in the 2013-2014 heating season. DPL, also an electric-only utility, reported a 6% increase from the previous heating season.

MEAP GRANTS

Table 12 presents the average MEAP grant payable to the utility at the time of the customer's enrollment in the USPP program. OHEP's benefit calculation methodology provides for larger MEAP grants at poverty levels reflecting lower incomes. The data indicates that the overall level of average benefit rose to \$339.77 in 2013-2014 from \$240 in 2012-2013 and \$288 in 2011-2012, but was down from \$418 in the 2010-2011 heating season. As seen in the previous years, the size of the MEAP benefit awarded to customers decreased as the poverty level denomination increased. Customers in Poverty

Level 1, at the lowest household income level, received an average MEAP benefit of \$363, whereas those in Poverty Levels 2, 3, 4, and 5 received benefit amounts of \$336, \$354, \$321, and \$201, respectively. The data show that gas customers received the largest average MEAP benefit: CMD, CUC-Citizens, and WGL offered \$487, \$461, and \$435, respectively. BGE providing gas and electric service ranked fourth receiving \$354, and Choptank serving electric customers only was fifth receiving \$325 in 2013-2014 reporting season.

CONCLUSION

The data collected for the 2013-2014 winter heating season show that the Utility Service Protection Program may contribute to fewer service terminations among eligible consumers. There were 59,982 USPP participants during the 2013-2014 heating season, which presents a decrease of 3,407 or 5% from USPP participants reported during the 2012-2013 level of 63,389 and the lowest level since the 2009-2010 heating season. Of the total USPP participants, 3%, or 1,788 customers, were terminated during the 2013-2014 heating season. This number was 0.5% lower than the percentage of USPP participants that were terminated during the 2012-2013 heating season.

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, some utilities providing electric and/or gas service in Maryland operated other specific programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers during the 2013-2014 heating season. These programs vary from utility to utility, but all focus on helping low-income customers with billing and related issues.

TABLE 1

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

UTILITY	USPP Participants						USPP Eligible Non-Participants						Grand Total
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	8,794	5,784	5,964	2,675	8,757	31,974	506	256	213	92	213	1,280	33,254
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	20	12	14	3	*	49	134	107	68	18	*	327	376
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	4	3	3	1	*	11	263	226	151	41	*	681	692
Choptank Electric Cooperative	816	758	725	230	*	2,529	4	2	1	0	*	7	2,536
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	355	327	315	127	*	1,124	248	272	297	97	*	914	2,038
Delmarva Power & Light	2,880	2,082	1,667	573	*	7,202	555	472	416	124	*	1,567	8,769
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	757	*	*	*	*	*	295	1,052
Elkton Gas	48	28	32	13	*	121	74	68	50	18	1	211	332
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	574	574
Mayor & Council of Berlin	48	45	48	20	58	219	2	1	3	0	3	9	228
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,675	1,691	1,598	624	*	6,588	49	49	49	49	*	196	6,784
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	1,390	903	790	296	*	3,379	2,122	1,373	1,191	455	*	5,141	8,520
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	63	63
The Potomac Edison Company	771	644	626	238	*	2,279	699	676	595	176	*	2,146	4,425
Washington Gas	1,473	1,005	883	389	*	3,750	1,125	787	681	339	*	2,932	6,682
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	25	25
TOTALS	19,274	13,282	12,665	5,189	8,815	59,982	5,781	4,289	3,715	1,409	217	16,368	76,350

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 2

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

	2013-2014 Participation						2012-2013 Participation					
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall
UTILITY												
Baltimore Gas & Electric	95%	96%	97%	97%	98%	96%	96%	97%	97%	97%	98%	97%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	13%	10%	17%	14%	*	13%	26%	18%	23%	9%	*	22%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	1%	1%	2%	2%	*	2%	3%	0%	2%	0%	*	2%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	59%	55%	51%	57%	*	55%	69%	65%	60%	60%	*	64%
Delmarva Power & Light	84%	82%	80%	82%	*	82%	78%	83%	83%	82%	*	81%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	45%	37%	27%	26%	*	35%
Elkton Gas	39%	29%	39%	42%	*	36%	*	*	*	*	*	67%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	96%	98%	94%	100%	95%	96%	96%	97%	91%	100%	96%	96%
Potomac Electric Power Company	98%	97%	97%	93%	*	97%	99%	100%	100%	100%	*	99%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	40%	40%	40%	39%	*	40%	41%	39%	39%	40%	*	40%
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	52%	49%	51%	57%	*	52%	52%	52%	52%	53%	*	52%
Washington Gas	57%	56%	56%	53%	*	56%	60%	58%	60%	56%	*	59%
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	76%	75%	77%	78%	98%	79%	80%	79%	81%	82%	98%	83%

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 3
PERCENTAGE OF 2013-2014 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED
IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON

UTILITY	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall¹
Baltimore Gas & Electric	42%	47%	45%	38%	64%	49%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	25%	0%	0%	0%	*	9%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	69%	77%	76%	66%	*	73%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	62%	55%	58%	66%	*	59%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	25%	21%	44%	15%	*	28%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	26%	28%	24%	19%	*	26%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	25%	27%	27%	22%	*	26%
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	41%	53%	52%	46%	*	48%
Washington Gas	60%	53%	59%	58%	*	57%
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*
STATE TOTALS	43%	46%	45%	40%	63%	46%

¹ This column represents the two-year participation rate.

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 4

AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	Average Monthly Payment Obligation (\$)						Average Actual Monthly Usage (\$) ¹					
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	136.00	134.00	136.00	137.00	112.00	131.00	276.00	276.00	274.00	275.00	239.00	268.00
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	123.00	286.00	145.00	65.00	*	154.75	254.20	194.20	210.60	83.80	*	185.70
Choptank Electric Cooperative	153.00	125.00	134.00	154.00	*	141.50	*	*	*	*	*	179.45
Columbia Gas of Maryland	38.32	35.34	37.38	39.02	*	37.52	163.70	156.35	157.20	164.86	*	160.53
Delmarva Power & Light	144.00	135.00	145.00	156.00	*	145.00	186.00	178.00	201.00	184.00	*	187.25
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	35.00	37.00	50.00	51.00	*	43.25	79.00	81.00	86.00	117.00	*	72.60
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	82.00	75.00	87.00	94.00	*	84.50	128.00	130.00	147.00	155.00	*	140.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	195.00	169.46	175.19	183.37	*	180.76	479.94	457.07	461.24	505.52	*	475.94
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	127.00	108.00	115.00	135.00	*	121.25	189.60	149.40	166.40	173.60	*	169.75
Washington Gas	78.04	84.02	71.44	90.36	*	80.97	182.84	154.27	165.39	137.89	*	160.10
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	111.14	118.88	109.60	110.48	112.00	112.50	215.48	197.37	207.65	199.63	239.00	199.99

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

¹ Average actual monthly usage is the monthly average for five billing months of November 2013 - March 2014.

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 (\$)¹					Average Supplemental Arrearage (\$)²				
	Poverty level 1	Poverty level 2	Poverty level 3	Poverty level 4	Poverty level 5	Poverty level 1	Poverty level 2	Poverty level 3	Poverty level 4	Poverty level 5	Poverty level 1	Poverty level 2	Poverty level 3	Poverty level 4	Poverty level 5
Baltimore Gas & Electric	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	104.00	105.00	102.00	104.00	92.00	1,079	1,173	1,060	1,087	986
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	5%	8%	0%	0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0%	67%	0%	100%	*	0.00	62.00	0.00	43.00	*	0.00	370.00	0.00	250.00	*
Choptank Electric Cooperative	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	55%	39%	43%	36%	*	19.94	18.99	21.41	21.54	*	221	204	176	190	*
Delmarva Power & Light	70%	62%	66%	73%	*	31.00	31.00	33.00	34.00	*	1,464	1,345	1,373	1,446	*
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	60%	51%	53%	60%	*	60.00	58.00	54.00	62.00	*	905.00	868.00	823.00	978.00	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	47%	40%	40%	43%	*	66.68	59.10	56.89	58.59	*	539.88	495.31	447.28	465.56	*
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	14%	7%	9%	9%	*	100.00	98.00	90.00	91.00	*	410.00	445.00	323.00	366.00	*
Washington Gas	3%	3%	3%	4%	*	106.17	95.73	119.19	100.35	*	287.26	358.00	405.53	399.81	*
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	25%	22%	21%	21%	3%	47.52	45.87	45.92	51.90	92.00	1,043.54	1,002.24	965.21	1,044.13	986.00

¹ and ²TOTALS represent weighted average calculations.

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELEGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS¹ 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	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	72%	63%	62%	67%	59%	64%	67%	60%	54%	58%	48%	59%	20%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	10%	0%	0%	33%	*	6%	66%	38%	43%	39%	*	51%	30%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0%	33%	0%	0%	*	9%	55%	46%	40%	49%	*	49%	17%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	10%	9%	10%	13%	*	10%	25%	0%	0%	*	*	14%	11%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	41%	21%	24%	14%	*	28%	18%	9%	4%	9%	*	10%	20%
Delmarva Power & Light	66%	57%	60%	66%	*	62%	40%	32%	30%	36%	*	35%	20%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	40%	54%	16%	62%	*	39%	31%	24%	32%	22%	*	28%	27%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	67%	43%	54%	57%	*	55%	26%
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	18%
Potomac Electric Power Company	78%	74%	75%	75%	*	76%	49%	49%	49%	49%	*	49%	20%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	43%	36%	40%	47%	*	41%	30%	25%	29%	34%	*	29%	28%
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	37%	32%
The Potomac Edison Company	36%	11%	12%	13%	*	20%	23%	14%	17%	24%	*	19%	17%
Washington Gas	5%	5%	6%	3%	*	5%	31%	21%	24%	25%	*	26%	10%
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	25%	40%	17%	100%	*	32%	31%
TOTALS	60%	50%	51%	55%	59%	54%	36%	27%	27%	32%	48%	31%	18%

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

¹ Customer is considered in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2014.

TABLE 7

AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS¹ 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	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	861.00	790.00	740.00	760.00	710.00	780.15	1,024.00	908	981	1,225	1,267	1,041	440.00
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0.00	175.00	0.00	0.00	*	175.00	246.00	208.00	266.00	286.00	*	240.05	220.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	337.00	483.00	294.00	185.00	*	348.20	74.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	74.00	164.23
Columbia Gas of Maryland	123.44	116.41	166.61	117.44	*	132.09	299.63	323.87	199.89	341.25	*	295.89	173.85
Delmarva Power & Light	1,434.00	1,318.00	1,347.00	1,424.00	*	1,383.07	771.00	738.00	744.00	704.00	*	750.03	539.00
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	68.00	82.00	41.00	152.00	*	83.89	91.00	94.00	89.00	90.00	33.00	90.23	161.00
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	522.00	407.00	531.00	390.00	*	487.32	166.00
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company²	*	*	*	*	*	*	579.00	579.00	579.00	579.00	*	579.00	345.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	624.12	536.74	557.64	510.03	*	576.93	344.06	348.34	376.34	359.89	*	354.16	219.46
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	313.00	175.00	161.00	469.00	*	278.08	326.00	288.00	347.00	239.00	*	313.13	237.00
Washington Gas	104.18	157.07	88.27	68.40	*	112.85	331.97	381.92	343.94	374.68	*	350.03	227.58
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS³	755.35	699.65	664.73	693.81	710.00	713.40	479.53	448.39	467.99	486.12	1255.13	486.28	263.01

¹Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is part due on March 31, 2014.

² Pepco didn't report the data due to a data error in the system.

³ This row represents weighted average calculation.

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 8

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

UTILITY	Compliance 2013-2014						Compliance 2012-2013					
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric ¹	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	65%	92%	79%	67%	*	76%	45%	68%	67%	100%	*	57%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	40%	0%	33%	*	*	36%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	83%	90%	92%	91%	*	89%	84%	89%	91%	97%	*	89%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	73%	80%	77%	73%	*	76%	73%	81%	81%	77%	*	78%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	45%	65%	78%	69%	*	61%
Elkton Gas	100%	100%	94%	92%	*	98%	*	*	*	*	*	99%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	97%	98%	98%	97%	*	98%	55%	54%	56%	28%	*	52%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	98%	99%	99%	99%	*	98%	98%	98%	98%	99%	*	98%
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	97%	84%	81%	79%	*	87%	93%	73%	78%	68%	*	80%
Washington Gas	90%	91%	90%	89%	*	90%	64%	67%	68%	71%	*	67%
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	94%	95%	95%	94%	*	95%	88%	88%	89%	87%	*	90%

¹ BGE, Columbia Gas of Maryland do not remove customers from USPP for failure to pay the amount due on two consecutive monthly bills.

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATION

UTILITY	USPP Participants						MEAP Eligible Non-Participants						Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	489	274	283	139	383	1,568	37	10	10	5	6	68	6,858
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	4	4	1	0	*	9	28
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	29	10	4	1	*	44	112
Choptank Electric Cooperative	47	28	24	5	*	104	0	0	0	0	*	0	123
Columbia Gas of Maryland	0	0	0	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	29
Delmarva Power & Light	38	17	18	5	*	78	9	1	0	1	*	11	357
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	0
Elkton Gas	1	0	0	0	*	1	0	0	0	0	*	0	4
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	53
Potomac Electric Power Company	17	6	8	3	*	34	0	0	0	0	*	0	336
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	*	*	0	0	0	0	*	0	648
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	1	0	2	0		3	1	0	0	1	*	2	106
Washington Gas	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	593	325	335	152	383	1,788	80	25	15	8	6	134	8,654

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 10

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

UTILITY	Poverty Level					Overall
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	41%	41%	41%	42%	28%	38%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	12%	9%	7%	17%	*	10%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	76%	55%	56%	62%	*	63%
Delmarva Power & Light	59%	55%	58%	60%	*	58%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	15%	11%	16%	23%	*	15%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	60%	53%	80%	75%	*	64%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	70%	55%	68%	67%	*	65%
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	56%	46%	54%	47%	*	52%
Washington Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0%
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	47%	43%	48%	48%	28%	44%

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 11

**PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELEGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS
WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY PROVERTY LEVEL**

UTILITY	USPP Participants						MEAP Eligible Non-Participants						Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	75%	77%	80%	80%	79%	78%	71%	76%	76%	79%	64%	72%	49%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	93%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	51%	41%	38%	41%	*	44%	100%	100%	100%	*	*	100%	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	100%	100%	99%	98%	*	99%	95%
Delmarva Power & Light	87%	86%	86%	83%	*	86%	97%	98%	98%	97%	*	97%	44%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	*	100%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	39%	42%	43%	41%	*	41%	51%	51%	51%	51%	*	51%	30%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	89%	92%	92%	88%	*	90%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	32%
The Potomac Edison Company	83%	86%	81%	89%	*	84%	78%	78%	80%	80%	*	79%	44%
Washington Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	99%
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	74%	75%	76%	77%	79%	76%	53%	57%	58%	59%	63%	55%	50%

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 12

**AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS
BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS**

UTILITY	Average 2013-2014 Grants (\$)						Average 2012-2013 Grants (\$)					
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	440.00	407.00	373.00	349.00	201.00	354.00	393.00	346.00	316.00	285.00	180.10	304.44
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	577.00	395.00	655.00	216.00	*	460.75	330.00	0.00	173.00	0.00	*	272.79
Choptank Electric Cooperative	364.00	314.00	315.00	308.00	*	325.25	351.00	306.00	299.00	281.00	*	315.01
Columbia Gas of Maryland	470.39	510.76	468.26	499.15	*	487.14	454.78	458.5	423.25	434.28	*	444.75
Delmarva Power & Light	265.00	265.00	265.00	265.00	*	265	*	*	*	*	*	255.00
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	275.429	249.609	232.800	239.769	*	520.32
Elkton Gas	257.00	272.00	225.00	324.00	*	269.5	*	*	*	*	*	215.50
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	306.00	306.00	306.00	306.00	*	306.00	*	*	*	*	*	303.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	304.89	286.25	270.07	262.09	*	280.825	336.73	331.48	314.29	297.13	*	327.29
The Commissioners of Thurmont	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	232.00	206.00	208.00	213.00	*	214.75	199.00	179.00	174.00	170.00	*	183.03
Washington Gas	416.49	398.32	455.06	468.23	*	434.525	418.1	421.24	429.66	448.12	*	425.20
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
TOTALS	363.28	336.03	354.04	321.05	201.00	339.77	350.28	244.29	233.68	227.26	180.10	240.55

* Data are not available, not available by poverty level, or utility with less than 5,000 customers.