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**Executive Summary**

The Utility Service Protection Program continued to accomplish its goal of minimizing the number of service terminations during the winter heating season. Participation levels for the 2005-2006 winter heating season were 8,638 greater than the level of participants for the 1995-1996 winter heating season and 5,445 greater than the 2004-2005 winter heating season.

Data reported by the participating utility companies indicated that 0.0912 percent of the USPP population was terminated during the 2005-2006 heating season as compared to

0.09 percent of participants terminated in the previous year's heating season. 1995-1996 data indicated that 0.0758 percent of USPP participants were terminated during the heating season. The low number of terminations indicates that the USPP is effective in keeping low­ income customers' service connected during the winter.

In addition to the USPP, MEAP, and EUSP providing assistance to low-income customers, all utilities providing electric or gas service in Maryland have programs dedicated to assist low-income customers. These programs are different from utility to utility, but all are focused on helping low-income customers with billing or other related issues.

The Commission believes that the survey results of the 2005-2006 heating season reflect the capability of the Utility Service Protection Program, and the utilities managing the program, to benefit low-income customers. Although the Commission sees nothing in the 2005-2006 heating season results alone to indicate the need for immediate changes in the USPP for the 2005-2006 heating season. However, the evolution of the Electric Universal Service Program and gas and electric choice programs may lead to a comprehensive review of USPP and related programs within the next few years.

**Background**

On March 1, 1988 the Maryland Public Service Commission ("PSC" or "the Commission") issued Order No. 67999 in Case No. 8091 which proposed to establish the Utility Service Protection Program ("USPP") to meet the requirements of Public Utility Companies Article ("PUC Article") § 7-307 of the Maryland Annotated Code (formerly Article 78, Section 54K). Section 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 Chapter 20.31.05 of the Code of Maryland Regulations ("COMAR").

The USPP is available to utility customers who are eligible and have made application for a grant from the Maryland Energy Assistance Program ("MEAP") administered by the Office of Home Energy Programs ("OHEP"). The USPP is designed to protect eligible low-income residential customers from utility service terminations during the winter. The USPP helps low-income customers avoid the accumulation of arrearages, which could lead to service terminations, by providing equal monthly utility payments for participants based on the estimated annual service cost to the household. The USPP allows customers in arrears to restore service by accepting the USPP equal payment plan and by bringing outstanding arrearages down to $400. The program encourages the utility to establish a supplemental monthly payment plan for customers with outstanding arrearages to reduce those arrearages. Maryland's gas and electric utilities are required to publicize and offer the USPP prior to November 1 of each year.

PUC Article §7-307 requires the Commission to submit an annual report to the General Assembly on terminations of service during the previous heating season. To facilitate the compilation of such reports, the Commission directs all gas and electric utilities to collect an array of data. See COMAR 20.31.05.09. By means of a Commission issued data request, 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 heat 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; 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; 8) the number of customers consuming more than 135% of the heating season system average; and 9) the average heating season cost of actual usage. This report provides the summary and analysis of that information.

**Data Reporting**

All investor owned utilities serving residential customers in Maryland submitted data for this report. The Commission's March 2006 data request contained the same questions as those in all USPP data requests since the 1990-91 reporting season. Consistent questions and data reporting procedures have contributed to the yearly comparability of the information contained in this report.

Pursuant to COMAR 20.31.05.0lC, the Hagerstown Light Department ("Hagerstown") operates an approved alternative USPP 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. In addition, Hagerstown and three other utilities were not required to answer all the questions contained in the Commission's data request because these utilities are either municipally-owned or have fewer than 5,000 residential customers.

**Program Participation**

Table 1 presents the number of USPP participants and eligible non-participants by utility. The eligible income brackets are separated into three categories: Poverty Level I (0- 50%), Poverty Level II (51-100%), and Poverty Level III (101-150%), with Poverty Level I being the lowest income bracket. The poverty levels are based on Federal guidelines. 1

For a complete explanation of the Federal Poverty Guidelines and Threshold please refer to

During the 2005-2006 heating season 58,725 eligible customers participated in USPP. This constituted 3,363 more participants than during the 2004-2005 heating season and 14,349 more participants than during the 1995-96 heating season. There were 41,315 participants in the 1995-96 heating season. The total eligible population for the 2005-2006 heating season was 70,645 customers, an increase of 5,445 since the 2004-2005 heating season Baltimore Gas and Electric Company ("BGE") provided service to 58.4% of all USPP participants. BGE had 2,347 more USPP participants and 1,890 more eligible non­ participants than in the 2005-2006 heating season. The increase in USPP participation may be due to extensive outreach activities conducted by BGE, OHEP, the Maryland Office of People's Counsel ("OPC"), and the Commission, combined with a major increase in the cost of gas, electricity and other fuels in addition to changes in BGE's service termination practices. Under BGE's policy, special agreements are cancelled and the process to terminate service begins when bills become 90 or more days past due.2 If this policy significantly reduced the number of low-income customers receiving service or able to return to service through a supplemental payment arrangement, the number of BGE customers receiving MEAP and participating in USPP would also be reduced.

Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco") had 7,888 or 13.4% of the USPP eligible, participating population. For the last three years Pepco has had 13% of the State's USPP population.

Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative ("SMECO") saw its number of eligible participants fall from 483 in 2004-2005 to 444 in 2005-2006. SMECO is aware of the decrease and is working closely with OHEP and outside contractors to rectify the declining USPP enrollment. Most utilities showed an increase in USPP participation although Delmarva Power and Light Company ("Delmarva") experienced a decrease of 300 participants and a 123 non-participant increase for MEAP-only customers.

Table 2 presents USPP participation as a percentage of the total number of MEAP­ eligible customers for 2005-2006 and 2004-2005. The overall rate of customer participation

the following websites: [www.aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/04povertv](http://www.aspe.hhs.gov/poverty/04povertv) and [www.ncat.org/liheap.](http://www.ncat.org/liheap)

2 Although BGE's internal credit and collection policy have changed, BGE continues to operate under the otherwise applicable COMAR provisions on service terminations.

in the USPP for all utilities is 86%, which reflects a 3% decrease from the 2004-2005 results. The overall participation rate was 66% for the 1995-1996 heating season. Washington Gas­ Maryland Gas Division experienced an increased participation rate of 10%. SMECO, Potomac Edison, Berlin, Elkton Gas, and Easton experienced a decrease in participation rates of 10% or greater. The other utilities had either nominal increases or decreases m participation rates or remained the same as compared to the 2004 -2005 heating season.

Participation levels tend to be lower for smaller utilities versus the larger utilities. For example, over 88% of eligible BGE customers participate in the USPP program versus 11% of Chesapeake Utilities, Citizens Gas Division, and 20% for Easton Utilities Gas Division. It is quite likely that the availability of EUSP has increased eligible customer participation in the USPP. The Commission has generally addressed low participation rates on a case-by­ case basis. However, the Commission also works closely with OHEP and the utilities as a group to explore ways to encourage customer participation in the USPP. The Commission Staff is a member of the OHEP Advisory Board, OHEP Statewide Outreach Team, and Energy Advocates. These groups are dedicated to developing ways to assist low-income customers with their energy bills.

Table 3 presents the percentage of USPP participants who were also enrolled in the program during the 2004-2005 heating season. Overall, only 55% of the 2005-2006 participants were participants in the 2004-2005 heating season. Fifty-three percent (53%) of the 2004-2005 participants were also in the program the previous year. Historical data shows that 51% of the 1995-1996 participants participated in the 1993-94 heating season.

Equal Monthly Payments and Actual Heating Season Usage

Table 4 compares average equal monthly billings to actual usage for USPP participants. This Table shows clearly that equal monthly payments reduced the overall impact of higher utility usage during the heating season.

The average monthly payments are calculated based on the previous year's actual usage. The overall average monthly payment for all utilities was $109.74. The actual monthly payments are an average of five billing months, November through March for 2005- 2006. The overall average actual monthly usage for the 2005-2006 heating season was

$163.73. Although this data reflects what consumers paid and actually used, it does not necessarily reflect the norm. According to Maryland data obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA),3 November 2005, January 2006, February 2006, and March 2006 were above the average temperature maintained by that agency. December 2005 was below the average temperature maintained by that agency. November 2005 temperature was above average ranking 99th out of 111 with a mean temperature of 48.3 degrees Fahrenheit. The average temperature for November is 45.05 degrees Fahrenheit. December 2005 temperature was below average, ranking 32nd with a mean temperature of 33.3 degrees Fahrenheit. The average temperature for a Maryland December is 35.35 degrees Fahrenheit. January 2006 temperature was significantly above average ranking 106 out of **111** with a mean temperature of 41 degrees Fahrenheit. The average temperature for January in Maryland is 32.60 degrees Fahrenheit. February 2006 was above average ranking 78th with a mean temperature of 35.4 degrees Fahrenheit. The average temperature for February in Maryland is 33.70 degrees. March 2006 temperatures were slightly above average, ranking 77th with a mean temperature of 44.6 degrees Fahrenheit. The average temperature for March is 42.38 degrees Fahrenheit.

The average temperature for November 2004, December 2004, January 2005, and February 2005 were either close to or significantly above average monthly temperatures maintained by that agency. March 2005 ranked as a colder than average month. The average temperature for March 2005 was 39.1 degrees Fahrenheit. In comparison, the average monthly temperatures for the 2003-2004 heating season were at or above the historical averages, with the exception of January 2004. However, the average monthly temperatures for the 2002-2003 and 2001-2002 heating seasons were among the coldest in the past ten years. Data for previous years indicated that actual monthly usage was down and average monthly payments were lower because the average winter temperature was higher. The tables included in this report are not seasonally adjusted to reflect a normal Maryland heating season. Nor do the tables in this report reflect the volatility in the natural gas market resulting in significant increases. Therefore, future results in this category may seem comparatively low when they are actually normal. The overall weighted average monthly

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) maintains the world's largest

archive of weather data at the National Climate Data Center (NCDC, Climate at a Glance). The NCDC has archived weather data dating back to 1895. Items in their system are ranked from 1-111 with one being the coldest average temperature and 111 being the warmest temperature. One can run queries isolating mean temperature according to months, seasons, and other variables.

payment for the 1995-96 heating season was $91.09 with an overall weighted average actual monthly usage of $120.66.

**Supplemental Payments and Arrearages**

Equal monthly payments are not the only payment obligation many USPP participants have to the utility. 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. For the purpose of this report, these special agreements are called "supplemental arrearages", and the payments on the special agreements are called "supplemental payments." 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 making their USPP equal monthly payments and their supplemental payments in a timely fashion.

Table 5 presents the percentage ofUSPP participants making supplemental payments, the average monthly amount of those payments, and the average "supplemental arrearage" which led to those payments. Twenty-two percent (22%) of Poverty Level I customers for all utilities make supplemental payments. The average monthly supplemental payment is

$37.80, and the average supplement arrearage amount is $312.26. Twenty-three percent (23%) of Poverty Level II and sixteen percent of Poverty Level III customers are making supplemental payments. The average monthly payment amounts are $37.35 and $52.94, respectively. The average arrearage amounts are $306.21 and $189.70, respectively.

Less than five percent (5%) of all or certain Poverty Levels of BGE, Choptank, Easton Utilities, and Elkton Gas eligible population are making supplemental payments. Sixty percent or more of the eligible populations of Columbia Gas of Maryland, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Pepco are making supplemental payments.

Data for 2004-2005 for all utilities indicated that twenty-one percent of Poverty Level I customers make supplemental payments. The average monthly supplemental payment is

$33.77, and the average supplement arrearage amount is $421.39. Twenty-seven percent of Poverty Level II and eighteen percent of Poverty Level III customers are making

supplemental payments. The average monthly payment amounts are $32.65 and $47.15, respectively. The average arrearage amounts are $360.03 and $256.78.

Data collected during 1995-1996 for all utilities indicated that 52% of Level I customers, 43% of Level II customers, and 42% of Level III customers were making supplemental payments. The average monthly amount of the supplemental payments were

$19.56 for Level I customers, $17.26 for Level II customers, and $21.45 for Level III customers. The average arrearages on which the supplemental payments were based were

$408.40 for Level I customers, $364.64 for Level II customers, and $335.79 for Level III

customers.

**Participant Arrearages and Program Compliance**

Table 6 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP eligible non­ participants, and all other utility residential customers in arrears as of March 31, 2006. In the case of USPP participants, this means that the customer has failed to pay the total amount due on at least one equal monthly billing.

Overall, 2005-2006 USPP participants were more likely to be in arrears to the utility than eligible non-participants. For all utilities 41% of USPP participants, 32% of eligible non-participants, and 15% of non-eligible customers are currently in arrears. Overall, BGE had the highest percentage of USPP participants in arrears at 55%, a nominal increase from 54% in 2004-2005. Elkton Gas Service showed a significant increase of program participants in arrears for Poverty Level III, up from 45% in the 2004-2005 heating season to 79% in the 2005-2006 heating season. Washington Gas Light Company - Maryland Division decreased from 62% in 2003-2004 to 23% in 2004-2005 to 17% in 2005-2006. This may be attributed to Washington Gas Light Company's Residential Essential Service Program that rewards low-income customers with a bill credit if they keep their bills current. Looking at utilities individually, nine utilities reported decreased percentages of participants in arrears; two utilities reported an increase in the number of USPP participants in arrears; three showed no change at all. Forty-four percent of USPP participants, 44% of eligible non-participants, and 19% ofnon-MEAP customers were in arrears for the 1995-1996 reporting year.

Overall weighted average data for all utilities indicates that only 15% of non-program participant customers are in arrears. Non-program participant customers may be least likely to have an arrearage for several reasons. First, these customers are subject to termination during the winter heating season ifthe amount past due is not paid. Second, non-low-income customers usually have other financial resources to "tap" in the event of an utility arrearage. Third, non-low-income customers are usually better able to budget their utility bills because the utility bill represents a smaller portion of net income.

Table 7 presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-eligible customers currently in arrears. The dollar amount of the overall average arrearage for USPP participants was $317.62 for all utilities and

$296.66 for MEAP eligible non-participants. Delmarva Power and Light Company had, by

far, the highest average arrearage for USPP participants and MEAP eligible non-participants, reporting $802.11 and $1,079.51, respectively. As compared to 2004-2005 data, eight utilities reported increased average arrearages for USPP customers, and four utilities reported decreased average arrearages. For all utilities that provided service in the 2004-2005 heating season the overall weighted average for USPP participants and MEAP eligible non­ participants was $325.47 and $324.55 respectively. For the 1995-96 heating season the overall arrearage amount for USPP participants was $345.02. The overall arrearage amount for MEAP eligible non-participants was $378.86; the arrearage amount for non-MEAP customers was $206.38.

Table 8 presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for 2005-2006 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. The May 1st deadline for the data request (and the fact that most utilities needed to prepare data at least one week earlier) possibly contributes to an upward bias in the compliance rates presented in Table 8. Due to the different billing cycles, most utilities did not have information as to how many were in arrears for March, and thus potentially in arrears for two consecutive months, at the time their data was compiled.

The overall 2004-2005 compliance for all utilities was 82%, which represents the same level for the last two years. Data for 1995-1996 shows further evidence of consistency

in compliance, with the overall compliance at 81%. Overall compliance differed little by poverty level. Compliance rates varied considerably for the different utilities. The overall compliance level for most utilities has increased or remained relatively constant except for SMECO, Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division, and Washington Gas Light Company - Maryland Gas Division. Delmarva Power and Light Company and Columbia Gas of Maryland are still unable to supply compliance numbers by Poverty Level. The overall compliance rate for SMECO for the 2005-2006 year was 41%, which reflects a 42 percentage point decrease from 2004-2005. The overall compliance level for Washington Gas Light Company - Maryland Division increased significantly in all Poverty Levels.

**Heating** Season **Terminations**

The primary purpose of the USPP is the prevention of service terminations during the heating season. Table 9 presents the number of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers who had their service terminated during the heating season. Three hundred sixty-three (363) USPP participants, 169 MEAP eligible non-participants, and 5,143 non-MEAP customers were terminated during the 2005-2006 winter heating season. During the 2004-2005 heating season the service of 487 USPP participants, 205 eligible non­ participants, and 6,666 eligible non-MEAP customers was terminated.

A substantial portion of all (USPP, MEAP, and non-MEAP) customer terminations occur in the service territories of BGE, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Potomac Electric Power Company. Twenty - three percent of USPP participant terminations occurred in BGE's service territory. Twenty - one percent (21%) of USPP participant terminations occurred in Delmarva Power and Light Company's territory. Forty-six ofUSPP terminations occurred in Pepco's service territory. A similar situation continues for MEAP eligible non­ participants. BGE terminated 30 or 0.7% of its MEAP eligible non-participants. Whereas, Chesapeake Utilities (Cambridge Gas and Citizens Gas) terminated 9 and 13%, respectively. It appears that BGE terminates more customers as compared to the other utilities. But when a thorough examination is made, it can be determined that BGE terminates less than one percent of its population.

Data from 1995-1996 indicated that there were over 62,581 USPP and eligible non­ participants. During the 1995-96 heating season there were 1,748 winter heating season

terminations. At that time most of the terminations occurred in the service territory of Potomac Electric Power Company, Delmarva Power and Light Company, and Chesapeake Utilities Citizens Gas Division.

**High Energy Consumption**

Table 10 presents the percentage of USPP participants who consumed more than 135% of the system average for the utility providing service. In 1992, in cooperation with the Weatherization Assistance Program ("WAP"), utilities developed a prioritized list of customers eligible for weatherization assistance. BGE was exempted from maintaining a list of all eligible customers using more than 135% of system average energy for the heating season because BGE has company-specific low-income weatherization assistance programs. Although exempted from responding to this question, BGE realized the importance of low­ income customers with energy usage greater that 135% of the system average. Therefore, BGE continues to collect data in this area. For the 2005-2006 heating season 33% of Poverty Level I, 31 % of Poverty Level II, and 32% of Poverty Level III participants consumed more than 135% of the system average energy between November and March. Overall, 31% of USPP customers consumed amounts of electricity and gas greater than 135% of the system average.

BGE, Columbia Gas, Delmarva Power and Light, Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division, Potomac Edison and Pepco had a moderate to high overall percentage of USPP customers consuming more than 135% of the system average. Choptank Electric Cooperative was unable to respond to this data request. For most utilities, it is clear that significant numbers of low-income customers could benefit from weatherization and energy conservation programs.

**Primary Heat Source**

Table 11 presents the percentage of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers whose primary heat source is the energy provided by the indicated utility. Overall for all utilities, 75% of USPP customers, 64% of eligible non-participants, and 48% of non-MEAP customers receive their primary heat source from the utility responding to the data request. The 2004-2005 results indicated that 75% of USPP

customers, 79% of eligible non-participants, and 50% of non-MEAP customers receive their primary source of heat from a utility. Interestingly, Choptank Electric Cooperative had only 30% of its USPP customers receive their primary heat source from the utility, and 100% of its eligible non-participants received their primary heat source from the utility. Chesapeake Utilities Citizens-Gas Division, Easton Utilities Gas and Electric Divisions, and Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division are the primary heat source for 100% of their USPP participants and eligible non-participants.

**MEAP Grants**

Table 12 presents the average MEAP grant payable to the utility at the time of customer enrollment. Most utilities also included supplemental awards in their reports. The overall average 2005-2006 MEAP grant for all utilities was $356.61 versus $338.52 in 2004- 2005. The overall average for all utilities varied from $439.44 for Poverty Level I customers,

$360.99 for Poverty Level II customers, and $280.65 for Poverty Level III customers.

**Conclusion**

The Utility Service Protection Program continued to accomplish its goal of minimizing the number of service terminations during the winter heating season. The participation level for the 2005-2006 winter heating season showed 8,638 more participants than for the 1995-1996 winter heating season and 5,445 more participants than during the 2004-2005 winter heating season.

Data reported by the participating utility companies indicated that 0.0912 percent of the USPP population was terminated during the 2005-2006 heating season as compared to

0.09 percent of participants terminated in the previous year's heating season. Data from 1995-1996 indicated that 0.0758 percent of USPP participants were terminated during the heating season. The low number of terminations indicates that the USPP is effective in keeping low-income customers' service connected during the winter.

In addition to the USPP, MEAP, and EUSP providing assistance to low-income customers, all utilities which provide electric or gas service in Maryland have programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers. These programs are different from utility to

utility, but all are focused on helping low-income customers with billing or other related issues. Some gas or joint utilities offer specialized programs to their low-income customers. For example, Washington Gas Light Company ("WGL") has a pilot program, and Baltimore Gas and Electric Company has two well-established programs for low-income customers. Washington Gas Light Company has a Residential Essential Services4 (RES) pilot program that has been operating since January 2004. This program is only open to MEAP-eligible customers who are current on their gas utility bills. Through the 2004-2005 heating season, over 2,300 RES participants have received over $95,000 in cash assistance from the RES program. 5

As previously stated, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company has two well-established programs for low-income customers. The first is Customer Assistance Maintenance Program (CAMP).6 Under CAMP, USPP participants may receive as much as a $144 yearly credit on their total utility bills if the customer remains current on the monthly utility bill. Last year, 21,239 low-income customers received 111,266 CAMP credits or $1,089,164 in cash assistance. BGE also offers the Conservation Home Improvement Program (CHIP). Through CHIP, BGE provides funding for weatherization measures such as wall and attic insulation installation and gas furnace repair or replacement for low-income customers. Funding for CHIP7 is provided by BGE in conjunction with the Department of Energy and the State of Maryland Weatherization Program. For calendar year 2005, 322 low-income customers' homes were weatherized at a cost of $651,000. Furnaces were replaced in 80 homes through CHIP totaling over $ $270,000.

Responding to the USPP data request in a timely manner is still challenging for many utilities, the Commission is working on a solution to this problem.

4 Funding for this program is from two components. The Company contributes $50,000 annually and any additional funding is charged to firm customers through the Company's Firm Credit Adjustment.

5 The Company's report on the 2005-2006 heating season is not due until June 30, 2006, therefore data

for that period is not yet available to the Commission.

1. Funding for this program comes directly from avoided costs associated with credit and collections services.
2. Funding for this program is derived from an embedded gas conservation surcharge.

The survey results of the 2005-2006 heating season reflect the capability of the Utility Service Protection Program, and the utilities managing the program, to benefit low-income customers. Terminations remained low. Only 0.61%, ofUSPP participants were terminated during the winter heating season.8 Sixty-percent (60%) of all program,participants and 64% of eligible non-participants were able to make current bill payments in a timely manner avoiding arrearages. Although the 2005-2006 heating season results alone do not indicate the need for immediate changes in the USPP for the 2005-2006 heating season, the evolution of the Electric Universal Service Program and gas and electric choice programs may lead to a comprehensive review ofUSPP and related programs within the next few years.

This number does not reflect the number of terminations that occur when the winter heating season officially ends. Utility companies terminate many consumers April l 51 or some day thereafter because some customers do not pay their utilities bills during the winter. Many customers are aware that their utility service probably will not be terminated during the winter therefore, they simply do not pay their utility bill.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF 2005 - 2006 USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | USPP Participants | | | | Elb.dble Non-Participants | | | | Overall |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Total | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Total | Total |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 7,959 | 5,721 | 20,649 | 34,329 | 1,579 | 748 | 2,504 | 4,831 | 39,160 |
| Chesapeake Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge Gas Division | 21 | 17 | 14 | 52 | 110 | 138 | 67 | 315 | 367 |
| Citizens Gas Division | 19 | 31 | 22 | 72 | 122 | 257 | 228 | 607 | 679 |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 614 | 608 | 539 | 1,761 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1,767 |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 500 | 462 | 498 | 1,460 | 261 | 307 | 431 | 999 | 2,459 |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 1,995 | 1,493 | 1,330 | 4,818 | 404 | 305 | 309 | 1,018 | 5,836 |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 71 | 46 | 46 | 163 | 103 | 94 | 92 | 289 | 452 |
| Gas | 14 | 8 | 12 | 34 | 56 | 44 | 37 | 137 | 171 |
| Elkton Gas Service | 95 | 64 | 43 | 202 | 50 | 46 | 79 | 175 | 377 |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 94 | 37 | 44 | 175 | 111 | 79 | 84 | 274 | 449 |
| Hagerstown Municipal Electric | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | 48 | 225 | 32 | 305 | 305 |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 1,569 | 942 | 963 | 3,474 | 106 | 85 | 187 | 378 | 3,852 |
| Mayor & Council - Berlin | 4 | 9 | 11 | 24 | 7 | 20 | 57 | 84 | 108 |
| Potomac Edison | 1,083 | 1,373 | 1,279 | 3,735 | 559 | 424 | 355 | 1,338 | 5,073 |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 2,095 | 1,619 | 4,174 | 7,888 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7,890 |
| Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative | 13 | 40 | 44 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 200 | 99 | 145 | 444 | 551 | 340 | 271 | 1,162 | 1,606 |
| TOTALS: | 16,346 | 12,569 | 29,813 | 58,728 | 4,069 | 3,115 | 4,736 | 11,920 | 70,648 |

\*\* Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE2

USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH POVERTY LEVEL, 2005 - 2006 AND 2004 - 2005

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | 2005 - 2006 Particioation | | | | 2004 - 2005 Particioation | | | |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 83% | 88% | 89% | 88% | 86% | 88% | 93% | 91% |
| Chesapeake Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge Gas Division | 16% | 11% | 17% | 15% | 13% | 13% | 23% | 20% |
| Citizens Gas Division | 13% | 11% | 9% | 11% | 17% | 13% | 10% | 13% |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 99% | 99% |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 66% | 60% | 54% | 60% | 72% | 66% | 67% | 67% |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 83% | 83% | 81% | 83% | 85% | 80% | 84% | 83% |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 41% | 33% | 33% | 36% | 56% | 52% | 40% | 48% |
| Gas | 20% | 15% | 24% | 20% | 21% | 42% | 50% | 43% |
| Elkton Gas Service | 66% | 58% | 35% | 54% | 72% | 67% | 70% | 69% |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 46% | 32% | 34% | 39% | 27% | 38% | 36% | 36% |
| Hagerstown Municipal Electric | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Washington Gas- Maryland Division | 94% | 92% | 84% | 90% | 94% | 76% | 75% | 80% |
| Mayor & Council - Berlin | 36% | 31% | 16% | 22% | 29% | 44% | 46% | 44% |
| Potomac Edison | 66% | 76% | 78% | 74% | 87% | 86% | 88% | 87% |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 27% | 23% | 35% | 28% | 32% | 34% | 35% | 34% |
| ALL UTILITIES: | 84% | 86% | 88% | 86% | 85% | 86% | 92% | 89% |

\*\*The City of Hagerstown offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers

PERCENTAGE OF 2005- 2006 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE 2004-2005 HEATING SEASON

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | Povert Level | | | |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 49% | 58% | 63% | 59% |
| Chesapeake, Citizens Gas | 5% | 10% | 14% | 10% |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 20% | 17% | 18% | 18% |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 38% | 42% | 37% | 39% |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 46% | 54% | 41% | 47% |
| Gas | 57% | 75% | 50% | 59% |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 81% | 76% | 71% | 77% |
| Potomac Edison | 32% | 68% | 66% | 57% |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 55% | 75% | 62% | 63% |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | \* | \* | \* |  |
| ALL UTILITIES: | 47% | 55% | 60% | 55% |

\* Data is Not Available

AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR 2005 - 2006 USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | Averae:e Monthly Payments($) | | | | Avera2e Actual Monthly Usae;e ($)\* | | | |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 140.00 | 143.00 | 125.00 | 131.48 | 245.08 | 241.24 | 217.43 | 227.81 |
| Chesapeake, Citizens Gas | 97.00 | 108.00 | 114.00 | 106.93 | 177.40 | 180.00 | 172.40 | 176.99 |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 85.00 | 82.00 | 93.00 | 86.41 | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | 124.62 |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 86.04 | 92.12 | 97.31 | 91.81 | 215.34 | 217.55 | 208.99 | 213.87 |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 97.17 | 98.72 | 101.57 | 98.86 | 106.09 | 108.95 | 106.82 | 107.18 |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 161.00 | 113.00 | 120.00 | 135.88 |
| Gas | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 114.00 | 155.00 | 95.00 | 116.94 |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 86.00 | 87.00 | 86.00 | 86.21 | 155.00 | 148.60 | 151.40 | 152.74 |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 99.33 | 107.05 | 105.85 | 103.23 | 153.11 | 153.88 | 122.06 | 144.71 |
| Potomac Edison | 83.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.58 | 51.60 | 48.60 | 48.20 | 49.33 |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 59.00 | 54.00 | 65.00 | 61.15 | 96.00 | 98.00 | 101.00 | 99.06 |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 121.27 | 122.40 | 109.32 | 117.62 | 170.78 | 178.84 | 176.85 | 174.56 |
| ALL UTILITIES WEIGHTED AVERAGE: | 91.47 | 101.16 | 107.33 | 109.73 | 168.85 | 144.65 | 173.56 | 163.73 |

Average monthly usage for five billing months ofNov.-March

\*Utility is unable to supply date

\*\*Not Available by Poverty Level

TABLES

PERCENTAGE OF 2005-2006 USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENATAL PAYMENTS\*, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

Percentage of USPP Customers Average Monthly Amount of Average Supplemental Arrearage

UTILITY Makin!! Sunnlemental Pavments Sunnlemental Payments ($) ($)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 0.214% | 0.192% | 0.228% | 99.00 | 137.00 | 130.00 | 689.00 | 1081.00 | $974.00 |
| Chesapeake |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge Gas | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Citizens Gas | 5% | 13% | 0% | 67.00 | 65.00 | 0.00 | 400.00 | 306.00 | 0.00 |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 0% | 0% | 0% | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 73% | 66% | 61% | 17.00 | 21.60 | 26.31 | 400.02 | 389.03 | 333.68 |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 62% | 58% | 63% | 11.70 | 13.78 | 17.56 | 642.32 | 641.63 | 608.63 |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 14% | 9% | 17% | 83.00 | 135.00 | 103.00 | 211.00 | 286.00 | 220.00 |
| Gas | 0% | 0% | 17% | 130.00 | 0.00 | 150.00 | 382.00 | 0.00 | 466.00 |
| Elkton Gas Service | 0% | 0% | 0% | 23 | 21 | 20 | 302 | 250 | 241 |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 16% | 32% | 20% | 0.00 | 0.00 | 25.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 294.00 |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 4% | 3% | 3% | 97.07 | 107.11 | 104.25 | 342.33 | 349.47 | 378.73 |
| Mayor & Council - Berlin | 0% | 11% | 27% | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Potomac Edison | 30% | 27% | 34% | 42.00 | 40.00 | 42.00 | 384.00 | 412.00 | 365.00 |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 76% | 78% | 74% | 59.00 | 54.00 | 65.00 | 22.00 | 21.00 | 24.00 |
| Southern Maryland Electirc CooperativE | 11% | 10% | 7% | 31.53 | 11.71 | 32.50 | 323.55 | 262.29 | 378.28 |
| IALL UTILITm:S WEIGHT.EU  AVERAGE | 22% | 23% | 16% | 37.80 | 37.35 | 52.94 | 312.26 | 306.21 | 189.70 |

\*Under COMAR 20.31.01.08 \*\*Not required to provide this inform \*\*\*Required data not supplied.

TABLE6

PERCENTAGE OF 2005 - 2006 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS\* BY POVERTY LEVEL

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | USPP Participants | | | | Eli1!ible Non-Participants | | | | Non-MEAP |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150o/i | Overall | Customers |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 61% | 52% | 53% | 55% | 48% | 46% | 49% | 48% | 8% |
| Chesapeake Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge Gas Division | 10% | 6% | 7% | 8% | 52% | 41% | 48% | 46% | 28% |
| Citizens Gas Division | 0% | 10% | 14% | 8% | 43% | 39% | 33% | 38% | 18% |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 8% | 8% | 11% | 9% | 50% | 0% | 67% | 50% | 15% |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 33% | 24% | 19% | 25% | 24% | 17% | 18% | 19% | 34% |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 33% | 30% | 36% | 33% | 34% | 28% | 29% | 31% | 46% |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 8% | 2% | 9% | 7% | 10% | 12% | 5% | 9% | 4% |
| Gas | 0% | 0% | 17% | 6% | 4% | 9% | 3% | 5% | 11% |
| Elkton Gas Service | 35% | 36% | 79% | 45% | 52% | 28% | 34% | 38% | 19% |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 45% | 32% | 18% | 35% | 0% | 37% | 33% | 41% | 16% |
| City of Hagerstown | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | 50% | 19% | 34% | 26% | 12% |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 17% | 18% | 17% | 17% | 31% | 16% | 37% | 31% | 22% |
| Mayor & Council - Berlin | 0% | 0% | 9% | 5% | 14% | 40% | 53% | 46% | 15% |
| Potomac Edison | 25% | 10% | 10% | 14% | 13% | 7% | 10% | 10% | 12% |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 21% | 17% | 22% | 21% | na | 0% | 0% | 0% | 16% |
| Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 3% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 17% | 8% | 4% | 11% | 39% |
| WEIGHTED AVERAGE ALL  UTILITIES: | 41% | 34% | 43% | 41% | 32% | 25% | 36% | 32% | 15% |

\* Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2004

\*\*Not Available

\*\*\*Operates approved alternate USPP na No customers in this category

s

TABLE7

AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR 2005 - 2006 USPP PA.RTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS\* BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY USPP Participants *($1* MEAP Elie:ible Non-Participants ($) Non-MEAP

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-50o/o | 51-lOOo/o | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50o/o | 51-lOOo/o | 101-1500/o | Overall | Customers ($) |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 349.00 | 333.00 | 279.00 | 305.50 | 290.00 | 289.00 | 257.00 | 272.45 | 355.00 |
| Chesapeake, Citizens Gas | 0.00 | 61.00 | 107.00 | 84.00 | 178.00 | 162.00 | 157.00 | 163.97 | 165.00 |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 422.31 | 460.19 | 428.08 | 435.81 | 299.27 | 97.44 | 690.31 | 340.03 | 164.58 |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 220.13 | 231.19 | 290.69 | 241.40 | 237.40 | 200.36 | 274.67 | 233.43 | 183.68 |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 655.93 | 663.10 | 631.40 | 650.49 | 901.00 | 796.51 | 734.12 | 823.86 | 273.92 |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 352.00 | 800.00 | 272.00 | 363.64 | 365.00 | 409.00 | 692.00 | 446.50 | 730.00 |
| Gas | 298.00 | 0.00 | 507.00 | 402.50 | 566.00 | 746.00 | 367.00 | 603.88 | 900.00 |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 147.00 | 89.00 | 287.00 | 153.84 | 256.00 | 284.00 | 236.00 | 258.27 | 96.00 |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 193.00 | 195.00 | 220.00 | 201.03 | 362.41 | 335.30 | 392.46 | 377.14 | 309.40 |
| Potomac Edison | 142.00 | 161.00 | 137.00 | 145.81 | 187.00 | 172.00 | 166.00 | 178.44 | 94.00 |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 251.00 | 253.00 | 278.00 | 266.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 147.00 |
| Southern Maryland Electirc Cooperative | 19.00 | 78.00 | 6.00 | 24.75 | 636.29 | 575.40 | 314.88 | 596.30 | 130.40 |
| Overall Weighted Average: | 352.34 | 347.03 | 289.86 | 317.62 | 339.35 | 286.58 | 268.41 | 296.66 | 251.82 |

\* Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2004

\*\*Not Available by Poverty Level

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS 2005 - 2006 and 2004 - 2005 BY POVERTY LEVEL

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | Compliance 2005-2006 | | | | Compliance 2004-2005 | | | |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Chesapeake Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge Gas Division | 67% | 76% | 86% | 75% | 40% | 100% | 86% | 85% |
| Citizens Gas Division | 63% | 65% | 82% | 69% | 67% | 92% | 92% | 86% |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 89% | 89% | 92% | 90% | 91% | 94% | 99% | 95% |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Delmarva Power & Light | \* | \* | \* | 45% | \* | \* | \* | 41% |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 90% | 100% | 91% | 93% | 88% | 96% | 97% | 95% |
| Gas | 0% | 100% | 83% | 94% | 0% | 90% | 100% | 89% |
| Elkton Gas Service | 97% | 88% | 81% | 91% | 95% | 99% | 98% | 98% |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 87% | 84% | 80% | 85% | 100% | 100% | 97% | 97% |
| Hagerstown Municipal Elec. | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 55% | 63% | 64% | 60% | 10% | 39% | 47% | 36% |
| Mayor & Council - Berlin | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Potomac Edison | 83% | 92% | 92% | 90% | 90% | 94% | 94% | 93% |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 76% | 78% | 74% | 76% | 69% | 83% | 73% | 76% |
| Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 47% | 41% | 33% | 41% | 84% | 81% | 84% | 83% |
| ALL UTILITIES: | 75% | 76% | 88% | 82% | 78% | 78% | 85% | 82% |

* + Unable to supply data, therefore comparison is unavailable

\*\*Operates approved alternate USPP

\*\*\* No USPP participants

TABLE9

NUMBER OF 2005 - 2006 WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | USPP Participants | | | | MEAP Eli2ible Non-Participants | | | | Non-MEAP |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Total | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Total | Customers |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 36 | 17 | 31 | 84 | 16 | 4 | 10 | 30 | 716 |
| Chesapeake Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cambridge Gas Division | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 8 | 9 | 29 | 68 |
| Citizens Gas Division | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 20 | 34 | 25 | 79 | 352 |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 1 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 168 |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 38 | 20 | 21 | 79 | 8 | 3 | 8 | 19 | 997 |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| Gas | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Elkton Gas Service | 7 | *5* | *5* | 17 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 126 |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hagerstown Municipal Electric | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | \*\* | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mayor & Council - Berlin | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Potomac Edison | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 46 | 30 | 92 | 168 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,542 |
| Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| TOTALS: | \* | \* | \* | 363 | \* | \* | \* | 169 | 5,143 |

* + Data not available by povety level

\*\*Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY FOR NOVEMBER 2005 - MARCH 2006

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| UTILITY | Poverty Level | | | | |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | | 101-150% | Overall |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 44% | 43% | | 32% | 36% |
| Chesapeake, Citizens Gas | 5% | 10% | | 14% | 10% |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | \*\* | \*\* | | \*\* | \*\* |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | \* | \* | | \* | 21% |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 30% | 32% | | 33% | 31% |
| Easton Utilities .. |  |  | |  |  |
| Electric | 0% | 0% | | 0% | 0% |
| Gas | 0% | 0% | | 0% | 0% |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 56% | 57% | | 68% | 59% |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 2% | 5% | | 4% | 3% |
| Potomac Edison | 63% | 37% | | 40% | 45% |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 25% | 27% | | 29% | 27% |
| Southern Maryland Electirc Cooperative | 7% | 15% | | 12% | 10% |
| All Utilities: | 33% | 3 | 1% | 29% | 31% |

\* Utility provides improved weatherization priority list and is no longer required to maintain this data

\*\*Utility is unable to respond to data request

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF 2005 - 2006 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 |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | Customers |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 79% | 83% | 84% | 83% | 42% | 81% | 39% | 47% | 47% |
| Chesapeake, Citizens Gas | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 91% |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 32% | 2,8% | 29% | 30% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 17% |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 97% | 94% | 94% | 95% | 94% |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 63% | 64% | 57% | 61% | 96% | 96% | 97% | 96% | 46% |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | \* |
| Gas | 0% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | \* |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| City of Hagerstown | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \*\*\* | \* | \* | \* | \* | \* |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99% |
| Potomac Edison | 70% | 66% | 65% | 67% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 39% |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 59% | 52% | 46% | 53% | n/a | 50% | 0% | 50% | \* |
| Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative | 57% | 72% | 65% | 64% | 60% | 74% | 77% | 68% | 28% |
| TOTALS: | 74% | 73% | 76% | 75% | 66% | 78% | 61% | 64% | 48% |

\*Not Available

\*\*\* Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 12

AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT\* FOR 2005-2006 AND 2004-2005 USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY Average 2005-2006 Grant($) Average 2004-2005 Grant $)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 0-50% | 51-100% | 101-150% | Overall | 0-50% | 51-lOOo/o | 101-150% | Overall |
| Baltimore Gas & Electric | 598.00 | 484.00 | 287.00 | 391.93 | 576.00 | 391.00 | 312.00 | 386.37 |
| Chesapeake, Citizens Gas | 506.00 | 356.00 | 320.00 | 384.58 | 506.00 | 356.00 | 320.00 | 384.58 |
| Choptank Electric Cooperative | 301.00 | 252.00 | 201.00 | 253.47 | 490.00 | 330.00 | 230.00 | 319.13 |
| Columbia Gas of Maryland | 554.73 | 548.69 | 554.57 | 552.76 | 349.28 | 344.52 | 312.74 | 332.68 |
| Delmarva Power & Light | 187.63 | 181.09 | 164.21 | 177.57 | 357.00 | 298.00 | 234.00 | 286.01 |
| Easton Utilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Electric | 189.00 | 167.00 | 247.00 | 199.16 | 230.00 | 350.00 | 230.00 | 290.41 |
| Gas | 316.00 | 273.00 | 134.00 | 241.65 | 528.00 | 400.00 | 320.00 | 375.11 |
| Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division | 249.00 | 311.00 | 276.00 | 268.90 | 528.00 | 400.00 | 320.00 | 344.72 |
| Washington Gas - Maryland Division | 673.00 | 682.00 | 592.00 | 652.99 | 569.00 | 437.00 | 354.00 | 431.64 |
| Potomac Edison | 146.00 | 118.00 | 104.00 | 121.32 | 283.00 | 216.00 | 171.00 | 211.79 |
| Potomac Electric Power Company | 310.00 | 310.00 | 310.00 | 310.00 | 291.00 | 291.00 | 291.00 | 291.00 |
| Southern Maryland Electirc Cooperative | 232.78 | 231.39 | 186.23 | 217.27 | 354.72 | 287.17 | 231.59 | 275.38 |
| ALL UTILITIES: | 439.41 | 360.99 | 280.65 | 356.60 | 472.68 | 288.67 | 284.93 | 351.72 |

\* Average grant payable to the utility at the time of customer emollment plus supplemental awards (if any).