

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF MARYLAND**

**UTILITY SERVICE PROTECTION PROGRAM (USPP)**

**ANNUAL REPORT**

**WINTER 2011-2012**

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](http://www.psc.state.md.us)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BACKGROUND.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PROGRAM PARTICIPATION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND ARREARAGES.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>MEAP GRANTS.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>12</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>TABLE 1</b>	<b>NUMBER OF USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>TABLE 2</b>	<b>USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH OF THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>TABLE 3</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>TABLE 4</b>	<b>AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>TABLE 5</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>TABLE 6</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>TABLE 7</b>	<b>AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>TABLE 8</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS DURING THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>TABLE 9</b>	<b>NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>TABLE 10</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY DURING THE MOST RECENT HEATING SEASON .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>TABLE 11</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY POVERTY LEVEL .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>TABLE 12</b>	<b>AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS .....</b>	<b>24</b>

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The 2011-2012 winter heating season marked the third consecutive year of declining energy bills. This relief from higher heating bills was due to lower gas and electricity prices and to warmer than normal weather conditions. The total Maryland Energy Assistance Program (“MEAP”) funding, the size of MEAP grants, the number of plan participants and the number of utility terminations were all lower in 2011-2012 as compared to the 2010-2011 heating season. Plan participants emerged from the heating season with arrearage levels that were lower than was the case at the end of the previous heating season.

The primary purpose of the Utility Service Protection Program (“USPP”) is to minimize service terminations during the winter, and the 2011-2012 data reported by the participating utility companies indicate that the percentage of terminations among the USPP population was low. Service for one percent of the USPP population was terminated during the 2011-2012 winter heating season, compared to .9% in 2010-2011 and 1.2% during the 2009-2010 heating season. In 2011-2012, the number of USPP customers whose service was terminated was 708, which was 13.5% fewer than the 819 USPP customer terminations during the 2010-2011 heating season and 33.0% lower than the 1,061 USPP customer terminations during the 2009-2010 heating season. Arrearage balances for participating customers decreased by 13.0% from \$812 in 2010-2011 to \$704 during the 2011-2012 heating season. There were 70,892 USPP participants for the 2011-2012 winter heating season, compared to 84,826 last year, 84,538 in 2009-2010, 70,664 in 2008-2009 and 67,916 in 2007-2008. The average MEAP grant provided to USPP participants during 2011-2012 was \$288, compared to \$418 in 2010-2011, \$276 in 2009-2010 and \$293 in 2008-2009.

The data in this USPP report provide information on Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4.<sup>1</sup> As was the case in previous years, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company’s (“BGE”)

---

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

reported information on USPP participants for a fifth poverty level category, which is not identified as one of the above-mentioned Poverty Levels.<sup>2</sup> Data recorded for this additional poverty level category were included in the analysis to be consistent with previous reports.<sup>3</sup> In addition to this characteristic, the BGE data are also unique among the reporting utilities in that it alone has gas and electric customers and combines the data for these customers.

## **BACKGROUND**

On March 1, 1988, the Public Service Commission of Maryland (“Commission”) issued Order No. 67999 in Case No. 8091, which established the Utility Service Protection Program, as required by Article 78, § 54K, which has been recodified as § 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 COMAR 20.31.05.

The USPP is available to utility customers who are eligible and have applied for a grant from the Maryland Energy Assistance Program, which is administered by the Office of Home Energy Programs (“OHEP”). The USPP is designed to protect eligible low-income residential customers from utility service termination during the winter. The USPP helps low-income customers avoid the accumulation of arrearages, which could lead to service terminations, by requiring timely equal monthly utility payments for participants based on the estimated cost of annual service to the household. The USPP allows customers in arrears to restore service by accepting the USPP equal payment plan

---

<sup>2</sup> The fifth Poverty Level is comprised of participants that receive subsidized housing allowances. These participants usually have 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 persons receive a separate and lower benefit than other USPP participants.

<sup>3</sup> The Poverty Level 5 data reported by BGE is included in the “Total” columns in each of the tables, but do not appear as a separate poverty level category. As a result, the figures reported in the “Total” columns for BGE in the tables are not equal to the summation of data for Poverty Levels 1 through 4.

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 20.31.05.03.

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 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.<sup>4</sup> Utilities serving residential customers in Maryland submitted data for this report. The Commission's March 2011 data request contained the same questions as those in the USPP Data Request issued for the 2010-2011 heating

---

<sup>4</sup> The data request was issued to BGE, Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division ("Cambridge"), Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division ("Citizens"), Choptank Electric Cooperative ("Choptank"), Columbia Gas of Maryland ("Columbia"), Delmarva Power & Light ("Delmarva" or "DPL"), Easton Utilities Commission-Electric ("Easton-Electric"), Easton Utilities Commission-Gas ("Easton-Gas"), Elkton Gas Service ("Elkton"), Washington Gas Light Company ("Washington Gas" or "WGL"), Hagerstown Municipal Electric ("Hagerstown"), Mayor & Council of Berlin ("Berlin"), The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison"), Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco"), Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative ("Somerset"), and Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative ("SMECO").

season and was similar to previous USPP data requests.<sup>5</sup> This report provides an analysis and summary of that information.<sup>6</sup>

## **PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

**Table 1** shows the number of USPP participants for each utility by Poverty Level. There were 70,892 participants in the USPP program during the 2011-2012 heating season. This represents a decrease of 16.4% or 13,934 customers over the participation level recorded last year (84,826) and a decrease of 13,646 or 16.0% less than the participation level recorded for the 2009-2010 heating season (84,538). The number of eligible non-participants statewide decreased by approximately 10.0% or by over 1,800 customers to 15,842 from last year (17,681).

During the 2011-2012 heating season, BGE reported the largest number of USPP participants as well as the largest year over year decrease in the number of USPP participants. BGE's 2011-2012 participant level of 43,675 represented a decrease of 10,395 from the previous year's level of 54,707. BGE's 43,675 USPP participants accounted for 62.0% of all the 2011-2012 USPP participants. Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco") had the second highest USPP participation level, with 7,312 customers enrolled for the 2011-2012 winter heating season, representing 10.0% of the total number enrolled by all companies. Delmarva Power and Light Company ("Delmarva") enrolled 6,212 customers in the USPP during 2011-2012, which was the third highest number enrolled by any utility company. This number represented 9.0% of all USPP 2011-2012 participants. Washington Gas Light Company ("WGL") reported participation by 4,296 customers or 6.0% of the total. Thus, the two largest utilities

---

<sup>5</sup> The USPP Data Request was expanded in 2007.

<sup>6</sup> 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. Similarly, Berlin, Somerset, Williamsport, UGI, and Thurmont are municipality-owned utilities with 5,000 customers or less. As such, those utilities were required to provide a limited amount of data.

enrolled 72.0% of the USPP customers and the four largest utilities accounted for 87.0% of USPP enrollment.

**Table 2** presents USPP participation as a percentage of the total number of MEAP-eligible customers for the 2011-2012 and 2010-2011 heating seasons. The overall rate of customer participation in the USPP for all utility companies for the 2011-2012 winter heating season was 82.0%, one percentage point lower than in 2010-2011. As was the case for the 2010-2011 heating season, Pepco and Choptank reported that 100.0% of eligible customers participated in the USPP during 2011-2012. Ninety-six percent of eligible BGE customers participated in the USPP program during 2011-2012, compared to 94.0% in 2010-2011.

**Table 3** shows the percentage of customers that were USPP participants in the 2011-2012 and 2010-2011 heating seasons. Fifty-seven percent of the USPP participants during the 2011-2012 heating season were also enrolled in the USPP during the 2010-2011 heating season. Overall, there was a 14 percentage point decrease in the “consecutive year participation rate,” which brought that figure back to the level recorded for the 2009-2010 heating season. Among the major utilities, the highest percentages of consecutive year enrollments were recorded by Washington Gas (88.0%) and Choptank (77.0%).

### **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 prior year heating season. The differences between the average monthly 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. Average monthly usage and average

monthly payment obligation levels fell across all Poverty Levels in the 2011-2012 heating season.

Average monthly usage for USPP participants during the 2011-2012 heating season fell for the third consecutive heating season. Average monthly usage for USPP participants fell by approximately 15.9% during the 2011-2012 heating season from the level one year earlier, was 20.8% lower than the 2009-2010 level and was approximately 30.0% lower than during the 2008-2009 heating season. During the 2011-2012 heating season, average monthly usage for USPP participants fell to \$180 on a statewide basis, from \$215 during the 2010-2011 heating season, from \$228 during the 2009-2010 heating season and from \$257 during the 2008-2009 heating season. Year-over-year declines in usage were reported across all Poverty Levels, and with the exception of DPL and Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative (“SMECO”), for all utilities. On a Poverty Level basis, usage fell by 15.0% for Poverty Level 4 participants, by 11.0% for Poverty Level 3 participants, and by 12.0% for participants in Poverty Levels 2 and 1. Among the major utilities, usage by USPP participants in BGE’s service territory fell by 17.0% to \$214 from \$259 in 2010-2011, from \$274 in 2009-2010 and from \$318 in 2008-2009. Usage by USPP participants for WGL fell by 20.0% to \$96 from \$117 last year and from \$126 in 2009-2010. Pepco recorded a decrease of 33.0% to \$110 from \$166 last year and from \$188 in 2009-2010. Usage by Potomac Edison’s customers fell by 21.0% to \$78 from \$99 in 2010-2011 and from \$96 in 2009-2010.

For all poverty levels, average monthly payment obligations by USPP participants fell by approximately 5.0% to \$123 in 2011-2012 from \$129 in 2010-2011. Average monthly payment obligations fell for each of the major utilities in 2011-2012 as compared with the 2010-2011 heating season. Average monthly payment obligations made by Pepco’s customers fell by 20.0% from \$111 to \$88. The next largest decrease was reported by Potomac Edison whose USPP customers realized a 19.0% decrease in average monthly payment obligations to \$125 from \$153. Comparable figures for BGE, DPL and WGL were -1.5%, -9.9%, and -1.0%, respectively.

## **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 who have outstanding arrearages 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. 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 data indicated that at the end of the 2011-2012 heating season, the average levels of supplemental arrearages and supplemental payments as well as the percentage of USPP participants making supplemental payments were all lower than for the previous year for all Poverty Levels. Average supplemental arrearage balances during the 2011-2012 heating season were approximately 21.8% lower for all Poverty Levels, whereas the average monthly supplemental payments across all Poverty Levels in 2011-2012 were 19.4% lower. During the 2011-12 heating season, approximately 18.0% of USPP recipients for all utilities made supplemental payments. That figure is down from the 27.0% figure during the 2010-2011 heating season.

## **PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE**

**Table 6** presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-participants, and all other utility residential customers who were in arrears on their utility bills as of March 31, 2012. This means that the customer had failed to pay the total amount due on at least one equal monthly billing.

In contrast to the pattern experienced over the previous three heating seasons, USPP participants during 2011-2012 were more likely to be in arrears to the utility than MEAP eligible non-participants. As was the case during the previous three heating

seasons, non-MEAP-eligible customers exhibited the lowest probability of carrying arrearages during the 2011-2012 heating season. For all utilities, 51.0% of USPP participants, 35.0% of eligible non-participants, and 22.0% of non-MEAP-eligible customers were in arrears as of March 31, 2012. In comparison with the 2010-2011 heating season, the proportion of USPP participants that were in arrears on March 31, 2011, was higher by twenty percentage points.

With the exception of Potomac Edison, each of the major utilities recorded higher proportions of USPP participants that were in arrears on March 31, 2012, when compared to the same date last year. BGE reported that 57.0% of its USPP participants were in arrears, which is 27 percentage points higher than the 30% reported for the 2010-2011 heating season and the 40.0% that were reported in arrears during the 2009-2010 heating season. Pepco reported that 80.0% of USPP participants were in arrears in 2011-2012, compared to 73.0% in 2010-2011 and 44.0% in 2009-2010. Similarly, 39.0% of DPL's USPP customers (compared to 20.0% in 2010-2011) and 17.0% of WGL's USPP customers (compared to 1.0% in 2010-2011) were in arrears on March 31, 2012.

**Table 7** presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-eligible customers who are in arrears. Average arrearage balances for USPP customers, non-MEAP eligible customers and for non-MEAP customers fell from prior year levels. For the 2011-2012 heating season, the overall average arrearage for USPP participants was \$704 which was down by 13.0% from last year. In 2011-2012, the average arrearage balance for MEAP eligible non-participants who were in arrears decreased by 10.0%, from \$539 in 2010-2011 to \$485 in 2011-2012, whereas the arrears for non-MEAP customers fell by 19 percentage points, from \$410 to \$331. Among the major utilities, the average arrearage balance for USPP participants fell for BGE, WGL and SMECO and increased for DPL and Potomac Edison. The highest average arrearage balance for USPP participants was recorded by BGE (\$1,004), followed by DPL (\$566) and SMECO (\$488). BGE and DPL also recorded the highest and second highest average arrearage balances for MEAP eligible non-participants as well as for non-MEAP eligible customers during the 2011-2012 heating season. Average arrearage balances for eligible non-participants for BGE and

DPL were \$990 and \$695, respectively, and for non-MEAP customers were \$420 and \$267, respectively.

**Table 8** presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for the 2011-2012 heating season and compares that data to the previous year's results. According to the USPP provisions, a customer can be removed from the program and a customer's service may be terminated if the amount due on two consecutive monthly bills is not paid. As was the case for previous years, BGE reported that, as a matter of company policy, it did not remove customers from the program if the customer fell out of compliance with the USPP payment rules during the 2011-2012 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 93.0% shown on Table 8, likely overstates the proportion of customers that comply with the USPP payment provisions.

There were no meaningful differences in the compliance percentages for the 2011-2012 heating season when compared with the previous three heating seasons. Overall compliance percentages have been in the 92.0%-93.0% range for each of the last four heating seasons. Compliance percentages across poverty levels during the 2011-2012 heating season varied within the narrow range of 91.0%-93.0%. This too was consistent with the pattern observed during the prior three heating seasons. During the 2011-2012 heating season, Potomac and SMECO reported compliance rates that were very close to 100.0% for all poverty levels.

## **HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS**

**Table 9** presents the number of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers who had their service terminated during the heating season. The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations during the heating season. The data indicate that the USPP program was successful in mitigating utility service terminations.

Of the total number of USPP participants (70,892), Maryland's utilities collectively terminated 708 USPP participants. This is equal to 1.00% of the USPP participant population. The percentage of terminations for plan participants was about the same during the 2011-2012 heating season as the percentage of terminations during the prior heating season (0.9%).

As indicated in Table 9, five of the 14 utilities for which data are available did not terminate any USPP participants during the 2011-2012 winter heating season. The utilities with no USPP terminations were: Columbia, Easton-Electric and Easton-Gas, Berlin, and SMECO. An additional five utilities terminated fewer USPP participants during the 2011-2012 heating season than during the 2010-2011 heating season. Four utilities; BGE, Choptank, DPL and Pepco, accounted for 97.0% of the USPP participant terminations during the 2011-2012 heating season. BGE terminated 321 USPP participants during the 2011-2012 heating season, which represented .7% of BGE's total number of plan participants and accounted for 45.0% of all USPP participant terminations during the 2011-2012 heating season. The number of USPP participants that were terminated by BGE during the 2011-2012 heating season was down by 27.5% from the 443 termination recorded during the previous heating season. Choptank terminated 204 USPP participants, which represented a 6.9% termination rate and accounted for 29.0% of the total number of terminations. Pepco's 88 USPP participant terminations represented a termination rate of 1.2% and accounted for 12.0% of the total number of USPP participant terminations during the 2011-2012 heating season. DPL's 71 USPP participant terminations represented 1.1% of its plan participants and accounted for 10.0% of all USPP participant terminations.

### **HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION**

**Table 10** presents the percentage of USPP participants who consumed more than 135.0% of the respective utility's system average use. Data in this table show the proportions of USPP customers by Poverty Level who consume higher than average levels of energy. These consumers will have higher than average heating bills, will place a higher than average burden on the USPP, tend to generate higher arrearages, will run a

higher risk of defaulting on payment plans and will tend to suffer higher termination rates.

For the 2011-2012 heating season, 42.0% of USPP participants consumed more than 135.0% of the respective utility's system average usage. That figure is up from the 38.0% reported during the 2010-2011 heating season and the 35.0% reported for the prior heating season. As indicated in Table 10, the proportion of USPP customers reporting more than 135.0% of system average use does not vary much across poverty levels. Potomac Edison, SMECO, Pepco and DPL reported the highest overall percentages of USPP customers consuming more than 135.0% of the system average in 2011-2012.

### **PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE**

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

Although the data reported for this statistic vary greatly across the utilities, they do not vary much by poverty level or over time for any utility. For all utilities in 2011-2012, 78.0% of USPP customers, 71.0% of eligible non-participants, and 59.0% of non-MEAP customers receive their primary heat source from the utility responding to the data request. These results for the most recent heating season are very similar to the prior season's percentage of customers obtaining the primary heat source from the serving utility. Citizens, Columbia, Easton-Electric, Easton-Gas, Elkton, WGL, and Potomac Edison reported that all or very nearly all of both USPP participants and eligible non-participants received their primary heat source from the utility during 2011-2012. BGE provides the primary heat source to 79.0% of its USPP participants, 65.0% of its eligible non-participants, and 72.0% of its non-MEAP customers. DPL provides the primary heat source for approximately 79.0% of its USPP customers, whereas the percentage for Pepco is approximately 39.0%.

## **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 indicate that the overall level of benefit fell by 31.0% to \$288 per USPP customer in 2011-2012 from \$418 in 2010-2011. As seen in previous years, the size of the MEAP benefit awarded to customers in 2011-2012 decreased as the Poverty Level increased. Customers in Poverty Level 1 received an average MEAP benefit of \$344, whereas those in Poverty Levels 2, 3, and 4 received benefit amounts of \$288, \$239, and \$214, respectively. Viewed from the perspective of specific utilities, the data show that customers of SMECO, Choptank and BGE received the largest average MEAP benefit of all utilities (\$325, \$316 and \$302, respectively).

## **CONCLUSION**

The data collected for the winter 2011-2012 winter heating season show that the Utility Service Protection Program continues to minimize the number of service terminations among eligible consumers. There were 70,892 USPP participants during the 2011-2012 heating season, which is a decrease of 13,934 or 16.4% below the 2010-2011 level of 84,826. Of that total, 1.0%, or 708 customers, were terminated during the 2011-2012 heating season. The percentage of terminations for USPP participants during 2011-2012 was lower than for eligible non-participants. The relatively low number of terminations indicates that the USPP is helping to keep low-income customers' service connected during the winter heating season. The overall average arrearage for participating customers decreased by 13.0% from \$811 in 2010-2011 to \$704 in 2011-2012, while the average arrearage level for MEAP eligible non-participants during the same period fell by 10.0%, from \$539 to \$485.

In addition to the winter protections offered by USPP to low-income customers and the financial assistance to low-income customers from the MEAP and Electric Universal Service Program, utilities providing electric or gas service in Maryland

operated other specific programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers during the 2011-2012 heating season. These programs varied from utility to utility, but all are focused on helping low-income customers with billing or related issues.

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

	USPP Participants					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants					Overall
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Total
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>1</sup>	12,268	7,586	8,130	3,648	43,675	760	322	349	152	1,882	45,557
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	92	52	26	8	178	46	56	30	12	144	322
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	19	3	7	3	32	328	218	184	63	793	825
Choptank Electric Cooperative	923	910	826	315	2,974	3	2	0	1	6	2,980
Columbia Gas of Maryland	452	461	408	148	1,469	172	240	271	111	794	2,263
Delmarva Power & Light	2,274	1,940	1,487	511	6,212	1,440	781	699	261	3,181	9,393
Easton Utilities-Electric	61	56	53	12	182	46	51	75	29	201	383
Easton Utilities-Gas	26	29	17	8	80	32	21	24	7	84	164
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	269	*	*	*	*	114	383
Washington Gas	1,690	1,131	1,020	455	4,296	1,001	735	680	293	2,709	7,005
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	138	164	110	26	438	438
Mayor & Council - Berlin	73	48	44	15	180	26	12	16	4	58	238
The Potomac Edison Company	972	808	703	260	2,743	963	805	725	246	2,739	5,482
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,730	1,933	1,818	831	7,312	0	0	0	0	59	7,371
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	548	344	290	108	1,290	1,125	690	607	218	2,640	3,930
<b>TOTALS:</b>	22,128	15,301	14,829	6,322	70,892	6,080	4,097	3,770	1,423	15,842	86,734

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

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

UTILITY	2011 - 2012 Participation					2010- 2011 Participation				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>1</sup>	94%	96%	96%	96%	96%	89%	92%	93%	94%	94%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	67%	48%	46%	40%	55%	44%	42%	51%	31%	43%
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	5%	1%	4%	5%	4%	6%	5%	3%	5%	5%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	72%	66%	60%	57%	65%	63%	62%	52%	52%	58%
Delmarva Power & Light	61%	71%	68%	66%	66%	75%	79%	76%	72%	76%
Easton Utilities-Electric	57%	52%	41%	29%	48%	39%	32%	29%	22%	32%
Easton Utilities-Gas	45%	58%	41%	53%	49%	43%	29%	32%	40%	35%
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	70%	*	*	*	*	81%
Washington Gas	63%	61%	60%	61%	61%	71%	69%	67%	65%	69%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	50%	50%	49%	51%	50%	48%	47%	45%	50%	47%
Potomac Electric Power Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	33%	33%	32%	33%	33%	29%	27%	28%	27%	28%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	78%	79%	80%	82%	82%	77%	77%	78%	81%	83%

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

**TABLE 3**  
**PERCENTAGE OF 2011-2012 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE**  
**PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON**

UTILITY	Poverty Level				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
<b>Baltimore Gas &amp; Electric<sup>1</sup></b>	54%	61%	58%	53%	61%
<b>Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division</b>	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division</b>	5%	0%	14%	0%	6%
<b>Choptank Electric Cooperative</b>	75%	80%	79%	72%	77%
<b>Columbia Gas of Maryland</b>	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Delmarva Power &amp; Light</b>	59%	50%	53%	63%	55%
<b>Easton Utilities-Electric</b>	52%	54%	60%	50%	55%
<b>Easton Utilities-Gas</b>	54%	72%	82%	50%	66%
<b>Elkton Gas Service</b>	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
<b>Washington Gas</b>	84%	96%	89%	78%	88%
<b>Hagerstown Municipal Electric</b>	**	**	**	**	**
<b>Mayor &amp; Council - Berlin</b>	***	***	***	***	***
<b>The Potomac Edison Company</b>	32%	29%	29%	22%	29%
<b>Potomac Electric Power Company</b>	34%	44%	35%	29%	36%
<b>Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative</b>	*	*	*	*	*
<b>Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative</b>	22%	29%	25%	15%	24%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	52%	56%	54%	50%	57%

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels.

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

**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 (\$ ) <sup>2</sup>				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>1</sup>	131.00	131.00	133.00	135.00	131.98	213.00	216.00	216.00	214.00	214.37
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	106.00	74.00	106.00	93.00	101.78	114.80	100.20	121.20	95.20	110.71
Choptank Electric Cooperative	182.00	147.00	156.00	176.00	163.43	**	**	**	**	168.51
Columbia Gas of Maryland	48.84	52.18	60.07	59.71	54.10	108.94	108.62	109.23	111.95	109.36
Delmarva Power & Light	123.00	111.00	117.00	123.00	117.82	143.00	129.00	151.00	138.00	140.91
Easton Utilities-Electric	158.00	104.00	210.00	147.00	155.80	116.00	120.00	131.00	152.00	127.81
Easton Utilities-Gas	147.00	165.00	101.00	65.00	135.55	54.00	62.00	88.00	102.00	69.71
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	45.00	*	*	*	*	50.00
Washington Gas	83.54	81.49	84.22	83.38	83.14	94.62	91.32	95.64	96.44	94.18
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
The Potomac Edison Company	130.00	118.00	121.00	137.00	124.82	81.00	75.20	75.80	83.20	78.12
Potomac Electric Power Company	88.00	82.00	89.00	100.00	88.03	109.00	107.00	109.00	118.00	110.75
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	183.11	180.51	183.38	196.56	183.60	325.86	327.59	337.60	336.05	329.85
<b>TOTALS:</b>	122.04	116.72	121.93	126.55	122.67	167.79	158.90	167.33	169.34	180.55

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

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

<sup>2</sup> Average monthly usage for five billing months of November 2011 - March 2012.

TABLE 5

PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS<sup>1</sup>, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	Percentage of USPP Customers Making Supplemental Payments				Average Monthly Amount of Supplemental Payments (\$)				Average Supplemental Arrearage (\$)			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>2</sup>	2%	2%	2%	4%	113.00	110.00	114.00	114.00	1481.00	1422.00	1489.00	1496.00
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	0%	0%	4%	0%	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	5%	0%	14%	67%	36.00	0.00	67.00	32.00	142.00	0.00	400.00	129.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	62%	48%	43%	47%	15.87	14.52	17.24	19.70	225.05	172.24	159.85	177.73
Delmarva Power & Light	60%	50%	50%	56%	10.64	12.31	15.31	15.68	617.00	536.00	591.00	608.00
Easton Utilities-Electric	13%	20%	19%	17%	176.00	166.00	168.00	209.00	235.00	356.00	302.00	375.00
Easton Utilities-Gas	19%	14%	41%	25%	98.00	191.00	101.00	107.00	132.00	127.00	245.00	596.00
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Washington Gas	3%	3%	4%	8%	115.16	107.50	114.28	124.88	344.55	284.79	302.90	319.05
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	35%	39%	42%	44%	111.00	108.00	103.00	116.00	150.00	78.00	49.00	111.00
Potomac Electric Power Company	61%	49%	56%	60%	60.00	53.00	55.00	55.00	757.00	689.00	710.00	703.00
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	39%	27%	32%	31%	65.66	60.67	56.76	60.09	591.17	533.68	467.15	512.62
<b>TOTALS:</b>	19%	18%	17%	19%	48.45	46.71	52.56	58.62	640.97	550.94	604.15	661.15

<sup>1</sup> Under COMAR 20.31.01.08.

<sup>2</sup> BGE noted that number of customers making supplemental payments was unusually low on March 31, 2012 because most of its plan participants have defaulted on their payment plans prior to that date.

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

**TABLE 6**  
**PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS**  
**IN ARREARS<sup>1</sup> BY POVERTY LEVEL**

UTILITY	USPP Participants					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants					Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>2</sup>	70%	88%	61%	60%	57%	57%	54%	52%	53%	53%	29%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	22%	6%	19%	25%	17%	52%	43%	27%	50%	43%	26%
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	41%	29%	24%	32%	33%	15%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	17%	15%	14%	10%	15%	67%	0%	0%	0%	33%	12%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	33%	19%	15%	20%	22%	23%	16%	14%	13%	16%	14%
Delmarva Power & Light	46%	34%	35%	45%	39%	67%	55%	55%	57%	60%	20%
Easton Utilities-Electric	25%	20%	15%	25%	20%	13%	20%	8%	14%	13%	34%
Easton Utilities-Gas	12%	14%	12%	25%	14%	25%	19%	13%	14%	19%	NA
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	26%	*	*	*	*	29%	24%
Washington Gas	13%	21%	20%	17%	17%	33%	20%	26%	29%	27%	NA
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	25%	9%	16%	23%	17%	15%
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	43%	29%	28%	33%	34%	3%	2%	2%	0%	2%	14%
Potomac Electric Power Company	80%	81%	77%	78%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	53%	43%	44%	47%	48%	57%	47%	47%	56%	52%	32%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	59%	64%	51%	53%	51%	43%	31%	31%	35%	35%	22%

<sup>1</sup> Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.

\* Not Available or not available by poverty level.

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

**TABLE 7**

**AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS<sup>1</sup> BY POVERTY LEVEL**

UTILITY	USPP Participants (\$)					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants (\$)					Non-MEAP Customers (\$)
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	1,193.00	1,041.00	1,084.00	1,035.00	1,003.52	941.00	978.00	1,217.00	774.00	990.18	420.00
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	146.00	155.00	159.00	140.00	149.92	159.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	228.00	228.00	247.00	444.29	247.93	264.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	264.00	132.27
Columbia Gas of Maryland	159.41	149.70	152.21	129.51	152.78	171.97	166.67	160.29	131.32	162.63	161.95
Delmarva Power & Light	588.00	517.00	568.00	599.00	565.58	701.00	723.00	693.00	576.00	694.68	267.00
Easton Utilities-Electric	303.00	176.00	204.00	289.00	242.70	257.00	234.00	202.00	189.00	225.00	227.00
Easton Utilities-Gas	145.00	264.00	387.00	211.00	244.27	98.00	109.00	147.00	325.00	124.13	NA
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	114.00	*	*	*	*	97.00	111.00
Washington Gas	23.48	16.56	17.89	24.50	19.85	268.13	208.50	245.91	330.75	258.25	205.07
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	554.00	377.00	283.00	489.00	445.47	328.00
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	299.00	282.00	247.00	330.00	286.75	421.00	464.00	335.00	104.00	403.15	157.00
Potomac Electric Power Company	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	*	*	*	*	*	242.00
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	496.31	477.44	474.72	499.23	487.63	488.15	440.38	533.94	508.41	488.28	175.31
<b>TOTALS:</b>	762.83	627.73	692.60	695.49	703.88	512.58	454.00	468.39	383.12	484.64	331.48

<sup>1</sup> Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2011.

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

UTILITY	Compliance 2011-2012					Compliance 2010-2011				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	60%	71%	62%	88%	65%	76%	79%	74%	89%	77%
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	42%	33%	57%	67%	47%	55%	73%	86%	80%	68%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	77%	88%	91%	88%	85%	76%	85%	87%	87%	83%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	61%	77%	75%	67%	70%	74%	82%	77%	77%	78%
Easton Utilities-Electric	56%	66%	74%	58%	64%	36%	46%	65%	54%	50%
Easton Utilities-Gas	50%	76%	53%	63%	61%	62%	30%	58%	50%	51%
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	93%	**	**	**	**	96%
Washington Gas	87%	79%	80%	83%	83%	95%	92%	91%	82%	92%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	99%	98%	99%
Potomac Electric Power Company	78%	82%	72%	65%	76%	54%	58%	52%	46%	53%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	95%	98%	97%	98%	97%	97%	98%	97%	97%	97%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	91%	92%	92%	91%	93%	89%	90%	88%	87%	92%

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

**TABLE 9**  
**NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS**

UTILITY	USPP Participants					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants					Non-MEAP
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Total	Customers
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>1</sup>	100	52	69	34	321	8	2	2	1	18	4021
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	2	0	0	0	2	6	0	1	0	7	51
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	2	0	0	0	2	33	10	10	3	56	118
Choptank Electric Cooperative	94	55	39	16	204	0	0	0	0	0	127
Columbia Gas of Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122
Delmarva Power & Light	45	12	6	8	71	39	13	15	1	68	645
Easton Utilities-Electric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	NA
Easton Utilities-Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	2	*	*	*	*	0	41
Washington Gas	2	2	3	5	12	3	5	3	4	15	541
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	38
Mayor & Council - Berlin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
The Potomac Edison Company	4	0	2	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	75
Potomac Electric Power Company	31	19	24	14	88	0	0	0	0	0	1374
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1180
<b>TOTALS:</b>	280	140	143	77	708	90	30	31	9	175	8334

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

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

UTILITY	Poverty Level				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>1</sup>	46%	47%	46%	46%	42%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	**	**	**	**	**
Choptank Electric Cooperative	7%	5%	5%	8%	6%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	47%	41%	45%	48%	45%
Easton Utilities-Electric	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Easton Utilities-Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	10%
Washington Gas	21%	24%	25%	23%	23%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council - Berlin	***	***	***	***	***
The Potomac Edison Company	90%	89%	90%	91%	90%
Potomac Electric Power Company	51%	47%	62%	75%	55%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	62%	53%	76%	83%	65%
<b>TOTALS:</b>	44%	42%	45%	47%	42%

\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

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

**TABLE 11**

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

UTILITY	USPP Participants					MEAP Eligible Non-Participants					Non-MEAP
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Customers
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>1</sup>	77%	80%	82%	82%	79%	64%	68%	72%	68%	65%	72%
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	51%	38%	39%	43%	43%	*	*	*	*	100%	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	97%	96%	97%	98%	97%	95%
Delmarva Power & Light	79%	79%	79%	75%	79%	94%	96%	95%	96%	95%	44%
Easton Utilities-Electric	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Easton Utilities-Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	66%	100%	100%	100%	87%	0%
Elkton Gas Service	*	*	*	*	100%	*	*	*	*	100%	98%
Washington Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council - Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
The Potomac Edison Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	85%	89%	92%	90%	88%	40%
Potomac Electric Power Company	38%	40%	38%	40%	39%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	66%	69%	71%	71%	68%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTALS:</b>	76%	78%	78%	79%	78%	69%	72%	74%	76%	71%	59%

\* Not Available or not available by poverty level.

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

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

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

**TABLE 12**  
**AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT<sup>1</sup> FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS**  
**BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS**

UTILITY	Average 2011-2012 Grant (\$)					Average 2010-2011 Grant (\$)				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric <sup>2</sup>	368.00	304.00	242.00	212.00	302.28	507.00	420.00	336.00	258.00	410.26
Chesapeake Utilities-Cambridge Gas Division	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Chesapeake Utilities-Citizens Gas Division	198.00	96.00	103.00	107.00	159.13	313.00	277.00	190.00	158.00	266.70
Choptank Electric Cooperative	360.00	302.00	296.00	277.00	315.69	811.00	660.00	584.00	460.00	663.33
Columbia Gas of Maryland	280.39	259.86	195.32	170.23	239.22	388.42	352.35	273.97	226.60	329.41
Delmarva Power & Light	**	**	**	**	259.00	**	**	**	**	575.00
Easton Utilities-Electric	260.00	233.00	241.00	390.00	254.73	482.00	408.00	446.00	431.00	445.34
Easton Utilities-Gas	163.00	170.00	180.00	129.00	165.75	230.00	245.00	160.00	131.00	205.04
Elkton Gas Service	**	**	**	**	106.00	**	**	**	**	123.00
Washington Gas	255.89	236.93	210.89	195.55	233.82	335.62	344.05	292.42	240.06	316.49
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Mayor & Council - Berlin	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
The Potomac Edison Company	218.00	194.00	187.00	194.00	200.71	396.00	336.00	299.00	261.00	339.53
Potomac Electric Power Company	**	**	**	**	271.00	**	**	**	**	605.00
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	345.87	340.48	276.35	295.37	324.58	735.65	538.20	470.87	371.79	592.59
<b>TOTALS:</b>	343.85	287.86	238.77	214.48	288.39	505.85	427.75	351.45	271.81	417.98

\*\* Not available or not available by poverty level.

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

<sup>1</sup> Average grant payable to the utility at the time of customer enrollment plus supplemental awards (if any).

<sup>2</sup> BGE provides data categorized into 5 poverty levels. The "Overall" column is a weighted average of all 5 poverty levels.