

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND**

UTILITY SERVICE PROTECTION PROGRAM (USPP)

ANNUAL REPORT

WINTER 2012-2013

Submitted to the
Maryland General Assembly
Annapolis, Maryland

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND.....	2
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION.....	4
EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE.....	6
SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND ARREARAGES.....	7
PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE	8
HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....	10
HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION.....	11
PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE.....	12
MEAP GRANTS.....	12
CONCLUSION	13

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	NUMBER OF USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL	14
TABLE 2	USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH POVERTY LEVEL FOR EACH OF THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	15
TABLE 3	PERCENTAGE OF 2012-2013 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON	16
TABLE 4	AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENT OBLIGATIONS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	17
TABLE 5	PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL	18
TABLE 6	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	19
TABLE 7	AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL	20
TABLE 8	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS BY POVERTY LEVEL DURING THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS.....	21
TABLE 9	NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....	22
TABLE 10	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY DURING THE MOST RECENT HEATING SEASON.....	23
TABLE 11	PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	24
TABLE 12	AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	25

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 2012-2013 winter heating season marked the fourth consecutive year of declining energy bills. This relief from higher heating bills was due to lower gas and electricity commodity prices and moderate weather. The number of plan participants and the average monthly payment obligation were both lower in 2012-2013 as compared to the 2011-2012 heating season. There were 63,389 Utility Service Protection Program (“USPP”) participants for the 2012-2013 winter heating season, as compared with 70,892 last year, 84,826 in 2010-2011, 84,538 in 2009-2010, 70,664 in 2008-2009, and 67,916 in 2007-2008. The average Maryland Energy Assistance Program (“MEAP”) grant provided to USPP participants during 2012-2013 was \$240.55 compared to \$288 during 2011-2012, \$418 in 2010-2011, \$276 in 2009-2010, and \$293 in 2008-2009. Participants in the USPP also emerged from the heating season with arrearage levels that were slightly lower than levels at the end of the previous heating season.

The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations during the winter, and the 2012-2013 data reported by the participating utility companies indicate that the percentage of terminations among the USPP population was 3.5 percent. The number of terminations during the 2012-2013 heating season was higher on a statewide basis than during the prior year due to the six-fold increase in terminations implemented by Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (“BGE”). BGE terminated 1,927 USPP participants in 2012-2013, an increase of 1,606 over its 321 terminations in 2011-2012. Excluding BGE, service for 1.1 percent of the USPP population was terminated during the 2012-2013 winter heating season, compared to one percent in 2011-2012, 0.97 percent in 2010-2011 and 1.2 percent during the 2009-2010 heating season. Excluding BGE, 281 USPP customers had their service terminated during the 2012-2013 heating season, which was a decrease of 27 percent from the 387 terminations during the 2011-2012 heating season. USPP terminations during the 2012-2013 heating season were 13.5 percent fewer than during the 2010-2011 heating season, when there were 819 USPP customer terminations and 33 percent lower than the 1,061 USPP customer terminations during the 2009-2010 heating season.

The data in this USPP report provide information on Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4 represent households with incomes measured against the federal poverty levels as follows: 0 percent to 75 percent; more than 75 percent to 110 percent; more than 110 percent to 150 percent; and more than 150 percent to 175 percent, respectively. The Poverty Level 5 data reported by BGE is comprised of participants that receive subsidized housing allowances. These participants usually have incomes that are at 0 percent to 75 percent 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. In addition to this characteristic, the BGE data are also unique among the reporting utilities in that it includes 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 section has been recodified as Section 7-307 of the Public Utilities Article (“PUA”), *Annotated Code of Maryland*. PUA § 7-307 directed the Commission to promulgate regulations relating to when, and under what conditions, there should be a prohibition against or a limitation upon the authority of a public service company to terminate, for nonpayment, gas or electric service to low-income residential customers during the heating season. Regulations governing the USPP are contained in Section 20.31.05 of the Code of Maryland Regulations (“COMAR”).

The USPP is available to utility customers who are eligible and have applied for a grant from the MEAP, which is administered by Office of Home Energy Programs (“OHEP”). The USPP is designed to protect eligible low-income residential customers from utility service termination during the winter heating season, which extends from November 1 to March 31. The USPP helps low-income customers avoid the accumulation of arrearages, which could lead to service terminations, by requiring timely

equal monthly utility payments for participants based on the estimated cost of annual service to the household. The USPP allows customers in arrears to restore service by accepting the USPP equal payment plan and by lowering any outstanding arrearages to no more than \$400. The program encourages the utility to establish a supplemental monthly payment plan for customers with outstanding balances to reduce those arrearages. Maryland's gas and electric utilities are required to publicize and offer the USPP prior to November of each year. *See* COMAR 20.31.05.03.

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 in the previous year; 2) the number of customers for whom the utility's service is the primary heating source; 3) the number of customers making supplemental payments, average supplemental payment amounts, and the amount of arrearage leading to those payments; 4) the number of USPP participating and eligible non-participating customers in arrears, the amount of the arrearage, and the amount of the average monthly payment obligations; 5) the average MEAP grant amount; 6) the number of customers dropped from the USPP for non-payment of bills; 7) the number of service terminations for USPP participants; 8) the number of USPP customers consuming more than 135 percent of the system average for the heating season; and 9) the average cost of actual usage for the heating season.¹ Utilities serving residential customers in Maryland

¹ The data request was issued to A&N Electric Cooperative ("A&N"), BGE, Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Cambridge Gas Division ("CUC-Cambridge"), Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Citizens Gas Division ("CUC-Citizens"), Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Choptank"), Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. ("Columbia" or "CMD"), Delmarva Power & Light Company ("Delmarva" or "DPL"), The Easton Utilities Commission ("EUC" or "Easton Utilities"), Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elkton Gas ("Elkton" or "Elkton Gas"), Washington Gas Light Company ("Washington Gas" or "WGL"), Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant ("Hagerstown"), Mayor and Council of Berlin ("Berlin"), The Potomac Edison Company ("Potomac Edison" or "PE"), Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco"), Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative ("Somerset"), Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative ("SMECO"), Thurmont Municipal Light Company ("Thurmont"), UGI Central Penn Gas, Inc. f/k/a PPL Gas Utilities Corporation ("UGI"), and Williamsport Municipal Light Plant ("Williamsport").

submitted data for this report.² The Commission's March 2013 data request contained the same questions as those in the USPP Data Request issued for the 2011-2012 heating season and was similar to previous USPP data requests.³ This report provides an analysis and summary of that information.⁴

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Table 1 shows the number of USPP participants and USPP eligible non-participants for each utility by poverty level. The utilities reported 63,389 USPP participants during the 2012-2013 heating season, which represents an 11 percent decrease in participation when compared with the 70,892 participants during the 2011-2012 heating season, and a 25 percent decrease from 84,826 participants in the 2010-2011 heating season. The decreases were observed at all poverty levels for USPP participants and ranged from an 8 percent decrease at Poverty Level 1 to a 15 percent decrease at Poverty Level 4. The number of USPP eligible non-participants in MEAP was 13,381 during the 2012-2013 heating season, a decrease of 16 percent (2,464 customers) from the 15,845 eligible non-participants reported for the 2011-2012 heating season. This represents a decrease of 24 percent (4,300 customers) as compared with the 2010-2011 heating season during which there were 17,681 eligible non-participants.

During the 2012-2013 heating season, BGE reported the largest number (37,847) of USPP participants, accounting for approximately 60 percent of total USPP participants. Delmarva had the second largest participation rate. DPL reported 7,663 participants, which accounted for 12.1 percent of the State's USPP participants, moving the company up from third place from the previous heating season. In the current heating

² Neither A&N nor Somerset responded to Staff's Data Request, and no data were available from these companies for this report.

³ The USPP Data Request was expanded in 2007.

⁴ 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, Williamsport, UGI, and Thurmont have 5,000 customers or less and were required to provide a limited amount of data.

season (2012-2013), DPL saw an increase of 1,451 customers from the 2011-2012 heating season (6,212), the largest USPP participation increase during the 2012-2013 heating season. Potomac Electric Power Company reported 5,934 participants, which accounted for approximately 9 percent of the total participants and represented a decrease of 19 percent from the 2011-2012 heating season (7,312). The Potomac Edison Company reported 2,890 USPP customers or about 5 percent of the total. Thus, the two utilities with the largest enrollments had 72 percent of the USPP customers, and the four largest participating utilities accounted for approximately 86 percent of USPP enrollment.

Table 2 presents USPP participation as a percentage of the total number of MEAP-eligible customers for the 2012-2013 and 2011-2012 heating seasons. The overall participation rate in the USPP for all utility companies for the 2012-2013 winter heating season was 83 percent, 1 percent higher than in 2011-2012. The participation rate varied among the utilities. There were no large changes in year-over-year participation rates for any utility. BGE increased its 2010-2011 USPP enrollment by 3 percent. DPL increased its USPP participation rate from 66 percent in 2011-2012 to 81 percent in 2012-2013 heating season. SMECO reported a 7 percent increase from the 2011-2012 heating season to the 2012-2013 heating season. Despite its decreased number of USPP participants, Pepco maintained a participation rate of 99 percent of MEAP-eligible customers participating in the USPP program in 2012-2013, 1 percent lower than the previous heating season. BGE had an increase of 1 percent participation, from 96 percent in the 2011-2012 to 97 percent in the current heating season. As was the case for the last three consecutive reported heating seasons starting from 2010-2011 to 2012-2013, Choptank reported that 100 percent of eligible customers participated in the USPP program.

Table 3 shows the percentage of customers that were USPP participants in the 2011-2012 and also participants in the 2012-2013 heating season. Overall, 51 percent of the USPP customers who participated in the 2011-2012 heating season also enrolled in the USPP during the 2012-2013 heating season. This was a 6 percent decrease from the 57 percent repeat enrollment in the previous heating season and a 21 percent decrease

from 71 percent in the 2010-2011 heating season. The utilities with the highest repeat enrollment rates were Choptank at 76 percent, EUC at 69 percent, Elkton Gas at 63 percent, and BGE at 60 percent.

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 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. The statewide average monthly payment obligation fell from \$122.67 during the 2011-2012 heating season to \$113.15 in the current heating season (2012-2013), an 8 percent decrease across all poverty levels. This reflects a continued downward trend as shown by a 12 percent decrease from \$129 in 2010-2011 and a 24 percent decrease from \$148 in 2009-2010. At the poverty level, the reduction for monthly obligation payments ranged from 2 percent at Poverty Level 2 to 6 percent at Poverty Level 4. All utilities with the exception of DPL and EUC reported a lower monthly payment obligation in the 2012-2013 heating season than in the 2011-2012 heating season. The largest reductions were SMECO (-\$19.17), BGE (-\$17.38), and CMD (-\$15.32).

Despite the reduction in the average monthly payment obligation, with the exception of EUC and SMECO, statewide average monthly usage actually increased by \$7.45, a 4 percent increase from 2011-2012 heating season. The actual usage increases across all poverty levels were almost identical, with a 12 percent increase for Poverty Level 1, 2 and 4, and 11 percent for Poverty Level 3. These increases may be due to the weather, which, while mild, was somewhat colder in the 2012-2013 heating season than in the previous heating season. Among the major utilities, CUC-Citizens reported the highest increase by \$96 from \$111 in 2011-2012 to \$207 in 2012-2013, and The Potomac

Edison Company had the second highest increase at \$61 from \$78 in 2011-2012 to \$139 in the most recent heating season. On the other hand, SMECO reduced its actual usage by \$120 from \$330 in 2011-2012 to \$210 in 2012-2013.

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 sometimes referred to as an alternate payment plan, to be paid off over an extended period of time. Although the deferred payment arrangements vary, all utilities provide for enrollment in supplemental payment plans. Placing outstanding arrearages in special agreements allows customers to enroll in USPP and to be considered current in their utility payments as long as they continue to make their USPP equal monthly payments and their supplemental payments in a timely fashion.

The number of customers who were participants in USPP and also made supplemental payments in the 2012-2013 heating season was 12,239, or approximately 19 percent of the USPP participants, which was slightly higher than the 18 percent in the 2011-2012 heating season. The average monthly supplemental payment balances during the 2012-2013 heating season decreased by approximately 7 percent, from \$52 in 2011-2012 to \$48 in 2012-2013. Among the poverty levels, the average monthly supplemental payment decreased in all poverty levels and ranged from -\$2.24 for Poverty Level 1, -\$3.79 for Poverty Level 2, -\$2.09 for Poverty Level 3, and -\$6.64 for Poverty Level 4.

At the end of the 2012-2013 heating season, the statewide weighted average levels of supplemental arrearages increased by 21.5 percent from \$627 in the previous heating season to \$762 in 2012-2013⁵ The increase across poverty levels ranged from 17 percent to 32 percent as follows: \$112 or 17 percent for Poverty Level 4; \$117 or 18

⁵ This is a weighted average calculation for all poverty levels across all utilities

percent for Poverty Level 1; \$138 or 23 percent for Poverty Level 3; and \$174 or 32 percent for Poverty Level 2. Six utilities reported increased supplemental arrearages in at least two of the four poverty levels. Delmarva, PE, and Pepco reported increases in supplemental arrearage in all four poverty levels. Easton Utilities and Washington Gas reported increases in three poverty levels, and Columbia reported the increases in two poverty levels. By contrast, BGE and SMECO reported average supplemental arrearage decreases.

PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

Table 6 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-USPP participants, and all other residential customers who were in arrears on their utility bills as of March 31, 2013. 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 four heating seasons, USPP participants were more likely to be in arrears to the utility than MEAP-eligible non-participants. As was the case during the previous four heating seasons, non-MEAP-eligible customers exhibited the lowest probability of carrying arrearages during the 2012-2013 heating season. For all utilities, 53 percent of USPP participants, 34 percent of MEAP-eligible non-participants, and 18 percent of non-MEAP-eligible customers were reported to be in arrears as of March 31, 2013. However, the proportion of USPP participants that were in arrears presented an upward trend as the USPP participants' arrearage percentage was two percent higher than in 2011-2012 and 22 percent higher than in 2010-2011.

Among the utilities in 2012-2013, five utilities recorded higher levels of customer arrearages, seven utilities reported lower levels of arrearages, and one utility reported no change from the 2011-2012 heating season. BGE reported that 62 percent of its USPP participants were in arrears, which is six percentage points up from the 57 percent reported for the 2011-2012 heating season and 33 percent increase from the 2010-2011

heating season. In contrast, Pepco reported a 10 percent reduction in arrearages among its USPP customers during the 2012-2013 heating season. Pepco reported the highest level of arrearages in 2012-2013 at 70 percent, down from the 80 percent reported for the 2011-2012 heating season. DPL and SMECO reported arrearages of 49 and 46 percent, respectively, among their USPP customers.

Table 7 presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP-eligible customers. Average arrearage balances for USPP customers and MEAP-eligible non-participants continue to fall from prior year levels. For the 2012-2013 heating season, the overall average arrearage for USPP participants was \$696, which was down 1 percent from the 2011-2012 heating season and down 14 percent from the 2010-2011 heating season. In 2012-2013, the average arrearage balance was \$396 for MEAP-eligible non-participants who were in arrears, a decrease of 18 percent and 26 percent, from the 2011-2012 and 2010-2011 heating seasons, respectively. Among the major utilities, BGE, SMECO, and WGL reported that the average arrearage balance for USPP participants fell, whereas Choptank, Potomac Edison, and DPL reported an arrearage increase in 2012-2013 as compared with 2011-2012. The highest average arrearage balances for USPP participants were recorded by BGE (\$855), DPL (\$697), and Choptank (\$671). BGE and DPL also recorded the highest and second highest average arrearage balances for MEAP-eligible non-participants as well as for non-MEAP customers during the 2012-2013 heating season. Average arrearage balances for MEAP-eligible non-participants for BGE and DPL were \$820 and \$562, respectively, and for non-MEAP customers were \$396 and \$444, respectively.

Table 8 presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for the 2012-2013 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 in 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 2012-2013 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 90 percent shown on Table 8, likely overstates the proportion of customers that comply with the USPP payment provisions. When compared with the previous heating seasons, the statewide compliance rate decreased by 3 percent from 93 percent in 2011-2012 to 90 percent in 2012-2013. The compliance rates across all poverty levels were down in 2012-2013 from the 2011-2012 heating season with a range of 3 to 4 percent decrease. As in the previous heating season, the four poverty levels had almost identical compliance rates, ranging from 87 percent (Poverty Level 4), 88 percent (Poverty Levels 1 and 2), to 89 percent (Poverty Level 3). Elkton and SMECO reported compliance rates that were above 98 percent.

HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

Table 9 presents the number of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible USPP non-participants, and non-MEAP customers whose services were terminated during the heating season. The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations during the heating season. The data indicate that, in the 2012-2013 winter heating season, the USPP program was successful in mitigating utility service terminations with the exception of BGE.

Of the total number of USPP participants (63,389), Maryland's utilities collectively terminated 2,208 USPP participants during the 2012-2013 heating season, an increase of 1,500 when compared with terminations of USPP participants during 2011-2012. The terminations represented approximately 3.5 percent of all USPP participants in 2012-2013. The significant change in the number of terminations was due to BGE's much higher level of terminations. BGE reported 1,927 terminations in 2012-2013 and represented 87.3 percent of the statewide USPP terminations in 2012-2013 and a 5 percent termination rate of its own USPP participants. When compared to BGE's terminations in the previous report, BGE's 1,927 terminations during 2012-2013

represented an increase of 1,606 over its 321 terminations in 2011-2012, and 1,484 over its 443 terminations in 2010-2011.⁶

Excluding BGE, Maryland utilities reported a termination rate for USPP participants of 1.1 percent during the 2012-2013 heating season. These reporting utilities terminated 281 USPP participants, a decrease of 27 percent from the 387 terminations for the same utilities during the 2011-2012 heating season. Choptank reported 108 terminations, 96 fewer than in 2011-2012 heating season. DPL, Pepco, and WGL also reported fewer terminations for USPP participants. Berlin, CUC-Cambridge, CMD, EUC, and SMECO⁷ did not report any terminations of USPP participants during the 2012-2013 heating season.

HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION

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

For the 2012-2013 heating season, 30 percent of USPP participants consumed more than 135 percent of the respective utility's system average usage, which was eight percentage points above the rates recorded for the 2010-2011 heating season. As indicated in Table 10, the proportion of USPP customers reporting more than 135 percent of system average use does not vary much across poverty levels. Pepco, Potomac Edison,

⁶ BGE responded to Staff's request for data verification that the increase in terminations in 2012-2013 was due to a system upgrade by the Office of Home Energy Programs. According to BGE, OHEP had been unable to transmit energy assistance funds to BGE in a timely manner. Therefore, BGE didn't terminate customers as the Company would have otherwise done.

⁷ UGI and Williamsport also reported no terminations during the 2012-2013 winter heating season.

and DPL reported that over 50 percent of USPP customers consumed more than 135 percent of the system average in the 2012-2013 heating season.

PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE

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

The data reported for this statistic vary greatly across utilities. For all utilities in 2012-2013, 74 percent of USPP customers, 59 percent of MEAP-eligible non-participants, and 50 percent of non-MEAP customers received their primary heat source from the utility responding to the data request. These figures were all lower than levels recorded during the previous reported heating season (78 percent for USPP, 71 percent for MEAP-eligible non-participants, and 59 percent for non-MEAP customers). The ranges for USPP customers reporting that they received their primary heating source from the reporting utilities ranged from 40 percent to 100 percent among utilities. This variation was primarily due to the three types of utilities: electric only, gas only, and electric and gas utilities. The lowest percentages reported are from the utilities that provide electric service only: Pepco (40 percent); Choptank (44 percent); and PE (50 percent). Three gas companies reported that they were the sole heating source for their entire customer base. These gas utilities are CUC-Citizens, CMD, and WGL.

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 indicated that the overall level of benefit fell to \$240 or by 8.4 percent from the previous heating season's benefit of \$288 and was down by 36.8 percent from the 2010-2011 heating season benefit of \$418. As seen in the previous years, the size of the MEAP benefit awarded to customers decreased as the poverty level denomination increased.

Customers in Poverty Level 1, the level of lowest income, received an average MEAP benefit of \$350, whereas those in Poverty Levels 2, 3, 4, and 5 received benefit amounts of \$244, \$234, \$227, and \$180, respectively. Viewed from the perspective of specific utilities, the data show that customers of CMD, WGL, SMECO, Choptank, and BGE received the largest average MEAP benefit of all utilities (\$445, \$425, \$327, \$315, and \$304, respectively).

CONCLUSION

The data collected for the 2012-2013 winter heating season show that the Utility Service Protection Program continues to minimize the number of service terminations among eligible consumers, with the exception of BGE's USPP participants. There were 63,389 USPP participants during the 2012-2013 heating season, which is a decrease of 7,500 or 11 percent from the 2011-2012 level of 70,892. Of the total, 3.5 percent, or 2,208 customers, were terminated during the 2012-2013 heating season, which was higher than the 1 percent of USPP participants that were terminated during the 2011-2012 heating season. The reason for this increase was that BGE reported 1,927 terminations in 2012-2013, 1,606 more terminations than its 321 in 2011-2012, thereby accounting for 87.3 percent of the statewide total terminations. However, the other utilities, excluding BGE, collectively terminated 281 USPP participants in 2012-2013, a 27 percent decrease from 387 terminations without BGE numbers in 2011-2012. The overall average arrearage for USPP participants decreased by 1 percent in 2012-2013 (\$696) from \$704 in 2011-2012.

In addition to the winter protections offered by USPP to low-income customers and the financial assistance to low-income customers from the MEAP and Electric Universal Service Program, some utilities providing electric or gas service in Maryland operated other specific programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers during the 2012-2013 heating season. These programs varied from utility to utility, but all are focused on helping low-income customers with billing and related issues.

TABLE 1

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

UTILITY	USPP Participants						MEAP Eligible Non-Participants						Grand Total
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	10,898	6,696	6,923	3,096	10,234	37,847	490	236	209	86	216	1,237	39,084
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	40	19	18	2	*	79	112	89	60	20	*	281	360
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	10	1	3	0	*	14	324	261	147	65	*	797	811
Choptank Electric Cooperative	822	872	800	262	*	2,756	7	2	1	0	*	10	2,766
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	432	427	405	143	*	1,407	191	231	267	96	*	785	2,192
Delmarva Power & Light	2,942	2,327	1,778	616	*	7,663	810	463	372	138	*	1,783	9,446
Easton Utilities	84	69	50	13	*	216	102	120	134	37	*	393	609
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	270	*	*	*	*	*	136	406
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	161	172	130	28	*	491	491
Mayor & Council of Berlin	49	38	41	14	51	193	2	1	4	0	2	9	202
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,466	1,378	1,537	553	*	5,934	33	0	0	0	*	33	5,967
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	1,007	591	495	184	*	2,277	1,450	937	789	273	*	3,449	5,726
The Potomac Edison Company	918	865	816	291	*	2,890	842	794	756	257	*	2,649	5,539
Washington Gas	725	456	445	217	*	1,843	489	324	296	173	*	1,282	3,125
TOTALS	20,393	13,739	13,311	5,391	10,285	63,389	5,027	3,649	3,172	1,179	218	13,381	76,770

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

TABLE 2

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

UTILITY	2012-2013 Participation						2011-2012 Participation				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	96%	97%	97%	97%	98%	97%	94%	96%	96%	96%	96%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	26%	18%	23%	9%	*	22%	67%	48%	46%	40%	55%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	3%	0%	2%	0%	*	2%	5%	1%	4%	5%	4%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	99%	100%	100%	100%	*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	69%	65%	60%	60%	*	64%	72%	66%	60%	57%	65%
Delmarva Power & Light	78%	83%	83%	82%	*	81%	61%	71%	68%	66%	66%
Easton Utilities	45%	37%	27%	26%	*	35%	55%	46%	66%	7%	32%
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	67%	*	*	*	*	70%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council of Berlin	96%	97%	91%	100%	96%	96%	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	99%	100%	100%	100%	*	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	41%	39%	39%	40%	*	40%	33%	33%	32%	33%	33%
The Potomac Edison Company	52%	52%	52%	53%	*	52%	50%	50%	49%	51%	50%
Washington Gas	60%	58%	60%	56%	*	59%	63%	61%	60%	61%	61%
TOTALS	80%	79%	81%	82%	98%	83%	78%	79%	80%	82%	82%

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

TABLE 3

**PERCENTAGE OF 2012-2013 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED
 IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON**

UTILITY	Poverty Level					Overall
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	53%	58%	56%	49%	74%	60%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	10%	*	*	*	*	7%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	73%	80%	78%	68%	*	76%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	45%	41%	44%	52%	*	44%
Easton Utilities	64%	74%	76%	54%	*	69%
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	63%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council of Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company	28%	35%	29%	23%	*	29%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	15%	14%	15%	13%	*	14%
The Potomac Edison Company	37%	44%	41%	37%	*	40%
Washington Gas	51%	54%	49%	45%	0%	51%
TOTALS	45%	50%	48%	44%	74%	51%

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 4

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

UTILITY	Average Monthly Payment Obligation (\$)						Average Actual Monthly Usage (\$) ¹					
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	120.00	121.00	121.00	119.00	99.00	114.60	239.00	238.00	238.00	233.00	210.00	230.31
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	112.00	0.00	71.00	0.00	*	95.21	227.00	266.40	119.00	0.00	*	206.67
Choptank Electric Cooperative	167.00	139.00	144.00	163.00	*	151.08	*	*	*	*	*	173.00
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	38.28	38.34	38.84	41.44	*	38.78	126.18	123.55	122.72	121.87	*	123.95
Delmarva Power & Light	128.00	117.00	120.00	130.00	*	122.96	162.00	154.00	176.00	158.00	*	162.50
Easton Utilities	182.28	169.01	218.39	165.00	*	185.36	139.85	116.19	143.21	190.40	*	136.11
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	32.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	64.00
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	0.00
Mayor & Council of Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company	81.00	78.00	89.00	95.00	*	83.68	107.00	107.00	125.00	131.00	*	113.90
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	170.63	164.99	150.47	166.27	*	164.43	212.88	200.28	208.19	232.93	*	210.21
The Potomac Edison Company	133.00	114.00	119.00	131.00	*	123.16	143.80	129.40	136.80	156.20	*	138.76
Washington Gas	75.82	76.00	77.48	97.17	*	78.78	93.04	96.28	97.21	99.70	*	95.63
TOTALS	117.84	114.27	115.39	119.02	98.51	113.15	187.68	177.21	185.40	189.39	208.96	188.00

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.

¹ Average actual monthly usage is the monthly average for five billing months of November 2012 - March 2013.

TABLE 5

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

UTILITY	Percentage of USPP Customers Making Supplemental Payments					Average Monthly Amount of Supplemental Payments (\$)					Average Supplemental Arrearage (\$)				
	Poverty level 1	Poverty level 2	Poverty level 3	Poverty level 4	Poverty level 5	Poverty level 1	Poverty level 2	Poverty level 3	Poverty level 4	Poverty level 5	Poverty level 1	Poverty level 2	Poverty level 3	Poverty level 4	Poverty level 5
Baltimore Gas & Electric	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	94.00	98.00	91.00	95.00	90.00	1,251.00	1,298.00	1,266.00	1,235.00	1,203.00
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	10%	0%	0%	*	*	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	224.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*
Choptank Electric Cooperative	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	52%	35%	31%	36%	*	16.99	16.95	17.05	14.29	*	202.55	188.82	161.59	132.29	*
Delmarva Power & Light	75%	66%	67%	74%	*	18.00	20.00	24.00	25.00	*	826.00	771.00	776.00	804.00	*
Easton Utilities	15%	10%	12%	15%	*	199.00	245.50	313.00	189.50	*	304.50	373.00	383.50	319.50	*
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council of Berlin	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company	54%	46%	52%	50%	*	63.00	55.00	60.00	59.00	*	839.00	745.00	792.00	814.00	*
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	49%	36%	39%	51%	*	52.35	53.29	45.33	46.96	*	464.07	454.85	416.83	460.10	*
The Potomac Edison Company	37%	22%	23%	28%	*	113.00	116.00	131.00	125.00	*	307.00	294.00	275.00	424.00	*
Washington Gas	1%	2%	2%	2%	*	231.64	166.47	122.76	136.25	*	508.97	546.96	321.51	126.35	*
TOTALS	24%	22%	21%	21%	4%	46.21	42.92	50.47	51.98	90.00	758.09	724.75	741.93	772.33	1203.00

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 6
PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELEGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS¹ BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants						MEAP Eligible Non-Participants						Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	70%	60%	60%	63%	56%	62%	63%	58%	58%	56%	48%	58%	20%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	10%	5%	6%	50%	*	9%	50%	36%	23%	55%	*	40%	31%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	10%	0%	0%	*	*	7%	39%	35%	31%	40%	*	36%	17%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	5%	2%	2%	2%	*	3%	71%	50%	100%	*	*	70%	15%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	39%	27%	21%	20%	*	28%	8%	3%	2%	3%	*	4%	16%
Delmarva Power & Light	54%	44%	45%	54%	*	49%	55%	44%	44%	41%	*	49%	19%
Easton Utilities	29%	30%	16%	8%	*	25%	18%	19%	8%	14%	*	15%	31%
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	34%	*	*	*	*	*	31%	27%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	57%	31%	38%	14%	*	40%	25%
Mayor & Council of Berlin	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	0%	22%
Potomac Electric Power Company	71%	71%	68%	68%	*	70%	30%	*	*	*	*	30%	18%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	51%	42%	41%	49%	*	46%	49%	39%	41%	47%	*	44%	27%
The Potomac Edison Company	44%	10%	9%	9%	*	20%	23%	15%	13%	16%	*	17%	15%
Washington Gas	8%	9%	10%	6%	*	8%	19%	13%	14%	14%	*	16%	10%
TOTALS	60%	48%	49%	52%	56%	53%	41%	30%	28%	30%	47%	34%	18%

¹ Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2012.

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

TABLE 7

AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS¹ BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants (\$)						MEAP Eligible Non-Participants (\$)						Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	927.00	832.00	829.00	835.00	800.00	854.53	889.00	669.00	725.00	1106.00	789.00	819.64	396.00
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	118.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	118.00	166.00	151.00	170.00	180.00	*	163.11	164.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	682.00	718.00	567.00	773.00	*	671.32	299.00	572.00	297.00	0.00	*	337.71	150.00
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	115.27	140.09	141.52	134.77	*	129.39	130.05	123.21	74.60	450.00	*	149.67	161.60
Delmarva Power & Light	715.00	685.00	674.00	713.00	*	697.95	572.00	531.00	500.00	773.00	*	562.16	444.00
Easton Utilities	251.67	174.86	261.88	205.00	*	222.44	223.33	282.43	222.50	274.00	*	251.46	294.00
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	51.50	*	*	*	*	*	113.60	119.75
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	671.00	298.00	386.00	189.00	*	489.97	183.00
Mayor & Council of Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company²	*	*	*	*	*	0.00	303.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	*	303.00	272.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	456.54	456.22	421.89	400.81	*	445.04	264.70	258.72	270.58	278.29	*	265.65	214.36
The Potomac Edison Company	494.00	222.00	222.00	239.00	*	409.72	263.00	164.00	150.00	77.00	*	195.87	298.00
Washington Gas	81.47	56.87	105.73	64.01	*	80.33	282.16	240.56	210.34	333.01	*	265.42	198.98
TOTALS	714.07	644.24	640.14	679.91	800.00	696.42	426.73	333.20	354.48	432.54	789.00	396.19	341.67

¹Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is part due on March 31, 2012.

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

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 8

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

UTILITY	Compliance 2012-2013						Compliance 2011-2012				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric¹	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	45%	68%	67%	100%	*	57%	60%	71%	62%	88%	65%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	40%	0%	33%	*	*	36%	42%	33%	57%	67%	47%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	84%	89%	91%	97%	*	89%	77%	88%	91%	88%	85%
Columbia Gas of Maryland¹	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	73%	81%	81%	77%	*	78%	61%	77%	75%	67%	70%
Easton Utilities	45%	65%	78%	69%	*	61%	85%	92%	89%	85%	81%
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	99%	*	*	*	*	93%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council of Berlin	*	*	*	*	*	0%	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	55%	54%	56%	28%	*	52%	78%	82%	72%	65%	76%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	98%	98%	98%	99%	*	98%	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	93%	73%	78%	68%	*	80%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Washington Gas	64%	67%	68%	71%	*	67%	87%	79%	80%	83%	83%
TOTALS	88%	88%	89%	87%	100%	90%	91%	92%	92%	91%	93%

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

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

UTILITY	USPP Participants						MEAP Eligible Non-Participants						Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	653	292	363	176	443	1,927	28	7	8	3	5	51	4,804
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	0	0	0	0	*	0	4	0	0	1	*	5	28
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	3	1	0	0	*	4	21	8	6	1	*	36	144
Choptank Electric Cooperative	50	24	26	8	*	108	0	0	0	0	*	0	102
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	5
Delmarva Power & Light	30	21	9	7	*	67	14	3	2	0	*	19	570
Easton Utilities	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	5
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	46
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Mayor & Council of Berlin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
Potomac Electric Power Company	35	17	18	11	*	81	0	0	0	0	*	0	881
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	335
The Potomac Edison Company	11	1	6	1	*	19	3	3	0	2	*	8	158
Washington Gas	1	0	1	0	*	2	0	1	0	1	*	2	316
TOTALS	783	356	423	203	443	2,208	70	22	16	8	5	121	7,552

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

TABLE 10

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

UTILITY	Poverty Level					
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	21%	21%	22%	22%	18%	21%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*
Choptank Electric Cooperative	9%	6%	5%	12%	*	7%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	52%	49%	49%	55%	*	51%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	12%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	0%
Mayor & Council of Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company	60%	64%	72%	94%	*	68%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	33%	32%	34%	42%	*	33%
The Potomac Edison Company	63%	54%	55%	65%	*	58%
Washington Gas	20%	21%	21%	22%	*	21%
TOTALS	32%	31%	32%	35%	18%	30%

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.
** Offers an approved alternate USPP to all MEAP eligible customers.
*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.

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 Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	75%	78%	79%	81%	80%	78%	76%	78%	67%	80%	75%	75%	49%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	***	***	***	***	***	***	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	92%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	50%	42%	39%	45%	0%	44%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%	100%	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	99%	100%	99%	100%	0%	99%	95%
Delmarva Power & Light	81%	80%	79%	75%	0%	80%	98%	97%	99%	96%	0%	98%	44%
Easton Utilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	100%	*	*	*	*	*	100%	98%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Mayor & Council of Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company	34%	38%	51%	39%	0%	40%	48%	0%	0%	0%	0%	48%	29%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	86%	90%	91%	90%	0%	88%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
The Potomac Edison Company	45%	55%	52%	47%	0%	50%	68%	68%	63%	65%	0%	66%	44%
Washington Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%	99%
TOTALS	70%	73%	73%	74%	80%	74%	57%	58%	58%	63%	74%	59%	50%

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.

TABLE 12

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

UTILITY	Average 2012-2013 Grant (\$)						Average 2011-2012 Grant (\$)				
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Poverty Level 5	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	393.00	346.00	316.00	285.00	181.00	304.44	368.00	304.00	242.00	212.00	302.28
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	330.00	0.00	173.00	0.00	*	272.79	198.00	96.00	103.00	107.00	159.13
Choptank Electric Cooperative	351.00	306.00	299.00	281.00	*	315.01	360.00	302.00	296.00	277.00	315.69
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	454.78	458.50	423.25	434.28	*	444.75	280.39	259.86	195.32	170.23	239.22
Delmarva Power & Light	*	*	*	*	*	255.00	**	**	**	**	259.00
Easton Utilities	275.43	249.61	232.80	239.77	*	520.32	231.01	211.51	226.19	285.60	227.56
Elkton Gas	*	*	*	*	*	215.50	*	*	*	*	106.00
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Mayor & Council of Berlin	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***	***
Potomac Electric Power Company	*	*	*	*	*	303.00	**	**	**	**	271.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	336.73	331.48	314.29	297.13	*	327.29	345.87	340.48	276.35	295.37	324.58
The Potomac Edison Company	199.00	179.00	174.00	170.00	*	183.03	218.00	194.00	187.00	194.00	200.71
Washington Gas	418.10	421.24	429.66	448.12	*	425.20	255.89	236.93	210.89	195.55	233.82
TOTALS	350.28	244.29	233.68	227.26	180.10	240.55	343.85	287.86	238.77	214.48	288.39

* Data are not available or not available by poverty level.

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

*** Utility with less than 5,000 customers.