

W. KEVIN HUGHES
CHAIRMAN

MICHAEL T. RICHARD
ANTHONY J. O'DONNELL
ODOGWU OBI LINTON
MINDY L. HERMAN



PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

November 29, 2017

The Honorable Thomas V. "Mike" Miller, Jr.
President of the Senate
State House, H-107
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

The Honorable Michael E. Busch
Speaker of the House of Delegates
State House, H-101
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

Re: Utility Service Protection Program Annual Report for Winter 2016-2017 In Compliance with § 7-307 of The Public Utilities Article, Annotated Code of Maryland (MSAR #9420)

Dear President Miller and Speaker Busch:

Pursuant to § 7-307 of the Public Utilities Article, *Annotated Code of Maryland*, enclosed is the Public Service Commission's *Utility Service Protection Program Annual Report for Winter 2016-2017*. It has come to the Commission's attention that you did not receive copies of the *Utility Service Protection Program Annual Reports for Winter 2014-2015 and Winter 2015-2016* that are also enclosed.

By Direction of the Commission,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David J. Collins".

David J. Collins
Executive Secretary

DJC:tj

Enclosures

cc: Sarah T. Albert, Department of Legislative Services (5 copies)

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
OF MARYLAND**

UTILITY SERVICE PROTECTION PROGRAM

ANNUAL REPORT

WINTER 2016-2017

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
BACKGROUND	4
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS	6
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION	8
SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTAL ARREARAGES.....	10
PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE	11
HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....	13
HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION	13
PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE	14
MEAP GRANTS.....	15
CONCLUSION	15
APPENDIX A1 2016-2017 HEATING SEASON REPORTING UTILITIES BASIC INFORMATION.....	29

LIST OF TABLES

E1	2016-2017 USPP PARTICIPATION INFORMATION BY UTILITY	1
E2	2016-2017 USPP TERMINATION BY UTILITY	3
E3	USPP PARTICIPATION AND SERVICE TERMINATION	4
TABLE 1	NUMBER OF USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL	17
TABLE 2	USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH POVERTY LEVEL FOR EACH OF THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	18
TABLE 3	USPP PARTICIPANTS AND PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLMENT TO MEAP AND TOTAL CUSTOMERS	19
TABLE 4	PERCENTAGE OF 2016-2017 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON	20
TABLE 5	PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL.....	21
TABLE 6	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL....	22
TABLE 7	ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP CERTIFIED NON-USPP PARTICIPANTS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL ¹	23
TABLE 8	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS BY POVERTY LEVEL DURING THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS.....	24
TABLE 9	NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....	25
TABLE 10	PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY DURING THE MOST RECENT HEATING SEASON	26
TABLE 11	PERCENTAGE OF PARTICIPANTS, MEAP CERTIFIED NON-USPP PARTICIPANTS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY POVERTY LEVEL	27
TABLE 12	AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL FOR THE LAST TWO HEATING SEASONS	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the 2016-2017 winter heating season, 37,251 customers participated in the Utility Service Protection Program (“USPP” or “Program”), representing 67 percent of the 55,334 customers statewide who are certified to receive benefits from the Maryland Energy Assistance Program (“MEAP”). The USPP enrollment rate among MEAP customers has decreased by nine percentage points in the 2016-2017 heating season compared to the USPP enrollment rate of 76 percent in the 2015-2016 heating season. Each utility’s USPP participants, MEAP certified customers, and USPP enrollment information are provided in Table E1. Of the utilities listed, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (“BGE”) with approximately 93 percent had the highest USPP enrollment rate among MEAP customers; Delmarva Power & Light Company (“DPL”) and Mayor and Council of Berlin (“Berlin”) were the second and the third highest with 84 percent and 78 percent enrollment rates, respectively. Most utilities had 30 or higher percentage USPP enrollment.

TABLE E1 2016-2017 USPP PARTICIPATION INFORMATION BY UTILITY

UTILITY	USPP	MEAP	USPP as a percent of MEAP	Total Customer	USPP Enrollment as a percent Total Customers
Baltimore Gas and Electric Company	18,649	20,155	93%	1,767,923	1.05%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	13	955	1%	11297	0.12%
Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc.	754	997	76%	48,124	1.57%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	1,113	2,105	53%	29,900	3.72%
Delmarva Power & Light Company	5,922	7,087	84%	177,537	3.34%
Easton Utilities Commission	79	506	16%	8,048	0.98%
Elkton Gas	93	284	33%	7,801	1.19%
Mayor and Council of Berlin	276	352	78%	2,579	10.70%
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,809	4,604	61%	521,206	0.54%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative, Inc.	2,636	8,558	31%	142,140	1.85%
The Potomac Edison Company	2,263	4,356	52%	219,647	1.03%
Washington Gas Light Company	2,644	5,375	49%	476,451	0.55%
TOTAL	37,251	55,334	67%	3,412,653	1.09%

Furthermore, the 2016-2017 USPP participants also represented 1.09 percent of the total residential customers the reporting utilities serve in the State.

The primary purpose of the USPP is to minimize service terminations of low income customers during the heating season. Compared to the 2015-2016 heating season, the USPP participants decreased by 2,678 or 6.7 percent and service terminations of USPP participants decreased by 395 or about 23 percent. Table E2 provides the termination number and termination rate of the USPP participants for each utility in the 2016-2017 winter heating season. Statewide USPP terminations were 1,323 resulting in a termination rate of 3.55 percent. BGE terminated 1,185 USPP customers' services resulting in a termination rate of 6.35 percent, which represented the highest termination rate among the reporting utilities in the 2016-2017 heating season but showed reduced terminations of 287, down from 1,472 terminations in the 2015-2016 heating season. DPL and Choptank reported 72 and 40 terminations, respectively. Potomac Electric Power Company ("Pepco"), The Potomac Edison Company ("PE"), and Easton Utilities Commission ("Easton") each reported below 15 terminations. Furthermore, five gas and two electric utilities did not report any terminations. Among these seven companies, Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc. ("CMD") and Washington Gas Light Company ("WGL") each have a no-termination policy during the winter heating season.

TABLE E2 2016-2017 USPP TERMINATION BY UTILITY¹

UTILITY	USPP	Termination	Termination Rate
Baltimore Gas & Electric Company	18,649	1,185	6.35%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	10	0	0.00%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	3	0	0.00%
Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc.	754	40	5.31%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	1,113	0	0.00%
Delmarva Power & Light Company	5,922	72	1.22%
Easton Utilities Commission	79	3	3.80%
Elkton Gas	93	0	0.00%
Mayor and Council of Berlin	276	0	0.00%
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,809	14	0.50%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative, Inc.	2,636	0	0.00%
The Potomac Edison Company	2,263	9	0.40%
Washington Gas Light Company	2,644	0	0.00%
TOTAL	37,251	1,323	3.55%

The number of service terminations in 2016-2017 indicated the lowest since the 2012-2013 winter season. Table E3 summarizes the number of USPP participants and the terminations for the five most recent winter seasons from 2012-2013 to 2016-2017. Both the number of USPP participants and number of terminations of USPP participants were downward trending. The number of USPP participants decreased from 63,389 in the 2012-2013 winter season to 37,251 in the 2016-2017 heating season, a decrease of approximately 42 percent. The number of USPP terminations decreased from 2,208 in the 2012-2013 heating season to 1,323 in the 2016-2017 heating season, a decrease of approximately 60 percent.

¹ The analysis of USPP as a whole on a statewide level included the Mayor and Council of Berlin but not an analysis using poverty levels since Berlin did not provide data by poverty level.

TABLE E3 USPP PARTICIPATION AND SERVICE TERMINATION²

Reporting Season	USPP Participants	USPP Service Termination	Percentage of USPP Termination
2012-2013	63,389	2,208	3.50%
2013-2014	59,982	1,788	3.00%
2014-2015	55,075	1,721	3.10%
2015-2016	39,907	1,718	4.30%
2016-2017	37,251	1,323	3.55%

BACKGROUND

On March 1, 1988, the Public Service Commission of Maryland (“Commission”) issued Order No. 67999 in Case No. 8091,³ which established the Utility Service Protection Program, as required by Article 78 §54K, which has since been 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 winter 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 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 heating season, which extends from November 1 to March 31. The USPP is intended to help 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

² The analyses of 2015-2016 and the 2016-2017 did not include the Poverty Level 5 data submitted by BGE, DPL, and Pepco.

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

household. The USPP allows customers in arrears to restore service by accepting an USPP equal payment plan and by requiring that any outstanding arrearages be lowered to no more than \$400 prior to the beginning of the winter heating season. The Program encourages the utility to establish a supplemental monthly payment plan for customers with outstanding balances to reduce those arrearages. Maryland's gas and electric utilities are required to publicize and offer the USPP prior to November of each year. *See* COMAR 20.31.05.03C.

PUA §7-307 requires the Commission to submit an annual report to the General Assembly addressing terminations of service during the previous winter 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, USPP eligible non-participants among MEAP certified customers, 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.⁴

⁴ The data request was issued to A&N Electric Cooperative ("A&N"), BGE, Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Cambridge Gas Division ("CUC-Cambridge"), Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Citizens Gas Division ("CUC-Citizens"), Chesapeake Utilities Corporation-Sandpiper; Choptank Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("Choptank"), CMD, "DPL, Easton, Pivotal Utility Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Elkton Gas ("Elkton Gas"), WGL, Hagerstown Municipal Electric Light Plant ("Hagerstown"), Berlin, (PE, Pepco, Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative ("Somerset"), Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative, Inc. ("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").

Utilities serving residential customers in Maryland submitted data for this report.⁵ The Commission's April 2017 data request for the 2016-2017 heating season contained the same questions as those in the USPP Data Request issued for the 2015-2016 heating season and was similar to previous USPP data requests.⁶ This report provides an analysis and summary of that information.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

There are eighteen companies that submitted 2016-2017 heating season USPP reports to the Commission. Among these companies, four companies did not participate in the USPP: Hagerstown does not participate in the USPP program but implements a Commission approved alternate program;⁷ two small municipal companies (Thurmont and Williamsport), and UGI reported that they did not participate in the USPP.⁸ Therefore, these four companies were not included in the analyses contained in this report. Chesapeake Utilities Corporation - Sandpiper Energy responded to the USPP data request for the second time since it merged with Chesapeake Utilities Corporation in 2016, but did not have any USPP participants for the 2016-2017 winter. Therefore, data analysis of this report did not include this company. Mayor and Council of Berlin reported a total number of USPP participants, MEAP certified non-USPP participants, and non-MEAP participants but did not provide a breakdown of data by poverty levels. Berlin USPP data was only included in the statewide participation analysis but not in the analysis by poverty level. The analyses contained in this report include twelve companies that provided USPP poverty level data.⁹ Companies that serve fewer than 5,000 customers are not required to provide all data requested through Staff's data request. These companies are Chesapeake

⁵ Neither A&N nor Somerset responded to Staff's Data Request, and no data were available from these companies for this report.

⁶ The USPP Data Request was expanded in 2007.

⁷ Pursuant to COMAR 20.31.05.01C, Hagerstown operates an approved alternative program that allows MEAP-eligible customers to receive USPP-type assistance as needed during the heating season. As such, Hagerstown does not distinguish between USPP participants and all MEAP-eligible customers and does not maintain records indicating the number of individual customers who received assistance beyond that provided under MEAP.

⁸ UGI is a Pennsylvania based company and serves some customers in Maryland.

⁹ Chesapeake Utilities Corporation reported data separately for three divisions, and these three divisions were treated as three companies.

Utilities Corporation - Cambridge Gas and Easton.¹⁰ The remaining ten companies are required to provide all data requested. Even so, the data provided to the Commission have variations. Some utilities indicated that the data were not available by poverty level or was unavailable for various other reasons. The data analyses in this report were performed based on the available data of the twelve companies for the 2016-2017 heating season. The basic information for all eighteen responding utilities is in Appendix Table A1.

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

Poverty Level Classification

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

A special note regarding the treatment of Poverty Level 5 in this report is required. Poverty Level 5 data previously was reported only by Baltimore and Gas Electric Company; however, for the last two reporting seasons DPL and Pepco also provided data for Poverty Level 5.¹¹ Poverty Level 5 data is comprised of participants that receive subsidized housing allowances. Because residents of subsidized housing receive an allowance to defray the cost of utilities, these participants receive a separate and lower benefit than other USPP participants.¹² Staff did not include Poverty Level 5 data as a separate poverty level in the instant USPP report.

¹⁰ Easton serves more than 5,000 customers, but reported limited data as required for a small company and was treated accordingly in this annual report.

¹¹ DPL and Pepco started reporting Poverty Level 5 as did BGE after those companies merged with Exelon Corporation since the three companies have the same parent company – Exelon.

¹² Energy assistance is available to residents of subsidized housing who are directly responsible for paying their own heating costs and who meet all other eligibility criteria for the MEAP.

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Table 1 shows the number of USPP participants and USPP eligible non-participants for each utility by poverty level in the 2016-2017 heating season.¹³ The number of USPP participants was 37,251 with MEAP certified non-USPP participants of 18,007, resulting in a total number of MEAP certified customers of 55,334.¹⁴ The number of USPP participants decreased by 2,656, or a 6.7 percent; the MEAP certified non-USPP customers increased by 5,275 or 41.43 percent; and the total number of MEAP certified customers increased by 2,695 or 5.12 percent when compared to the previous heating season.

During 2016-2017 heating season, the majority of utilities reported participation decreases, including BGE, DPL, PE, Choptank, and CMD, resulting in a total decrease of 5,065 participants while the other five utilities reported a total participant increase of 2,387. The resultant participation net decrease was 2,678.¹⁵ BGE reported the largest decrease of 3,696 participants; DPL followed with a decrease of 1,037, and PE with 106 USPP participants fewer than the last winter season. WGL reported the largest increase in number of participants, with 1,812 more participants than during the previous heating season, followed by Pepco and SMECO with increases of 284 and 185, respectively.

The decreases in USPP participants were observed at all poverty levels and ranged from 12.85 percent at Poverty Level 1; 6.19 percent at Poverty Level 4; 4.4 percent at Poverty Level 3; to 2.84 percent at Poverty Level 2.

As for the distribution of statewide USPP participants, BGE reported 18,649 USPP participants, accounting for 50.44 percent of the State's total USPP participants; DPL reported

¹³ The Terms "USPP eligible non-Participant", "MEAP eligible non-Participant", and "MEAP certified non-USPP participants" are used interchangeably in this report. These persons represent the customers who are certified eligible to receive a MEAP grant but who do not participate in USPP program.

¹⁴ The numbers of USPP participants and the total MEAP customers included Berlin's numbers. The numbers in Table 1 by poverty level excluded Berlin's numbers.

¹⁵ *Id.*

5,922, or 16.02 percent of total USPP participants; Pepco and SMECO reported 2,809 and 2,636 participants, or 7.6 and 7.13 percent of total USPP participants, respectively. The eight major utilities (BGE, DPL, Pepco, SMECO, Choptank, PE, WGL, and CMD) accounted for 98.76 percent of total USPP participants, almost the same as the previous 99 percent in the 2015-2016 heating season.

The number of USPP-eligible non-participants in MEAP was 18,007 during the 2016-2017 winter seasons, an increase of 5,275 as compared with the 2015-2016 heating season.

Table 2 presents USPP participation as a percentage of the total number of MEAP-certified customers for the 2016-2017 and 2015-2016 heating seasons by company and by poverty level. The statewide USPP participation rate of MEAP-certified customers for the 2016-2017 winter heating season is 67 percent, nine percentage points lower than that in 2015-2016, as it indicated that the enrollment in USPP of participants in MEAP has decreased during recent heating seasons. The same changes - USPP participation decreases - were observed by poverty level between the current and the previous heating seasons, during which, Poverty Level 1 participation decreased by 15 percentage points, Poverty Level 4 by seven percentage points, and Poverty Levels 2 and 3 by 3 and 4 percentage points, respectively. Among the utilities, eight utilities reported enrollment rate decreases, including BGE, CUC-Cambridge, CUC-Citizens, DPL, Choptank, CMD, Elkton Gas, and SMECO; PE had the same USPP enrollment rate; and three - Easton, Pepco, and WGL- reported increases in their enrollment rates. The enrollment rate decreases ranged from 20 percentage points (Elkton Gas) to one percentage point (CUC-Citizens) from the 2015-2016 winter season.

The enrollment rate varied among the utilities. BGE reported the highest enrollment rate at 93 percent; DPL the second highest enrollment at 84 percent; and Choptank reported 76 percent enrollment in the current report. Prior to the 2015-2016 winter season, Choptank reported 100 percent of USPP enrollment of MEAP customers; due to a change in Choptank's tracking method in 2015 it reported 79 and 76 percent enrollment for the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 heating seasons, respectively. Choptank, DPL, and Pepco automatically enrolled MEAP customers into USPP program if they had arrearages on their accounts. CMD worked with

energy assistance agencies and enrolled MEAP customers into USPP if the MEAP customers agreed to participate in alternate payment plans.

Table 3 presents the USPP enrollment compared to the total customers each utility serves. During the 2016-2017 heating season, the rate of USPP participants to total utility customers statewide was 1.09 percent and decreased slightly from the previously reported 1.2 percent. Among major utilities, CMD reported a 3.72 percent USPP participation rate (the highest USPP participation rate), followed by DPL with a 3.34 percent participation rate. BGE, Choptank, PE, Pepco, and SMECO each had a participation rate below two percent.

Table 4 shows the percentage of customers who were USPP participants in the 2015-2016 heating season and also participated in the 2016-2017 heating season. Overall, 36 percent of the USPP customers who participated in the 2015-2016 heating season also enrolled in the USPP during the 2016-2017 heating season. This enrollment rate of two-consecutive heating seasons is three percentage points lower than the 39 percent in the previous report and also continued a decreasing trend since the 2012-2013 heating season report where the repeated USPP customer enrollment rate was 51 percent. Based on data availability for the two reported heating seasons, major utilities BGE, Pepco, SMECO, PE, and WGL, reported lower repeat enrollment. However, CUC-Citizen, Choptank, DPL, and Elkton Gas reported higher repeat enrollment from the 2015-2016 report. CUC-Cambridge, CMD, and Easton had no available data.

SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND SUPPLEMENTAL 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 the utilities to offer customers with outstanding arrearages the opportunity to place all or part of those arrearages in a special agreement 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 heating season is 6,323, lower than the 7,145 in the 2015-2016. The percentage of USPP participants making supplemental payments held the same at 17 percent as in the last reporting season. The average monthly supplemental payment increased across all poverty levels for the second consecutive reporting season. As compared with the 2015-2016 season, the average monthly supplemental payments increased by \$129.59, \$153.65, \$165.6, and \$143.6 for Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Despite this trend, at the end of the 2016-2017 heating season, the supplemental arrearages statewide had decreased by approximately 11 percent from \$912 in the 2015-2016 heating season to \$811 in the 2016-2017 heating season.¹⁶ The weighted average of supplemental arrearages decreased across all poverty levels ranging from approximately 2 percent to 16 percent as follows: 2 percent for Poverty Level 2; 11 percent for Poverty Levels 3 and 4; and 16 percent for Poverty Level 1.

PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

Table 6 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-certified non-USPP participants, and all other residential customers who were in arrears on their utility bills as of March 31, 2017.

As was the pattern experienced over the previous heating seasons, USPP participants were more likely to be in arrears than either MEAP-certified non-USPP participants or non-MEAP customers of the utility. This pattern continued in the 2016-2017 winter heating season. Non-MEAP eligible customers exhibited the lowest percentage of customers in arrears during the 2016-2017 winter heating season. For all reporting utilities, the percentage of customers in arrears was 41 percent for USPP participants, 28 percent for MEAP-certified non-USPP participants, and 17 percent for non-MEAP-eligible customers as of March 31, 2017. The proportion of USPP participants who were in arrears was about four percentage points lower than

¹⁶ *Id.*

the previous 45 percent in the 2015-2016 heating season. Among the utilities in the 2016-2017 heating season, four utilities reported a slight arrearage reduction as compared with the previous heating season, and five utilities reported a slightly higher level of average arrearages for the 2015-2016 heating season.

Table 7 presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, MEAP-certified non-USPP participants, and non-MEAP customers. Compared to the 2015-2016 data, average arrearage balances for both USPP customers and MEAP-certified non-USPP participants increased. For the 2016-2017 heating season, the overall average arrearage for USPP participants was \$622, increasing by \$32 or about 6 percent from approximately \$590 in the 2015-2016. In 2016-2017, the average arrearage balance for MEAP eligible non-USPP participants was approximately \$465, increasing by \$39 or 9 percent from the 2015-2016 winter heating season.

Across all poverty levels, the average arrearage balances increased by one percentage point for Poverty Level 4 , 3 percentage points for Poverty Levels 3, and 9 and 5 percentage points for Poverty Levels 1 and 2, respectively, from that reported for the previous heating season.

Table 8 presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for the 2016-2017 heating season and compares those to the previous season's results. According to the USPP provisions, a customer can be removed from the program and a customer's service may be terminated if the amount due on two consecutive monthly bills is not paid. As in previous years, BGE and CMD reported that, as a matter of company policy, neither removed customers from the program if the customer did not comply with the USPP payment rules during the 2016-2017 heating season. Because these companies do not enforce this provision of the program, they do not track the percentage of customers who complied with the program rules. Also, for that reason, the statewide compliance percentage of approximately 96 percent shown on Table 9 may overstate the proportion of customers that comply with the USPP payment provisions. When compared with the previous heating seasons, the statewide compliance rate decreased by 2 percentage points from a 98 percent compliance

rate in the 2015-2016 winter heating season. The compliance rates across all poverty levels were almost identical at 96 percent in 2016-2017.¹⁷ Among the data reported by utilities, Easton and WGL reported a 100 percent compliance rate and were followed by SMECO with a compliance rate of 99 percent.

HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

Table 9 presents the number of USPP participants, MEAP-certified non-USPP participants, and non-MEAP customers whose services were terminated during the winter heating season. Of the 37,521 USPP participants, Maryland's utilities collectively terminated 1,323 USPP participants, lower than the 1,718 terminations experienced in the 2015-2016 winter heating season. The USPP customer terminations were reduced by 395 as compared with the 2015-2016 winter heating season. Winter termination policies vary among utilities. Major gas utilities, CMD and WGL, each has implemented a no-termination policy during the winter season since the USPP program took effect. Some small or municipal utilities normally reported few or no terminations. In the 2016-2017 heating season, Berlin, CUC-Cambridge, CUC-Citizens, Elkton, and SMECO did not report any terminations during the 2016-2017 heating season. Among those utilities reporting terminations during the 2016-2017 winter season, three major utilities (BGE, DPL, and Pepco) reported 1,271 terminations, accounting for 96 percent of the total terminations. BGE represented 1,185 terminations or approximately 90 percent of the State total reported USPP termination in the current report. It is noted that BGE's terminations decreased by 287 compared to the previous report¹⁸. The other four utilities all reported a decrease in terminations while Choptank reported a termination increase from the 2015-2016 terminations.

HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Table 10 presents the percentage of USPP participants who consumed more than 135 percent of their utility system's respective average usage. Data in this table show the proportions

¹⁷ The percentage numbers are rounded up to the nearest integer.

¹⁸ BGE reported 425 customer terminations for Poverty Level 5 customers and these terminations were excluded.

of USPP customers who consume higher than average levels of energy by poverty level.¹⁹ Due to this higher consumption, these customers will have higher than average heating bills. These higher bills may tend to generate higher arrearages, thereby creating a higher risk of defaulting on payment plans and a greater risk of termination.

For the 2016-2017 heating season, approximately 25 percent of USPP participants consumed more than 135 percent of their respective utility's system average usage, which was one percentage point higher than the 24 percent recognized in the 2015-2016 winter heating season. The high usage customer rates for the two recent consecutive heating seasons have been approximately 25 percent; however, the percentage of USPP participants reporting higher than average system consumption have presented an upward trend since the 2010-2011 heating season when only 12 percent of USPP participants reported their usage exceeding 135 percent of the system average usage on a statewide base.

As indicated in **Table 10**, the proportion of USPP customers reporting more than 135 percent of system average use does not vary much by poverty level. Poverty Levels 1, 3, and 4 have identical percentages of customers with high usage, 25 percent, and Poverty Level 2 reported 24 percent of customers with high energy usage. Pepco, SMECO, and PE reported over 50 percent of USPP customers that consumed more than 135 percent of the system average in both 2016-2017 and 2015-2016 heating seasons.

PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE

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

For all utilities in the 2016-2017 heating season, 74 percent of USPP customers, 52 percent of MEAP-certified non-USPP participants, and 51 percent of non-MEAP customers

¹⁹ The data did not include those customers with high usage who were referred to local weatherization agencies for the Weatherization Assistance Program and also do not include the three small utilities serving less than 5,000 customers since they are not required to report this information.

received their primary heating source from the utility responding to the data request. The percentage of USPP customers using the reporting utilities as their heating sources increased three percentage points. The data for primary heating source vary across utilities. The percentages of USPP customers whose primary heating source was provided by the reporting utilities ranged from 34 percent to 100 percent among utilities. This variation was primarily due to the three types of services the utilities provide: electric only, gas only, and electric and gas. The lowest percentages reported are the utilities that provide electric service only. Four gas companies reported that they were the sole heating source for their entire customer base (99 to 100 percent). These gas utilities are CUC-Citizens, CMD, Elkton Gas, and WGL. Choptank, an electric-only company continued reporting 100 percent of its USPP participants used electricity as their heating source as in the 2015-2016 report. SMECO, another electric-only company reported 95 percent of USPP customers having the utility as their heating source. DPL, an electric-only utility reported an increase of 10 percentage points from 24 percent in 2015-2016 to 34 percent in the 2016-2017 season.

MEAP GRANTS

Table 12 presents the average MEAP grant payable to the utility at the time of the customer's enrollment in the USPP program. OHEP's benefit calculation methodology provides larger MEAP grants at poverty levels reflecting lower incomes. The data indicates that the overall level of average benefit was \$451 in 2016-2017, which was decreased from \$466 in the 2015-2016 season. As seen in the previous years, the size of the MEAP benefit awarded to customers decreased as the poverty level increased. Customers in Poverty Level 1, at the lowest household income level, received the highest benefit, an average MEAP benefit of \$478; those in Poverty Levels 2, 3, and 4, reported the MEAP grant as: \$441, \$434, and \$426, respectively. Customers of CMD and SMECO received the largest average grant at \$533 and \$503, respectively, followed by WGL and BGE, with \$496 and \$478, respectively.

CONCLUSION

The data reported to the Commission from the utilities for the 2016-2017 winter heating season show that the USPP participants and the participation rate decreased from the previous

heating season. The number of statewide USPP participants was 37,251 during the 2016-2017 heating season, representing 2,656 or a 6.7 percent decrease of USPP participants from the 2015-2016 heating season. The number of USPP participants also indicated 67 percent of MEAP customers enrolled into the USPP, representing a nine percentage point decrease in the USPP enrollment rate of MEAP customers as compared with the previous 2015-2016 heating season.²⁰The USPP enrollment rate among the total utility customer base was 1.09 percent, a slight decrease from the 2015-2016's 1.19 percent participation rate. Furthermore, 1,321 USPP customers were terminated in the 2016-2017 winter season, which were 395 fewer than terminated in the 2015-2016 winter season. In addition to the winter protections offered by the USPP to low-income customers and the financial assistance to low-income customers from the MEAP and Electric Universal Service Program, some utilities providing electric and/or gas service in Maryland operated other specific programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers during the 2016-2017 heating season. These programs vary from utility to utility, but all focus on helping low-income customers with billing and related issues.

²⁰ The number of USPP participants included Berlin's USPP participants since Berlin provided its total USPP participants but did not provide USPP data by poverty level.

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

UTILITY	USPP Participants					USPP Eligible Non-Participants					Grand Total
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall 1	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	6,736	4,673	4,997	2,243	18,649	599	358	380	169	1,506	20,155
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	4	5	1	0	10	130	89	51	24	294	304
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	2	1	0	0	3	238	198	158	54	648	651
Choptank Electric Cooperative	235	240	202	77	754	77	74	65	27	243	997
Columbia Gas of Maryland	386	321	298	108	1,113	266	279	310	137	992	2,105
Delmarva Power & Light	2,038	1,839	1,535	510	5,922	376	369	312	108	1,165	7,087
Easton Utilities	26	26	21	6	79	100	142	143	42	427	506
Elkton Gas	36	25	27	5	93	74	52	51	14	191	284
Potomac Electric Power Company	1,111	775	627	296	2,809	664	485	438	208	1,795	4,604
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	967	732	658	279	2,636	4,007	813	788	314	5,922	8,558
The Potomac Edison Company	687	658	654	264	2,263	689	657	529	218	2,093	4,356
Washington Gas Light Company	972	690	696	286	2,644	1,030	745	634	322	2,731	5,375
TOTALS	13,200	9,985	9,716	4,074	36,975	8,250	4,261	3,859	1,637	18,007	54,982

*. Berlin data was not included because no breakdown by poverty level had been provided. The total USPP participants are not the same as statewide USPP total.

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

UTILITY	2016-2017 Participation					2015-2016 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	92%	93%	93%	93%	93%	94%	95%	96%	96%	95%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	3%	5%	2%	0%	3%	12%	18%	16%	10%	14%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	75%	76%	76%	74%	76%	81%	79%	75%	86%	79%
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	59%	54%	49%	44%	53%	60%	54%	55%	59%	57%
Delmarva Power & Light	84%	83%	83%	83%	84%	90%	87%	87%	85%	88%
Easton Utilities	21%	15%	13%	13%	16%	8%	4%	8%	11%	7%
Elkton Gas	33%	32%	35%	26%	33%	55%	35%	56%	75%	53%
Potomac Electric Power Company	63%	62%	59%	59%	61%	56%	57%	59%	59%	58%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	19%	47%	46%	47%	31%	48%	47%	47%	48%	48%
The Potomac Edison Company	50%	50%	55%	55%	52%	52%	49%	54%	58%	52%
Washington Gas Light Company	49%	48%	52%	47%	49%	45%	42%	41%	43%	43%
TOTALS	62%	70%	72%	71%	67%	77%	73%	76%	78%	76%

TABLE 3 USPP PARTICIPANTS AND PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLMENT TO MEAP AND TOTAL CUSTOMERS

UTILITY	USPP	MEAP Customer	Rate of USPP to MEAP Customer	Total Customer	Rate of USPP to Total Customer
Baltimore Gas & Electric	18,649	20,155	93%	1,767,923	1.05%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	10	304	3%	2,385	0.42%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	3	651	0%	8,912	0.03%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	754	997	76%	48,124	1.57%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	1,113	2,105	53%	29,900	3.72%
Delmarva Power & Light	5,922	7,087	84%	177,537	3.34%
Easton Utilities	79	506	16%	8,048	0.98%
Elkton Gas	93	284	33%	7,801	1.19%
Mayor & Council of Berlin	276	352	78%	2,580	10.70%
Potomac Electric Power Company	2,809	4,604	61%	521,206	0.54%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	2,636	8,558	31%	142,140	1.85%
The Potomac Edison Company	2,263	4,356	52%	219,647	1.03%
Washington Gas Light Company	2,644	5,375	49%	476,451	0.55%
TOTAL	37,251	55,334	67%	3,412,654	1.09%

**TABLE 4 PERCENTAGE OF 2016-2017 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED
 IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE PRIOR HEATING SEASON**

UTILITY	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	32%	42%	41%	36%	37%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	50%	0%	*	*	33%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	91%	88%	77%	113%	88%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	41%	52%	50%	43%	47%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	28%	24%	41%	0%	29%
Potomac Electric Power Company	24%	31%	23%	19%	25%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	38%	41%	36%	29%	37%
The Potomac Edison Company	41%	46%	51%	43%	46%
Washington Gas Light Company	9%	8%	9%	5%	8%
TOTAL	32%	40%	39%	34%	36%

* indicates either a company is not required to provide data or a company does not track data by poverty level.

TABLE 5 PERCENTAGE OF USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR OF 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	Over-all	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Over-all	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 4	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	84	103	96	87	92	572	837	658	617	659
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0%	100%	0%	0%	33%	0	38	0	0	38	0	75	0	0	75
Choptank Electric Cooperative	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Columbia Gas of Maryland	61%	44%	42%	43%	49%	15	14	19	20	16	201	187	175	174	189
Delmarva Power & Light	23%	19%	21%	27%	22%	70	76	79	80	75	2018	2184	2087	2146	2095
Easton Utilities	0%	4%	5%	0%	3%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Potomac Electric Power Company	22%	17%	15%	20%	19%	70	79	78	74	74	1943	1736	1745	1997	1862
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	37%	29%	30%	34%	33%	59	62	59	59	60	318	287	331	353	317
The Potomac Edison Company	13%	7%	7%	13%	10%	105	99	98	84	99	284	340	287	212	286
Washington Gas Light Company	92%	91%	91%	91%	91%	470	471	499	496	481	269	259	379	239	292
TOTAL	19%	16%	16%	17%	17%	212	224	245	228	225	796	837	809	808	811

* indicates either a company is not required to provide data or a company does not track data by poverty level.

TABLE 6 PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELEGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL¹

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	59.68%	53.26%	52.59%	56.84%	55.83%	46.24%	45.25%	41.84%	46.15%	44.89%	18.54%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	42.31%	34.83%	29.41%	29.17%	36.73%	25.28%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	45.80%	29.80%	27.22%	42.59%	36.11%	16.55%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	30.21%	28.75%	34.65%	36.36%	31.56%	41.56%	24.32%	29.23%	40.74%	32.92%	0.00%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	39.12%	28.04%	24.83%	21.30%	30.37%	8.27%	8.96%	5.48%	5.11%	7.16%	13.88%
Delmarva Power & Light	34.05%	27.46%	27.75%	29.02%	29.94%	36.17%	27.37%	24.36%	33.33%	29.96%	16.92%
Easton Utilities	15.38%	7.69%	9.52%	0.00%	10.13%	6.00%	4.23%	3.50%	7.14%	4.68%	2.62%
Elkton Gas	44.44%	40.00%	29.63%	40.00%	38.71%	35.14%	36.54%	33.33%	50.00%	36.13%	23.27%
Potomac Electric Power Company	26.10%	20.77%	21.85%	28.04%	23.89%	28.61%	25.36%	23.97%	29.81%	26.74%	19.48%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	55.43%	49.18%	49.85%	54.12%	52.16%	14.55%	50.31%	48.98%	52.55%	26.06%	21.63%
The Potomac Edison Company	34.21%	14.13%	11.47%	10.61%	19.05%	35.41%	18.72%	15.88%	23.85%	24.03%	14.77%
Washington Gas Light Company	0.00%	0.14%	0.29%	0.00%	0.11%	35.44%	25.23%	29.02%	30.12%	30.54%	7.18%
TOTAL	45.58%	37.86%	38.60%	42.66%	41.34%	24.79%	29.66%	28.76%	33.48%	27.58%	16.61%

¹ Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2017.

TABLE 7 ARREARAGE FOR USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP CERTIFIED NON-USPP PARTICIPANTS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL¹

UTILITY	USPP Participants (\$)					MEAP Certified Non-USPP 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	564	471	520	509	524	759	650	617	722	695	291
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	151	166	174	156	160	184
Choptank Electric Cooperative	402	323	312	265	337	595	487	587	548	562	136
Columbia Gas of Maryland	112	112	123	191	120	133	163	202	254	172	196
Delmarva Power & Light	1,611	1,467	1,329	1,185	1,467	1,223	1,600	1,356	2,123	1,454	535
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0	*
Elkton Gas	45	95	44	64	60	113	108	39	76	90	120
Potomac Electric Power Company	1,129	961	816	1,236	1,038	1,144	1,117	1,058	936	1,091	300
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	422	367	389	370	394	207	194	195	202	200	151
The Potomac Edison Company	285	167	138	144	225	257	223	154	226	228	205
Washington Gas Light Company	0	180	343	0	289	343	344	332	344	341	143
TOTALS	673	595	591	575	622	462	475	436	513	465	226

¹ Customer is in arrears if any monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2017.

* indicates either a company is not required to provide data or a company does not track data by poverty level.

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

UTILITY	Compliance 2016-2017					Compliance 2015-2016				
	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	25%	100%	100%	*	70%	60%	71%	56%	100%	65%
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	60%	100%	100%	0%	73%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	85%	92%	96%	96%	91%	88%	88%	93%	88%	89%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	91%	94%	94%	93%	93%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Easton Utilities	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%	88%	87%	50%	83%
Elkton Gas	97%	92%	89%	80%	92%	100%	94%	100%	98%	98%
Potomac Electric Power Company	71%	75%	67%	63%	70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	99%	98%	99%	100%	99%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%
The Potomac Edison Company	94%	85%	87%	86%	88%	94%	83%	84%	82%	87%
Washington Gas Light Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	59%	65%	65%	63%	62%
TOTALS	96%	96%	96%	95%	96%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%

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

* indicates data were not available.

TABLE 9 NUMBER OF WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATION

UTILITY	USPP Participants					MEAP Certified Non-USPP 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	502	267	265	151	1,185	37	26	22	14	99	9,275
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	3	16
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	0	0	0	0	0	17	6	8	2	33	84
Choptank Electric Cooperative	16	12	10	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	125
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	58
Delmarva Power & Light	37	13	18	4	72	8	7	2	1	18	1,620
Easton Utilities	2	1	0	0	3	3	0	3	1	7	23
Elkton Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	7
Potomac Electric Power Company	6	2	1	5	14	13	2	2	3	20	2,968
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,504
The Potomac Edison Company	2	1	3	3	9	4	2	1	0	7	129
Washington Gas Light Company	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0
TOTALS	565	296	297	165	1,323	84	44	39	21	188	15,809

* Columbia Gas and Washington Gas each has a no-termination policy during heating season.

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	22%	23%	23%	22%	22%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	50%	0%	0%	0%	33%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	*	*	*	*	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	30%	27%	28%	28%	28%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	6%	8%	22%	0%	11%
Potomac Electric Power Company	40%	39%	44%	52%	42%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	34%	29%	31%	32%	32%
The Potomac Edison Company	47%	40%	46%	42%	44%
Washington Gas Light Company	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%
TOTALS	25%	24%	25%	25%	25%

* indicates either a company is not required to provide data or a company does not track usage data by poverty level.

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

UTILITY	USPP Participants					MEAP Certified Non-USPP 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	71%	77%	79%	79%	75%	70%	72%	76%	81%	73%	49%
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	100%	100%	*	*	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	7%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Delmarva Power & Light	30%	37%	38%	32%	34%	36%	40%	44%	41%	40%	36%
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	100%	100%	96%	100%	99%	*	*	*	*	*	100%
Potomac Electric Power Company	77%	83%	79%	78%	79%	78%	78%	77%	76%	77%	31%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	95%	96%	96%	93%	95%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
The Potomac Edison Company	85%	85%	82%	89%	85%	85%	85%	82%	80%	84%	47%
Washington Gas Light Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
TOTALS	71%	74%	76%	77%	74%	40%	62%	61%	64%	52%	51%

* Data not applicable since only BGE, DPL, and Pepco provided Poverty Level 5 data; or small utilities are not required to report data; Choptank did not provide data for Non-MEAP customers and SMECO did not provide data for non-USPP and Non-MEAP participants.

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

UTILITY	Average 2016-2017 Grants (\$)					Average 2015-2016 Grants (\$)				
	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	\$517	\$478	\$453	\$418	\$478	\$518	\$476	\$452	\$423	\$480
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Gas Division	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division	\$539	\$323	\$0	\$0	\$467	\$452	\$269	\$531	\$0	\$375
Choptank Electric Cooperative	\$523	\$462	\$453	\$421	\$474	\$590	\$545	\$540	\$539	\$558
Columbia Gas of Maryland	\$538	\$538	\$522	\$527	\$533	\$529	\$476	\$497	\$439	\$493
Delmarva Power & Light	\$421	\$375	\$381	\$393	\$394	\$479	\$437	\$446	\$453	\$457
Easton Utilities	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Elkton Gas	\$239	\$154	\$282	\$214	\$227	\$201	\$230	\$213	\$160	\$200
Potomac Electric Power Company	\$394	\$371	\$405	\$428	\$394	\$419	\$390	\$447	\$473	\$424
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	\$507	\$518	\$462	\$551	\$504	\$542	\$526	\$552	\$508	\$537
The Potomac Edison Company	\$329	\$291	\$299	\$311	\$307	\$386	\$345	\$343	\$356	\$359
Washington Gas Light Company	\$482	\$490	\$517	\$511	\$496	\$489	\$478	\$493	\$477	\$486
TOTALS	\$478	\$441	\$434	\$426	\$451	\$497	\$454	\$448	\$430	\$469

* indicates a company is not required to provide data.

APPENDIX A1 2016-2017 HEATING SEASON REPORTING
UTILITIES BASIC INFORMATION

UTILITY	Participated in USPP	Serving Customers	Service Type	Included in Data Analysis
BGE	Yes	≥ 5,000	Gas and Electric	Yes
Chesapeake Utilities - Cambridge Division	Yes	< 5,000	Gas	Yes
Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Division	Yes	≥ 5,000	Gas	Yes
Chesapeake Utilities - Sandpiper Energy	No	≥ 5,000	Gas	No
Choptank Electric Cooperative	Yes	≥ 5,000	Electric	Yes
Columbia Gas of Maryland, Inc.	Yes	≥ 5,000	Gas	Yes
Delmarva Power and Light	Yes	≥ 5,000	Electric	Yes
Easton Utilities ¹	Yes	≥ 5,000	Gas and Electric	Yes
Elkton Gas	Yes	≥ 5,000	Gas	Yes
Hagerstown Light Department	No	≥ 5,000	Electric	No
Mayor & Council of Berlin	Yes	< 5,000	Electric	No
Potomac Electric Power Company	Yes	≥ 5,000	Electric	Yes
The Potomac Edison Company	Yes	≥ 5,000	Electric	Yes
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	Yes	≥ 5,000	Electric	Yes
Thurmont	No	< 5,000	Electric	No
UGI Utilities, Inc.	No	< 5,000	Gas	No
Washington Gas Light Company	Yes	≥ 5,000	Gas	Yes
Williamsport Municipal Electric Light Plant	No	< 5,000	Electric	No

¹ Easton Utilities has provided data as a small company although it has more than 5,000 customers.