

**THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION'S
UTILITY SERVICE PROTECTION PROGRAM (USPP)
ANNUAL REPORT
WINTER 2006-2007 RESULTS**

**Pursuant to § 7-307 of the Public Utility Companies Article,
*Annotated Code of Maryland***

By the
Maryland Public Service Commission
William Donald Schaefer Tower
6 Saint Paul Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
BACKGROUND.....	5
DATA REPORTING.....	6
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION.....	7
EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE.....	9
SUPPLEMENTAL PAYMENTS AND ARREARAGES.....	9
PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE	11
HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS.....	12
HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION.....	14
PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE.....	14
MEAP GRANTS.....	15
CONCLUSION	15

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1 NUMBER OF 2006 - 2007 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, 2006 - 2007 AND 2005 - 2006 18

TABLE 3 PERCENTAGE OF 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE 2005-2006 HEATING SEASON 19

TABLE 4 AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL..... 20

TABLE 5 PERCENTAGE OF 2006-2007 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 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL..... 22

TABLE 7 AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS BY POVERTY LEVEL 23

TABLE 8 PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS 2006 - 2007 AND 2005 - 2006 BY POVERTY LEVEL..... 24

TABLE 9 NUMBER OF 2006 - 2007 WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS 25

TABLE 10 PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY FOR NOVEMBER 2006 - MARCH 2007 26

TABLE 11 PERCENTAGE OF 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, 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 2006-2007 AND 2005-2006 USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL 28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The data collected for the 2006-2007 winter heating season show that the Utility Service Protection Program (“USPP”) continued to accomplish its goal of minimizing the number of service terminations among low-income customers. The number of USPP participants in Poverty Levels 1, 2 and 3 for the 2006-2007 winter heating season was 1,063 greater than the number of participants for the 2005-2006 winter heating season, and 20,285 more than that for the 1996-1997 winter heating season.

Data reported by the participating utility companies indicate that there was little change between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 in the low percentage of terminations among the USPP population, which is the primary purpose of the USPP. Seven tenths of one percent (0.7 percent) of the USPP population was terminated during the 2006-2007 winter heating season compared to 0.6 percent of the USPP participants terminated during the 2005-2006 heating season.

The low percentage of terminations indicates that the USPP is effective in keeping low-income customers’ service connected during the winter. The 2006-2007 winter heating results reflect the capability of the USPP, and the utilities managing the program, to benefit low-income customers.

According to the Office of Home Energy Programs (“OHEP”), OHEP used a 200 percent federal poverty level as the maximum poverty level for which households were eligible for USPP assistance in the 2006-2007 winter heating season rather than the 150 percent of the federal poverty level as in previous years. Due to the differences and inconsistencies in data by poverty levels submitted by the various companies,¹ this report presents data for Poverty Levels 1 (0-50% of the current federal poverty level), 2 (51-100% of the current federal poverty level) and 3 (101-150% of the federal poverty level)

¹ Some companies defined Poverty Levels 1, 2 and 3 as 0-50%, 51-100% and 101-150%, respectively (following traditional methods), while other companies defined these Poverty Levels as 0-75%, 76-110%, 111-150%, respectively. Furthermore, some companies submitted data for Poverty Levels 1, 2, and 3, while other companies submitted data for Poverty Levels 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 for some of the categories.

based on the Federal Poverty Guidelines and Threshold, as in previous reports. The Public Service Commission (“Commission”) will ensure consistent reporting of data across companies for subsequent reports.

BACKGROUND

On March 1, 1988, the Commission issued Order No. 67999 in Case No. 8091, which established the USPP as required by §7-307 of the Public Utility Companies Article, *Annotated Code of Maryland* (“PUC Article”). Section 7-307 of the PUC Article provides for the promulgation by the Commission of regulations relating to when and under what conditions there should be a prohibition against, or a limitation upon, the authority of a public service company to terminate, for nonpayment, gas or electric service to low-income residential customers during the heating season. Regulations governing the USPP are contained in Chapter 20.31.05 of the Code of Maryland Regulations (“COMAR”).

The USPP is available to utility customers who are eligible and have made application for a grant from the Maryland Energy Assistance Program (“MEAP”) administered by OHEP. The USPP is designed to protect eligible low-income residential customers from utility service termination during the winter. The USPP helps low-income customers avoid the accumulation of arrearages, which could lead to service terminations, by providing equal monthly utility payments for participants based on the estimated annual service to the household. The USPP allows customers in arrears to restore service by accepting the USPP equal payment plan and by bringing outstanding arrearages down to \$400. The program encourages the utility to establish a supplemental monthly payment plan for customers with outstanding 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).

Section 7-307 of the PUC Article requires the Commission to submit an annual report to the General Assembly on terminations of service during the previous heating

season. To facilitate the compilation of such reports, the Commission directs all gas and electric utilities to collect specific data (*see* COMAR 20.31.05.09). By means of a Commission issued data request, the utilities are asked to report the following: 1) the number of USPP participants, MEAP eligible non-participants, total utility customers, and current participants who also participated the previous year; 2) the number of customers for whom the utility's service is the primary 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; 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 customers consuming more than 135% of system average for the heating season; and, 9) the average cost of actual usage for the heating season. This report provides the summary and analysis of that information.

DATA REPORTING

All investor-owned utilities serving residential customers in Maryland submitted data for this report. The Commission's March 2007 data request contained the same questions as those in all USPP data requests since the 1990-1991 reporting season.

Pursuant to COMAR 20.31.05.01C, Hagerstown Electric Light Plant ("Hagerstown") operates an approved alternative USPP that allows MEAP-eligible customers to receive USPP-type assistance as needed during the heating season. As such, Hagerstown does not distinguish between USPP participants and all MEAP-eligible customers and does not maintain records indicating the number of individual customers who received assistance beyond that provided under MEAP. In addition, Hagerstown and three other utilities were not required to answer all the questions contained in the Commission's data request because the utilities are either municipally-owned or have fewer than 5,000 residential customers.

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Table 1 shows the number of USPP participants and eligible non-participants. The data collected show that during the 2006-2007 heating season, there were 59,796 participants in the USPP program in Poverty Levels 1 (0-50% of the federal poverty level), 2 (51-100% of the federal poverty level) and 3 (101-150% of the federal poverty level). This represents an increase of 1.8% over that recorded for the 2005-2006 heating season, and an increase of 51.3% compared to the USPP participation in the 1996-1997 winter heating season. The total eligible population for the 2006-2007 heating season was 70,606, which represents a decrease of 0.06% compared to the 2005-2006 heating season, and an increase of 13.2% compared to the 1996-1997 winter heating season.

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (“BGE”) accounted for more than half of all the 2006-2007 USPP participants, totaling 33,327 or 55.7%.² This represents a decrease of 2.9% when compared with the number of USPP participants reported by BGE during the 2005-2006 heating season. Of all utility companies, BGE also had the highest percentage of eligible non-participants for the 2006-2007 heating season, which was 30.6%.

The Potomac Electric Power Company (“Pepco”) enrolled 8,058 customers in the USPP, which was the second highest number enrolled by all utility companies. This number represented 13.5% of all USPP 2006-2007 participants, and it was an increase of 2.2% compared with the number enrolled in the 2005-2006 heating season.³ Delmarva Power and Light Company (“Delmarva”) had the third highest USPP participation level, with 6,311 customers enrolled for the 2006-2007 winter heating season, representing

² BGE has 56.1% of the residential customers in Maryland. Therefore, its representation within the population of EUSP recipients is roughly equal to its proportion of residential customers.

³ Pepco has 24% of the total residential customers in the state. Therefore, its representation in the EUSP population is about half as large as its proportion of residential customers.

10.6% of the total number enrolled by all companies.⁴ The Potomac Edison Company d/b/a Allegheny Power (“AP”) recorded 3,939 (6.6%) customers enrolled while Washington Gas Light Company (WGL) –Maryland Division enrolled 3,279 (5.5%) customers in the USPP.

Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative’s (“SMECO”) participation grew during 2006-2007 (where 669 customers were enrolled) compared to participation in 2005-2006, where 444 customers were enrolled.

Table 2 presents USPP participation as a percentage of the total number of MEAP-eligible customers for 2006-2007 and 2005-2006. The overall rate of customer participation in the USPP for all utility companies for the 2006-2007 winter heating season was 89%, which is 3% higher than the 2005-2006 results, and equal to the 2004-2005 results. The overall participation rate in 2006-2007 was 26% higher compared to the participation rate in the 1996-1997 winter heating season. One hundred percent of eligible Pepco, Choptank, and Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative (“Somerset”) customers participate in the USPP, 96% of eligible AP customers, 91% of eligible BGE customers, 88% of eligible WGL – Maryland Division customers, and 80% of Delmarva customers participate in the USPP program. There were lower participation rates of eligible customers among some of the smaller utilities, such as 59% of Columbia Gas eligible customers, 64% of eligible Elkton Gas customers and 43% of Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Gas Division, and 20% of eligible SMECO customers.

Table 3 presents the percentage of USPP participants who were also enrolled in the program during the 2005-2006 heating season. There was no change in the overall percentage of USPP participants between 2005-2006 and 2006-2007, when 55% of the 2006-2007 participants were also participants in the 2005-2006 heating season. Historical data shows that 55% of the 1996-1997 participants also participated in the 1995-1996 heating season.

⁴ Delmarva serves 8.75% of the state’s residential customers. Therefore, Delmarva’s residential customers receiving EUSP benefits are disproportionately large.

The percentage of Choptank's 2005-2006 USPP participants who also participated in 2004-2005 was 18% compared to the 2006-2007 percentage of 30% who also participated in 2005-2006. A significant decline was noted for WGL-Maryland Division, where the participation rate decreased from 77% in 2005-2006 to 41% in 2006-2007.

EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND ACTUAL HEATING SEASON USAGE

Table 4 provides a comparison of the average equal monthly billings to actual usage for USPP participants. The average monthly payments are calculated based on the previous year's actual usage. The actual monthly payments are an average of five billing months, November 2006 – March 2007. The overall average monthly payment for all utilities was \$99.81 while the overall average monthly usage for the 2006-2007 heating season was \$157.47. Both of these results were lower than those recorded for the 2006-2007 winter heating season, which was \$109.73 for the overall average monthly payment, and \$163.73 for the overall average monthly usage. The overall average monthly payment for the 1996-1997 winter heating season was \$87.76, with an overall average actual monthly usage of \$115.05

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" which led to those payments. The USPP encourages utilities to offer customers who have outstanding arrearages with the utility to place all or part of those arrearages in a special agreement or an alternate payment plan, to be paid off over an extended period of time. For the purpose of this report, these special agreements are called "supplemental payments." Placing outstanding arrearages in such special agreements allows customers to enroll in USPP

and to be considered current in their utility payments as long as they continue to make their USPP equal monthly payments and their supplemental payments in a timely fashion.

The average monthly supplemental payment for Poverty Level 1 is \$46.18,⁵ and the average supplemental arrearage amount is \$473.33. Also, 24% of Poverty Level 1 customers for all utilities make supplemental payments, while 26% of Poverty Level 2 customers and 14% of Poverty Level 3 customers are making supplemental payments. The average monthly supplemental payment for Poverty Levels 2 and 3 are \$43.31 and \$50.14, respectively, while the average supplemental arrearage amounts are \$381.50 and \$508.79, respectively.

In comparison with 2005-2006 data, 22% of Poverty Level 1 customers, 23% of Poverty Level 2 customers, and 16% of Poverty Level 3 customers made supplemental payments. The average monthly payment for Poverty Level 1 customers in 2005-2006 was \$37.80 and the average supplemental arrearage amount was \$412.75. Following a similar trend to that of 2005-2006, the percentages of the eligible population making supplemental payments in 2006-2007 are notably highest for Columbia Gas of Maryland, Delmarva and Pepco.

Data collected during 1996-1997 for all utilities show that 46% of Poverty Level 1 customers, 36% of Poverty Level 2 customers and 36% of Poverty Level 3 customers were making supplemental payments. The average monthly amounts of the supplemental payments were \$14.56 for Poverty Level 1 customers, \$16.32 for Poverty Level 2 customers and \$20.92 for Poverty Level 3 customers. The average supplemental arrearages were \$403.59, \$353.26 and \$321.02 for Poverty Levels 1, 2, and 3 respectively.

⁵ BGE revised its formula for calculating the number of customers on supplemental payment plans, compared to the formula used in previous years. As a result, BGE was unable to provide the average monthly amount of supplemental payments on a cumulative basis for the 2006-2007 winter heating season.

PARTICIPANT ARREARAGES AND PROGRAM COMPLIANCE

Table 6 presents the percentage of USPP participants, MEAP-eligible non-participants, and all other utility residential customers in arrears as of March 31, 2007. In the case of USPP participants, this means that the customer has failed to pay the total amount due on at least one equal monthly billing.

Overall, 2006-2007 USPP participants were more likely to be in arrears to the utility than eligible non-participants. For all utilities, 33% of USPP participants, 27% of eligible non-participants, and 15% of non-eligible customers are currently in arrears. Overall, Elkton Gas had the highest percentage of USPP participants in arrears at 63%, which represented an increase of 18% over its 2005-2006's percentage. BGE had the second highest percentage of USPP participants in arrears at 45%, which represented a decrease of 10% compared to its 2005-2006's percentage, when it had the highest percentage of all utilities.

In comparison with the 2005-2006 winter heating season, six utilities reported decreased percentages of USPP participants in arrears (BGE, Chesapeake Utilities – Citizens Gas Division, Delmarva, WGL, AP and Pepco); six utilities reported an increase in the number of USPP participants in arrears (Chesapeake Utilities – Citizens Gas Division, Columbia Gas, Easton Utilities [Electric and Gas Divisions], Elkton Gas, Mayor and Council – Berlin [“Berlin”] and SMECO); while one utility remained unchanged (“Choptank”).

Table 7 presents the average dollar amount of arrearages for USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-eligible customers currently in arrears. The dollar amount of the overall average arrearage for USPP participants was \$453.17 for all utilities and \$475.33 for MEAP-eligible non-participants. As occurred in 2005-2006, Delmarva recorded the highest overall average arrearage for USPP participants and MEAP eligible non-participants with \$652.70 and \$721.88 respectively. The overall

average arrearage amount for non-MEAP customers was \$329.98, which is an increase of 31% over the 2005-2006 amount of \$251.82. The overall arrearage amount for the 1996-1997 winter heating season was \$315.84 for USPP participants, \$345.59 for MEAP eligible non-participants, and \$216.81 for non-MEAP customers.

Table 8 presents the percentage of USPP participants who complied with the payment provisions of the program for 2006-2007 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. Compared with the 2005-2006 compliance percentage of 82%, the overall compliance for 2006-2007 was 81%. The overall compliance percentage for 1996-1997 was 78%.

There was some variation in the compliance levels across Poverty Levels for 2006-2007, where it was 75% for Poverty Level 1, 77% for Poverty Level 2 and 87% for Poverty Level 3. There was 100% compliance for BGE, Berlin and Somerset, while AP, Choptank, Easton Utilities – Electric Division, and Elkton Gas had compliance levels of over 90%. Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Division had the lowest compliance percentage of 36%, which was a significant decline from its 2005-2006 compliance level of 75%.

HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

Table 9 presents the number of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers who had their service terminated during the heating season. The primary purpose of the USPP is the prevention of service terminations during the heating season. At least half of the utilities did not terminate any USPP participants during the 2006-2007 winter heating season. The utilities with no USPP terminations were Columbia Gas, Easton Utilities (electric and gas divisions), Washington Gas (Maryland and Frederick Gas divisions), AP, SMECO, Somerset and Berlin.

During the 2006-2007 winter heating season, 419 USPP participants, 110 MEAP eligible non-participants, and 4,422 non-MEAP customers had their service terminated. During the 2005-2006 heating season, the service of 363 USPP, 169 MEAP eligible non-participants and 5,143 non-MEAP customers was terminated. Data from 1996-1997 show that 53 USPP participants, 165 MEAP eligible non-participants, and 1,837 non-MEAP customers had their service terminated during the winter heating season.

Of the total number of 2006-2007 USPP terminations (419), BGE terminated 14.8%, Delmarva terminated 19.3%, Pepco terminated 32.5%, Choptank terminated 19.1%, Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Gas division terminated 5.3%, Chesapeake Utilities – Citizens Gas Division terminated 7.4%, and Elkton Gas terminated 1.7%.

Of the total number of USPP participants (59,791), BGE terminated 0.1%, Delmarva terminated 0.14%, Pepco terminated 0.23%, Choptank terminated 0.13%, Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Gas division terminated 0.04%, Chesapeake Utilities – Citizens Gas Division terminated 0.05%, Elkton Gas terminated 0.01%. The total percentage of USPP participants who were terminated during the 2006-2007 winter heating season was therefore less than 1%.

Of the number of each utility's USPP population, the percentages of USPP customers that were terminated during 2006-2007 are given as follows: BGE terminated 0.19% of their USPP customers; Delmarva terminated 1.3%; Pepco terminated 1.7%; Choptank terminated 4.7%; Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Gas division terminated 13.0%; Chesapeake Utilities – Citizens Gas Division terminated 13.6%; and Elkton Gas terminated 2.9% of their USPP participants.

Of the total number of MEAP eligible non-participants, Delmarva terminated 40%, Chesapeake Utilities - Citizens Gas Division terminated 32.7%, Chesapeake Utilities – Cambridge Gas Division terminated 17.3% and BGE terminated 8.2%. There were no MEAP eligible non-participant terminations for Choptank, Columbia Gas, Easton Utilities, Washington Gas, Berlin, AP, Pepco, Somerset and SMECO

HIGH ENERGY CONSUMPTION

Table 10 presents the percentage of USPP participants who consumed more than 135% of the system average for the utility providing service. For the 2006-2007 heating season, 31% of Poverty Level 1, 30% of Poverty Level 2 and 28% of Poverty Level 3 participants consumed more than 135% of the system average energy between November and March. Overall, 30% of USPP customers consumed amounts of electricity and gas greater than 135% of the system average, compared to 31% in 2005-2006 and 27% in 1996-1997. AP, BGE, and WGL – Frederick Division had the highest overall percentages of USPP customers consuming more than 135% of the system average in 2006-2007.

PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE

Table 11 presents the percentage of USPP participants, eligible non-participants, and non-MEAP customers whose primary heat source is the energy provided by the indicated utility. Overall, for all utilities in 2006-2007, 72% of USPP customers, 80% of eligible non-participants, and 44% of non-MEAP customers receive their primary heat source from the utility responding to the data request. The overall 2005-2006 results indicated that 75% of USPP customers, 64% of eligible non-participants, and 48% of non-MEAP customers receive their primary heat source from a utility. The ten year comparison shows that the primary heat source of 66% of USPP participants, 62% of eligible non-participants and 66% of non-MEAP customers is provided by the utility.

The utilities in 2006-2007 that recorded 100% for both USPP participants and eligible non-participants receiving their primary heat source from a utility were Chesapeake Utilities – Citizens Gas Division, Easton Utilities and WGL. Even though Choptank had 100% of its eligible non-participants receive their primary heat source from the utility, only 29% of its USPP customers receive their primary heat source from the utility.

MEAP GRANTS

Table 12 presents the average MEAP grant payable to the utility at the time of customer enrollment. The overall average 2006-2007 MEAP grant for all utilities was \$311.83 versus \$356.60 in 2005-2006 and 193.04 in 1996-1997. The overall average for all utilities varied from \$375.20 for Poverty Level 1 customers, \$305.49 for Poverty Level 2 customers and \$219.46 for Poverty Level 3 customers.

CONCLUSION

The data collected for the winter 2006-2007 winter heating season show that the Utility Service Protection Program continued to accomplish its goal of minimizing the number of service terminations. Participation levels for the 2006-2007 winter heating season were 1,068 greater than the level of participants for the 2005-2006 winter heating season. Data reported by the participating utility companies indicate that 0.7 percent of the USPP population was terminated during the 2006-2007 winter heating season as compared to 0.6 percent of the USPP participants during the previous year's heating season.⁶ The historical ten year comparison (1996-1997) shows consistency in the efficacy of the USPP, where terminations were less than one tenth of one percent of all USPP participants. The low number of terminations indicates that the USPP is effective in keeping low-income customers' service connected during the winter.

In addition to the USPP, MEAP, and EUSP providing assistance to low-income customers, all utilities providing electric or gas service in Maryland have programs dedicated to assisting low-income customers. These programs are different from utility to utility, but all are focused on helping low-income customers with billing or other related issues. The survey results of the 2006-2007 heating season reflect the capability

⁶ This number does not reflect the number of terminations that occur when the winter heating season officially ends. Utility companies terminate many consumers on or after April 1 if those customers have built up arrearages during the winter.

of the Utility Service Protection Program, and the utilities managing the program, to benefit low income customers.

TABLE 1 NUMBER OF 2006 - 2007 USPP CUSTOMERS AND ELIGIBLE NON-PARTICIPATING CUSTOMERS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants				Eligible Non-Participants				Overall
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Total	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Total	Total
Baltimore Gas & Electric	8,618	6,111	18,598	33,327	1,351	667	1,285	3,303	36,630
Chesapeake Utilities									
Cambridge Gas Division	104	37	28	169	115	79	41	235	404
Citizens Gas Division	104	71	53	228	181	163	141	485	713
Choptank Electric Cooperative	592	625	500	1,717	3	1	1	5	1,722
Columbia Gas of Maryland	480	454	403	1,337	221	353	393	967	2,304
Delmarva Power & Light	2,479	2,010	1,822	6,311	637	510	428	1,575	7,886
Easton Utilities									
Electric	38	37	37	112	54	80	84	218	330
Gas	16	18	12	46	20	39	38	97	143
Elkton Gas Service	90	77	76	243	33	47	55	135	378
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	102	56	64	222	92	48	51	191	413
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	48	225	32	305	305
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	1,727	816	736	3,279	177	127	145	449	3,728
Mayor & Council - Berlin	8	7	15	30	9	12	15	36	66
Potomac Edison	1,633	1,234	1,072	3,939	75	58	35	168	4,107
Potomac Electric Power Company	3,146	2,387	2,525	8,058	0	0	0	0	8,058
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	32	30	42	104	0	0	0	0	104
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	384	165	120	669	1,145	869	627	2,641	3,310
TOTALS:	19,553	14,135	26,108	59,796	4,161	3,278	3,371	10,810	70,606

** Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 2 USPP PARTICIPATION AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL ELIGIBLE FOR EACH POVERTY LEVEL, 2006 - 2007 AND 2005- 2006

UTILITY	2006 - 2007 Participation				2005 - 2006 Participation			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	86%	90%	94%	91%	83%	88%	89%	88%
Chesapeake Utilities								
Cambridge Gas Division	47%	32%	41%	43%	16%	11%	17%	15%
Citizens Gas Division	36%	30%	27%	32%	13%	11%	9%	11%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	100%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	68%	56%	51%	59%	66%	60%	54%	60%
Delmarva Power & Light	80%	80%	81%	80%	83%	83%	81%	83%
Easton Utilities								
Electric	41%	32%	31%	34%	41%	33%	33%	36%
Gas	44%	32%	24%	32%	20%	15%	24%	20%
Elkton Gas Service	73%	62%	58%	64%	66%	58%	35%	54%
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	53%	54%	56%	54%	46%	32%	34%	39%
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	91%	87%	84%	88%	94%	92%	84%	90%
Mayor & Council - Berlin	47%	37%	50%	45%	36%	31%	16%	22%
Potomac Edison	96%	96%	97%	96%	66%	76%	78%	74%
Potomac Electric Power Company	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	25%	16%	16%	20%	27%	23%	35%	28%
ALL UTILITIES:	86%	88%	91%	89%	85%	86%	88%	86%

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

TABLE 3 PERCENTAGE OF 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO ALSO PARTICIPATED IN THE PROGRAM DURING THE 2005-2006 HEATING SEASON

UTILITY	Poverty Level			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	53%	62%	64%	61%
Chesapeake, Citizens Gas	11%	7%	15%	11%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	30%	30%	30%	30%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	31%	31%	27%	30%
Easton Utilities				
Electric	32%	38%	27%	32%
Gas	25%	50%	33%	37%
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	17%	11%	5%	12%
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	31%	50%	55%	41%
Potomac Edison	62%	67%	72%	66%
Potomac Electric Power Company	62%	79%	82%	73%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	3%	3%	9%	4%
ALL UTILITIES:	47%	55%	61%	55%

* Data is Not Available

TABLE 4 AVERAGE EQUAL MONTHLY PAYMENTS AND AVERAGE ACTUAL MONTHLY HEATING SEASON USAGE FOR 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	Average Monthly Payments (\$)				Average Actual Monthly Usage (\$)*			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	116.00	117.00	106.00	110.60	234.09	226.45	203.33	215.52
Chesapeake, Citizens Gas	94.00	111.00	100.00	100.69	192.60	188.00	182.60	188.84
Choptank Electric Cooperative	90.00	81.00	89.00	86.43	**	**	**	140.14
Columbia Gas of Maryland	65.46	70.32	77.54	70.75	172.61	176.90	175.25	174.86
Delmarva Power & Light	120.53	111.30	121.49	117.87	151.41	145.67	150.16	149.22
Easton Utilities								
Electric	0.00	0.00	150.00	49.55	137.00	182.00	129.00	149.22
Gas	0.00	150.00	213.00	123.94	194.00	167.00	438.00	247.09
Elkton	54.00	50.00	60.00	54.61	86.00	85.00	83.00	84.65
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	65.00	65.00	78.00	68.75	124.00	127.00	132.00	127.06
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	95.00	98.00	92.00	95.07	136.01	133.48	129.99	134.03
Potomac Edison	82.00	80.00	80.00	80.83	53.40	48.60	48.20	50.48
Potomac Electric Power Company	73.00	63.00	82.00	72.86	146.00	141.00	148.00	145.15
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	143.04	143.72	149.12	144.30	128.86	122.57	118.53	125.46
ALL UTILITIES WEIGHTED AVERAGE:	99.05	97.11	101.86	99.81	165.07	145.17	170.08	157.47

*Average monthly usage for five billing months of November 2006 – March 2007

** Not Available by Poverty Level

TABLE 5 **PERCENTAGE OF 2006-2007 USPP CUSTOMERS MAKING SUPPLEMENATAL PAYMENTS*, THE AVERAGE DOLLAR AMOUNT OF THOSE PAYMENTS, AND THE AVERAGE ARREARAGE REQUIRING PAYMENTS BY POVERTY LEVEL**
 (*Under COMAR 20.31.01.08 **Not required to provide this information ***Not Available)

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 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3
Baltimore Gas & Electric	1.543%	1.375%	1.613%	***	***	***	1,970.00	1,483.00	1,485.00
Chesapeake Utilities, Citizens Gas	6%	10%	9%	28.00	35.00	23.00	144.00	189.00	136.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	0%	0%	0%	***	***	***	***	***	***
Columbia Gas of Maryland	62%	52%	58%	20.14	20.47	25.19	240.23	214.47	231.00
Delmarva Power & Light	54%	43%	51%	11.45	10.82	14.67	665.45	585.50	608.36
Easton Utilities									
Electric	3%	11%	3%	150.00	101.00	125.00	267.00	380.00	356.00
Gas	0%	22%	25%	0.00	131.00	142.00	0.00	319.00	270.00
Elkton Gas Service	0%	0%	0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	13%	13%	5%	25.00	14.00	19.00	303.00	169.00	227.00
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	2%	1%	1%	95.18	98.04	92.84	326.33	426.09	459.85
Mayor & Council - Berlin	0%	14%	13%	**	**	**	**	**	**
Potomac Edison	23%	32%	36%	31.00	36.00	36.00	415.00	434.00	426.00
Potomac Electric Power Company	77%	84%	73%	73.00	63.00	82.00	325.00	259.00	325.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	9%	8%	6%	51.26	33.00	100.00	514.74	375.88	1156.53
ALL UTILITIES WEIGHTED AVERAGE	24%	26%	14%	46.18	43.31	50.14	473.33	381.50	508.79

TABLE 6 PERCENTAGE OF 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS* BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants				Eligible Non-Participants				Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	52%	42%	43%	45%	50%	42%	41%	45%	7%
Chesapeake Utilities									
Cambridge Gas Division	0%	5%	14%	4%	48%	34%	44%	43%	27%
Citizens Gas Division	10%	10%	8%	9%	31%	33%	30%	32%	17%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	10%	8%	10%	9%	33%	0%	0%	20%	17%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	46%	30%	27%	35%	24%	17%	14%	17%	24%
Delmarva Power & Light	27%	18%	26%	24%	40%	27%	26%	32%	13%
Easton Utilities									
Electric	5%	16%	3%	8%	9%	1%	7%	6%	31%
Gas	0%	17%	25%	12%	5%	10%	18%	12%	23%
Elkton Gas Service	64%	64%	59%	63%	45%	62%	38%	48%	21%
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	30%	21%	13%	23%	66%	40%	47%	54%	21%
City of Hagerstown	***	***	***	***	52%	7%	53%	19%	14%
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	3%	1%	5%	3%	61%	49%	61%	58%	19%
Mayor & Council - Berlin	0%	14%	7%	6%	56%	42%	27%	39%	19%
Potomac Edison	13%	11%	10%	11%	44%	7%	3%	23%	13%
Potomac Electric Power Company	19%	14%	18%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	20%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	10%	18%	16%	13%	3%	1%	1%	2%	**
WEIGHTED AVERAGE ALL UTILITIES:	33%	26%	36%	33%	32%	21%	27%	27%	11%

* Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2007

** Not Available

*** Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 7 AVERAGE ARREARAGE FOR 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS IN ARREARS* BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants (\$)				MEAP Eligible Non-Participants (\$)				Non-MEAP Customers (\$)
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	511.00	468.00	451.00	471.72	687.00	568.00	533.00	609.52	431.53
Chesapeake, Citizens Gas	98.00	113.00	106.00	104.52	191.00	180.00	192.00	187.42	242.00
Choptank Electric Cooperative	520.13	594.35	487.22	534.65	1,319.00	259.00	0.00	579.02	118.93
Columbia Gas of Maryland	249.32	216.57	282.47	247.37	261.88	172.39	208.45	215.58	192.59
Delmarva Power & Light	687.79	614.85	632.18	652.70	694.45	851.58	623.32	721.88	367.30
Easton Utilities									
Electric	333.00	285.00	131.00	278.56	237.00	111.00	154.00	185.00	189.00
Gas	135.00	321.00	304.00	287.14	115.00	113.00	124.00	119.33	191.00
Elkton	126.00	131.00	107.00	120.00	112.00	140.00	91.00	103.83	146.00
Hagerstown					638.00	643.00	495.00	566.92	476.00
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	121.00	149.00	157.00	133.24	263.00	223.00	177.00	235.85	159.00
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	124.78	90.26	117.87	118.09	431.53	386.46	402.33	410.71	367.13
Potomac Edison	128.00	113.00	101.00	117.39	148.00	316.00	7.00	161.97	263.00
Potomac Electric Power Company	325.00	259.00	325.00	309.13	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	210.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	5.76	2.48	0.00	3.35	503.69	1,001.96	659.84	592.75	**
Overall Weighted Average:	478.51	431.93	444.07	453.17	544.98	477.80	450.61	475.33	329.98

* Customer is in arrears if some monthly billing is past due on March 31, 2007

** Not Available

**TABLE 8 PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO COMPLIED WITH PROGRAM PAYMENT PROVISIONS
 2006 – 2007 and 2005 - 2006 BY POVERTY LEVEL**

UTILITY	Compliance 2006-2007				Compliance 2005-2006			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Chesapeake Utilities								
Cambridge Gas Division	27%	51%	46%	36%	67%	76%	75%	75%
Citizens Gas Division	61%	62%	43%	57%	63%	65%	82%	69%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	84%	92%	92%	89%	89%	89%	92%	90%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delmarva Power & Light	*	*	*	75%	*	*	*	45%
Easton Utilities								
Electric	89%	95%	100%	95%	90%	100%	91%	93%
Gas	0%	89%	75%	88%	0%	100%	83%	94%
Elkton Gas Service	98%	99%	99%	98%	97%	88%	81%	91%
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	90%	93%	88%	90%	87%	84%	80%	85%
Hagerstown Municipal Elec.	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	54%	73%	74%	63%	55%	63%	64%	60%
Mayor & Council - Berlin	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Potomac Edison	93%	95%	96%	94%	83%	92%	92%	90%
Potomac Electric Power Company	77%	84%	73%	78%	76%	78%	74%	76%
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	66%	79%	73%	70%	47%	41%	33%	41%
ALL UTILITIES:	75%	77%	87%	81%	78%	78%	85%	82%

* Not Available

** Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 9 NUMBER OF 2006 - 2007 WINTER HEATING SEASON TERMINATIONS

UTILITY	USPP Participants				MEAP Eligible Non-Participants				Non- MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Total	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Total	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	20	20	22	62	5	3	1	9	738
Chesapeake Utilities									
Cambridge Gas Division	15	5	2	22	12	6	1	19	68
Citizens Gas Division	18	7	6	31	18	13	5	36	257
Choptank Electric Cooperative	36	29	15	80	0	0	0	0	235
Columbia Gas of Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Delmarva Power & Light	41	14	26	81	27	8	9	44	929
Easton Utilities									
Electric	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Gas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Elkton Gas Service	4	2	1	7	0	1	0	1	102
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hagerstown Municipal Electric	**	**	**	**	0	0	1	1	11
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Mayor & Council - Berlin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Potomac Edison	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Potomac Electric Power Company	52	32	52	136	0	0	0	0	1,921
Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
TOTALS:	186	109	124	419	62	31	17	110	4,422

** Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 10 PERCENTAGE OF USPP PARTICIPANTS WHO CONSUMED MORE THAN 135% OF SYSTEM AVERAGE ENERGY FOR NOVEMBER 2006 - MARCH 2007

UTILITY	Poverty Level			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	44%	41%	30%	35%
Chesapeake, Citizens Gas	9%	15%	13%	12%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	8%	6%	7%	7%
Columbia Gas of Maryland	*	*	*	23%
Delmarva Power & Light	26%	25%	26%	26%
Easton Utilities				
Electric	0%	0%	0%	0%
Gas	0%	0%	0%	0%
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	33%	48%	56%	44%
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	2%	5%	5%	4%
Potomac Edison	37%	46%	44%	42%
Potomac Electric Power Company	28%	25%	35%	29%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	22%	20%	18%	21%
All Utilities:	31%	30%	28%	30%

* Not available by poverty level

TABLE 11 PERCENTAGE OF 2006 - 2007 USPP PARTICIPANTS, MEAP ELIGIBLE CUSTOMERS, AND NON-MEAP CUSTOMERS WHOSE PRIMARY HEAT SOURCE IS PROVIDED BY THE UTILITY BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	USPP Participants				Eligible Non-Participants				Non-MEAP Customers
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	
Baltimore Gas & Electric	79%	82%	84%	83%	76%	78%	79%	78%	47%
Chesapeake, Citizens Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	92%
Choptank Electric Cooperative	32%	27%	30%	29%	100%	100%	100%	100%	*
Columbia Gas of Maryland	100%	100%	100%	100%	96%	94%	96%	95%	94%
Delmarva Power & Light	60%	60%	56%	59%	79%	80%	78%	79%	45%
Easton Utilities									
Electric	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Gas	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
City of Hagerstown	**	**	**	**	*	*	*	*	*
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	87%
Potomac Edison	61%	63%	64%	63%	67%	79%	100%	78%	39%
Potomac Electric Power Company	37%	43%	37%	39%	*	*	*	*	24%
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	69%	69%	76%	71%	85%	87%	90%	87%	*
TOTALS:	68%	69%	76%	72%	79%	77%	83%	80%	44%

* Not Available

** Operates approved alternate USPP

TABLE 12 AVERAGE MARYLAND ENERGY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM GRANT* FOR 2006-2007 AND 2005-2006 USPP PARTICIPANTS BY POVERTY LEVEL

UTILITY	Average 2006-2007 Grant (\$)				Average 2005-2006 Grant (\$)			
	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall	Poverty Level 1	Poverty Level 2	Poverty Level 3	Overall
Baltimore Gas & Electric	610.00	463.00	286.00	402.24	598.00	484.00	287.00	391.93
Chesapeake, Citizens Gas	374.00	320.00	226.00	322.78	506.00	356.00	320.00	384.58
Choptank Electric Cooperative	290.00	241.00	250.00	260.52	301.00	252.00	201.00	253.47
Columbia Gas of Maryland	507.67	500.96	503.89	504.25	554.73	548.69	554.57	552.76
Delmarva Power & Light	**	**	**	258.30	187.63	181.09	164.21	177.57
Easton Utilities								
Electric	204.00	160.00	176.00	180.21	189.00	167.00	247.00	199.16
Gas	272.00	239.00	217.00	242.02	316.00	273.00	134.00	241.65
Elkton	217.00	218.00	185.00	206.69	***	***	***	***
Washington Gas-Frederick Gas Division	234.00	243.00	240.00	238.00	249.00	311.00	276.00	268.90
Washington Gas - Maryland Division	795.37	767.03	689.20	764.49	673.00	682.00	592.00	652.99
Potomac Edison	120.00	115.00	105.00	114.35	146.00	118.00	104.00	121.32
Potomac Electric Power Company	**	**	**	264.00	310.00	310.00	310.00	310.00
Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative	229.35	255.21	234.08	236.58	232.78	231.39	186.23	217.27
ALL UTILITIES:	375.20	305.49	219.46	354.31	439.41	360.99	280.65	356.60

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

** Not available by poverty level

*** No data