

		2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
Program dates and status						
	Date program started	2/1/2008	2/1/2008	2/1/2008	2/1/2008	2/1/2008
	Program effective date	1/1/2020	1/1/2021	1/1/2022	1/1/2023	1/1/2024
	Date next evaluation report due	5/31/2022	5/31/2022	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Date last evaluation completed	5/31/2019	5/31/2019	5/31/2022	5/31/2022	4/30/2023
	Last evaluation docket number	G002/M-19-380	G002/M-19-380	G002/M-22-257	Discontinued Requirement	Discontinued
	Status of program (pilot or permanent)	Permanent	Permanent	Permanent	Permanent	Permanent
	Date pilot program ends, if applicable	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Date of last Evaluation Order	1/17/2020	1/17/2020	1/18/2023	1/18/2023	N/A
	Program administrator	Energy Cents Coalition	Energy Cents Coalition	Energy CENTS Coalition	Energy CENTS Coalition	Energy CENTS Coalition
Participant benefits						
	Description of affordability benefit - maximum payment as % of household income	4%	Changed from 4% to 3% on October 1, 2021	3%	3%	3%
	Description of arrearage forgiveness benefit - repayment period	12-24 months	12-24 months	12-24 months	12-24 months	12-24 months
	Average annual income per participant	\$13,119	\$13,449	\$14,225	\$17,648	\$19,076
	Average annual bill per participant	\$1,096	\$1,128	\$1,629	\$1,437	\$1,313
	Average arrearage balance per participant	\$178	\$534	\$361	\$823	\$993
	Average annual affordability benefit per participant	\$175	\$164	\$248	\$266	\$237
	Average annual arrearage forgiveness benefit per customer	\$167	\$185	\$210	\$114	\$129
	Average total benefit per participant	\$240	\$223	\$280	\$307	\$250
Cost and Cost Recovery						
	Annual budget	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000
	Actual revenue	\$2,760,447	\$2,653,541	\$3,095,074	\$2,829,829	\$2,491,874
	Annual cost	\$1,932,190	\$1,748,130	\$2,238,735	\$4,263,976	\$4,173,297
	Surcharge (\$/therm)	0.00445	\$0.00445	\$0.00445	\$0.00445	\$0.00445
	Annual cost of surcharge for average residential customer who used 900 therms of gas per year	\$4.01	\$4.01	\$4.01	\$4.01	\$4.01
	Customer classes assessed the GAP surcharge	Residential firm, commercial firm and Commercial Demand Billed Service	Residential firm, commercial firm and Commercial Demand Billed Service	Residential firm, commercial firm and Commercial Demand Billed Service	Residential firm, commercial firm and Commercial Demand Billed Service	Residential firm, commercial firm and Commercial Demand Billed Service
	Tracker balance as of year-end	\$2,257,914	\$3,163,326	\$4,019,664	\$2,585,518	\$904,095
Participation						
	% of LIHEAP customers that participated in GAP	42%	37%	35%	61%	80%
	Number of participants enrolled as of year-end	5,022	5,504	6,342	10,650	9,861
	Number of participants enrolled and receiving benefits at some time during the year	7,683	7,395	7,668	13,620	16,273
	Whether a waiting list occurred at any time during the year	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	If so, the number of customers on the waiting list and for how long	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Impact on disconnection rates						
	Disconnection rates - non-GAP LIHEAP baseline					
	Active GAP participants	0.00%	0.00%	0.000%	0.000%	0.000%
	GAP participants	0.03%	0.08%	0.770%	1.310%	Docket No. G002/M-25-36
	Non-GAP LIHEAP customers	0.24%	1.12%	2.298%	4.560%	2024 GAP Annual Report
	Non-LIHEAP residential customers	0.02%	0.28%	0.730%	0.770%	Attachment A - Page &[Page] of &[Pages]
	Disconnection rates - pre-program baseline					
	GAP participant cohort	0.14%	0.29%	1.49%	0.26%	2.33%
	GAP participants cohort before they were enrolled in GAP	5.50%	3.21%	0.29%	2.20%	15.40%
Impact on payment frequency						
	Dollars paid - dollars requested					
	Non-GAP LIHEAP baseline					
	GAP participants	98%	119%	110%	109%	108%
	Non-GAP LIHEAP customers	91%	104%	111%	90%	91%
	Non-LIHEAP residential customers	97%	96%	97%	100%	96%
	Pre-Program Baseline					
	GAP participant cohort	76%	132%	129%	100%	100%
	GAP participant cohort before they were enrolled in GAP	75%	78%	132%	114%	120%
Number of payments made paid - number of payments requested						
	Non-GAP LIHEAP baseline					
	GAP participants	36%	76%	58%	65%	64%
	Non-GAP LIHEAP customers	49%	65%	54%	52%	54%
	Non-LIHEAP residential customers	12%	90%	91%	90%	90%
	Pre-program baseline					
	GAP participant cohort	76%	79%	62%	61%	65%
	GAP participant cohort before they were enrolled in GAP	75%	71%	79%	68%	64%
Impact on arrears						
	% Customers in arrears					
	Non-GAP LIHEAP baseline					
	GAP participants	36%	32%	15%	36%	47%
	Non-GAP LIHEAP customers	49%	49%	46%	61%	58%
	Non-LIHEAP residential customers	12%	11%	12%	12%	12%
	Pre-Program baseline					
	GAP participant cohort	56%	46%	18%	22%	34%
	GAP participant cohort before they were enrolled in GAP	61%	56%	46%	47%	72%
Dollar amount of arrears						
	% Change in dollar amount of arrears (non-GAP LIHEAP baseline)					
	GAP participants	-6%	-26%	-67%	128%	92%
	Non-GAP LIHEAP customers	56%	6%	-65%	356%	9%
	Non-LIHEAP residential customers	113%	25%	30%	4%	-15%
	Dollar amount of arrears (pre-Program baseline)					
	GAP participant cohort	\$477,288	\$677,178	\$154,310	\$809,137	\$2,101,003
	GAP participant cohort before they were enrolled in GAP	\$498,414	\$1,009,369	\$677,178	\$3,989,009	\$5,498,641
Complaints						
	Number of complaints	0	0	0	0	0
	Nature of complaint(s)	N/A	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Retention						
	GAP participant retention rate	67%	74%	75%	63%	52%
Impact on collection activity						
	Brief description of effect of GAP on collection activity	While we do not have specific data regarding the Program's impact on collection activity, we believe it is reasonable to conclude from the lower disconnection percentage and the lower average arrearage level attributable to GAP participants as compared to other customers receiving LIHEAP, that the Company may have experienced a reduction in collection activity as a result of this Program.	While we do not have specific data regarding the Program's impact on collection activity, we believe it is reasonable to conclude from the lower disconnection percentage and the lower average arrearage level attributable to GAP participants as compared to other customers receiving LIHEAP, that the Company may have experienced a reduction in collection activity as a result of this Program.	While we do not have specific data regarding the Program's impact on collection activity, we believe it is reasonable to conclude from the lower disconnection percentage and the lower average arrearage level attributable to GAP participants as compared to other customers receiving LIHEAP, that the Company may have experienced a reduction in collection activity as a result of this Program.	While we do not have specific data regarding the Program's impact on collection activity, we believe it is reasonable to conclude from the lower disconnection percentage and the lower average arrearage level attributable to GAP participants as compared to other customers receiving LIHEAP, that the Company may have experienced a reduction in collection activity as a result of this Program.	While we do not have specific data regarding the Program's impact on collection activity, we believe it is reasonable to conclude from the lower disconnection percentage and the lower average arrearage level attributable to GAP participants as compared to other customers receiving LIHEAP, that the Company may have experienced a reduction in collection activity as a result of this Program.
Coordination with other programs						
	Page(s) of report where coordination efforts described	pp. 11-12	pp. 11 - 12	pp. 11 - 12	pp. 11 - 12	pg. 12