

**RESULTS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF THE
SYSTEM BENEFITS CHARGE**

October 1, 2010

Submitted to:

**THE LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE
ON ELECTRIC RESTRUCTURING**

Representative Naida Kaen
Representative Suzanne Harvey
Representative Jacqueline Cali-Pitts
Representative James Devine
Representative James Garrity
Senator Amanda Merrill
Senator Jeb Bradley

Introduction

The New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission hereby submits to the Legislative Oversight Committee on Electric Restructuring its annual report on the results and the effectiveness of the system benefits charge (SBC).¹ The SBC is a charge assessed on all electric customers to fund public benefits related to the provision of electricity. The current SBC is \$0.0033 or 3.3 mills per kilowatt-hour (kWh). For a typical residential customer using 600 kWh, the total SBC charge is \$1.98 per month. Since its inception, funds collected through this charge are divided between energy efficiency and low income assistance programs (EAP). Senate Bill 300, effective on January 14, 2010, directed the Commission to increase as necessary the portion of the system benefits charge that funds the EAP in order to adequately fund the program for low-income customers. Accordingly, the Commission increased the portion devoted to the EAP program from 1.5 mills to 1.8 mills per kWh and decreased the portion devoted to energy efficiency from 1.8 mills to 1.5 mills per kWh. The re-allocation of funds authorized by Senate Bill 300 expires on June 30, 2011 and, without legislative action, will revert to the prior allocation.

In 2009, the total in SBC funds collected was \$34,684,859. Approximately \$18.9 M was for energy efficiency and \$15.7 M was for the low income EAP program.

Energy Efficiency

The energy efficiency portion of the SBC charge supports energy efficiency programs that are similar across the service territories of Until Energy Systems, National Grid (Granite State Electric Company), New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, and Public Service Company of New Hampshire. These “CORE” programs consume the vast majority of the program’s expenses; however, each utility offers a few non-CORE programs specific to its own customers’ needs. The CORE programs began in June 2002 following an extensive collaborative effort under the supervision of the Public Utilities Commission. Since then, approximately \$179 M has been expended on providing energy efficiency measures to approximately 562,220 customers with expected energy savings of over 6.3 billion kilowatt-hours over the lifetime of the measures.²

Two principal goals, cost-effective energy savings and transforming the market for energy efficient measures, continue to guide program design though demand response also is important due the significant increases in peak load growth and the potential capacity payments for eligible demand resources. The 2010 CORE program budget of approximately \$20 M includes \$1.5 million from proceeds from the ISO-NE Forward Capacity Market which began operation June 1, 2010.

The CORE programs are divided between services and measures offered to residential customers and programs for commercial and industrial (C&I) customers. As indicated in the table

¹ This report is filed pursuant to RSA 374-F:4,VIII (f). The SBC is authorized by RSA 374-F:3,VI and RSA 374-4, VIII.

² Data represents cumulative actual results through June 30, 2010.

below, program budgets are allocated to residential and C&I customers in proportion to their respective SBC payments, except that all customers contribute equally to the Home Energy Assistance (HEA) program. The HEA program provides weatherization and energy efficiency measures for low-income customers, often in coordination with and as a supplement to US Department of Energy Weatherization Assistance funding. The HEA program is administered by the Community Action Agencies.

2010 NH CORE Program Goals

NH CORE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS	BUDGETED EXPENSES ³	LIFETIME KWH SAVING	NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS
Residential			
ENERGY STAR Homes	\$ 1,455,771	5,603,403	509
Home Energy Solutions	\$ 2,040,636	7,765,123	872
Home Energy Assistance	\$ 2,731,810	24,298,030	999
ENERGY STAR Lighting ⁴	\$ 1,214,593	82,522,495	334,212
ENERGY STAR Appliances	\$ 992,713	21,285,070	14,143
Total Residential	\$8,435,523	141,474,121	350,735
Commercial & Industrial			
Educational Programs	\$ 228,764		
Small Business Energy Solutions	\$ 3,069,766	111,957,722	576
Large Business Energy Solutions	\$ 3,406,490	224,799,326	275
New Equipment & Construction	\$ 2,487,286	102,453,878	211
Total Commercial & Industrial	\$9,192,306	439,210,926	1,062
TOTAL	\$17,627,829	580,685,047	351,797

The 2010 budget continues the 2009 “fuel blind” pilot program for another year for PSNH and UES. This program offers the same services as the CORE Home Energy Solutions (HES) program to customers that would not qualify for HES, which is intended to provide high electric heating customers and high use electric customers with a comprehensive home energy audit, air sealing, insulation, duct sealing and other energy saving measures. The program was re-named the Home Performance with Energy Star (HPwES) in 2010. As in the HES program, HPwES customers receive an incentive payment equal to 75%, up to \$4,000, of the installed cost of the recommended measures. The Commission considered whether a fuel blind program was eligible for SBC funding and determined that RSA 374-F:3,X was not restricted solely to electrical energy efficiency measures. The Commission also considered the potential benefits of a fuel blind pilot in preparing the utilities for a fuel blind program using Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative funds.

The Commission approved the 2010 CORE budget on January 5, 2010 (Order No. 25,062). However, the passage of Senate Bill 300 (reallocating funds between energy efficiency and the EAP program) resulted in a \$3.2 million shortfall in the approved 2010 CORE program

³ Excludes Performance Incentives and Utility –Specific programs.

⁴ Number of customers represents number of lighting products expected to be installed.

budgets. In response, the Utilities filed proposed budget revisions to reduce the shortfall to approximately \$500,000, which the Commission approved on April 30, 2010 (Order No. 25,099). A mid-year overview of the 2010 CORE programs is shown below. The results indicate that the 2010 programs, overall, are above their target savings goals, especially for the Energy Star Homes, Home Performance with Energy Star for the Residential class. The Commercial and Industrial class programs have achieved approximately eighty-one percent of their target savings goals.

CORE NH Program Highlights
(January 1 - June 30, 2010)

NH CORE ENERGY EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS	EXPENSES (\$)		SAVINGS (Lifetime kWh)		NUMBER OF CUSTOMERS	
	Actual + In Process + Prospective	Percent of Budget	Actual + In Process + Prospective	Percent of Budget	Actual + In Process + Prospective	Percent of Budget
RESIDENTIAL (nhsaves@home)						
ENERGY STAR Homes	\$1,388,658	95%	23,654,154	422%	519	102%
Home Energy Solutions	\$1,381,334	67%	10,684,539	138%	1,409	162%
Home Energy Assistance	\$2,613,702	95%	24,217,640	100%	1,085	109%
ENERGY STAR Lighting	\$ 649,987	53%	60,772,649	74%	262,291	78%
ENERGY STAR Appliances	\$ 640,180	63%	23,060,277	108%	9,381	66%
TOTAL RESIDENTIAL	\$6,673,861	78%	142,389,259	101%	274,685	78%
COMMERCIAL & INDUSTRIAL (nhsaves@work)						
Small Business Energy Solutions	\$2,347,227	76%	74,913,235	67%	597	104%
Large Business Energy Solutions	\$2,581,749	75%	177,287,208	79%	181	66%
New Construction	\$1,584,903	63%	74,969,832	73%	98	46%
TOTAL COMMERCIAL&INDUSTRIAL	\$6,513,879	72%	327,170,276	74%	876	82%
TOTAL	\$13,187,740	75%	469,559,535	81%	275,561	78%

In 2008, the Commission, in conjunction with the electric and natural gas utilities and the Office of Consumer Advocate, conducted a major study of the technical and economic potential for additional energy efficiency in New Hampshire. The Commission retained GDS Associates, a leading consulting group in the field of energy efficiency, to conduct the study, The GDS Report, issued in January 2009⁵ indicated that a substantial amount of economic energy efficiency in both the residential and commercial and industrial sectors remains available in New Hampshire. In addition, in 2010 the Legislature enacted SB 323 which calls for a study of the energy efficiency programs now available, building on the GDS Report. The Commission and members of the Energy Efficiency and Sustainable Energy Board (EESE Board) are now in the process of selecting a consultant for the study, pursuant to an RFP. The Study will be released no later than November 1, 2011.

⁵ The Final Report is available on the Commission's website at <http://www.puc.state.nh.us/Electric/GDS%20Report/GDS%20Final%20Report.htm>

Electric Assistance Program

RSA 374-F:4, VIII (c) authorizes the funding of a low income electric assistance program through the system benefits charge. Customers of National Grid, New Hampshire Electric Cooperative, Public Service Company of New Hampshire and Unitil Energy Systems support the program through a per kWh charge on electric bills. The electric assistance program (EAP), which began on October 1, 2002, completed its eighth year of operation on September 30, 2010.

Funded by the low-income portion of the system benefits charge, the electric assistance program provides bill discounts to income eligible customers. The discounts range from 5% to 70%, with those participants with the lowest incomes receiving the highest discount. Tied to a percentage of the federal poverty guideline, the discounts are designed so that the portion of the bill for which the customer is responsible is between 4 and 5 percent of their income.⁶ There are 6 discount tiers: less than or equal to 75% of the federal poverty guideline; 76% to 100% of the federal poverty guideline; 101% to 125% of the federal poverty guideline; 126% to 150% of the federal poverty guideline; and 151% to 185% of the federal poverty guideline.

In October 2009, enrollment in the EAP was 28,462 with a wait list of 7,723 households. Funded at a rate of 1.5 mill or \$0.0015/kWh on electric bills, the projected sustainable enrollment for the program was 29,000 households, considerably below the combined enrollment and wait list of 36,185 households in need. Given unemployment levels and the financial difficulty created for many families in the state by the recession, Senate Bill 300 authorized the Commission to increase the portion of the system benefits charge used to adequately fund the program, effective January 14, 2010. Consequently, the Commission increased the low income portion of the system benefits charge by .3 mills for a total of 1.8 mills kWh in funding to EAP.

By January 20, 2010, 36,872 households were enrolled in the EAP. Since then, enrollment in the EAP has hovered between 35,000 and 36,000, with an average waiting list of 3,174.

	2/22/10	3/22/10	4/26/10	5/17/10	6/22/10	7/26/10	8/30/10
Enrollment	35,757	35,263	36,062	35,503	35,374	35,743	35,216
Wait List	2,445	3,384	2,954	3,569	3,535	2,971	3,363
Total	38,202	38,647	39,016	39,072	38,909	38,714	38,579

In Order No. 24,820, issued January 30, 2008, the Commission adopted several recommendations for program monitoring and evaluation made by the EAP advisory board, one of which was for the Office of Energy and Planning to perform a process evaluation of the EAP

⁶ To determine the discount percentage for each tier, several assumptions are made. The determination that the customer's contribution to the bill is between 4% and 5% of income is based on an average usage of 600 kWh and the midpoint of the income range, using an average household size of 2.3 persons, for the discount tier.

once every three years. On April 1, 2010, the Office of Energy and Planning submitted its first triennial review of the EAP. See Attachment A. The triennial process evaluation focused on whether the EAP had met the level of need within the limits of the available SBC; whether the EAP conformed to program design guidelines; and whether the EAP operated efficiently. The report concluded that the EAP accomplished those three objectives overall and provided some recommendations for the consideration of the advisory board and the Commission.

Based on current projections, the sustainable enrollment level for the EAP at a funding level of 1.5 mills per kWh, to which funding will revert on June 30, 2011, is 28,100. These projections are based on the assumption that the average monthly usage for all tiers is 600 kWh, which results in an average annual benefit of \$468.50. During the upcoming program year, the Commission will consider the best course for managing the EAP to reach the sustainable enrollment level. The Commission expects to receive recommendations from the EAP advisory board before year end.

EAP Financial Information October 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010				
SBC revenue	Interest on Reserve	Benefits paid	Administrative costs	Balance in EAP fund on 8/31/10
\$16,557,533	\$1,560	\$14,658,441	\$1,666,462 ⁷	\$656,223

Since the electric assistance program began in October 2002, more than 172,553 households have received benefits from the program. Information by town regarding the number of program participants and the benefits paid since program inception and for the past 12 months can be found in Attachment B.

The waiting list, as of September 13, 2010, stands at 3,612 households. Because the higher funding level is due to expire on June 30, 2011, enrollment in the program will have to be reduced and, therefore, the waiting list will likely grow over the next 9 months.

EAP waiting list as of 9/13/10		
Poverty Level	Number of Households Enrolled	Number of Households on Waiting List
Under 75%	8,197	429
76% - 100%	7,798	1,267
101% - 125%	7,367	1,281
126% - 150%	5,736	194
151% - 175%	4,555	216
176% - 185%	1,498	225
Total	35,151	3,612

⁷ EAP administrative costs include \$1,616,564 for the Community Action Agencies, \$35,765 for the utilities and \$14,133 for the Office of Energy and Planning.

**New Hampshire
Electric Assistance Program
Process Evaluation**

Final Report

April 1, 2010

**Prepared for:
New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission**

**Prepared by:
New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning
4 Chenell Drive
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-2155**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....Page 1

1. Process Evaluation Objectives.....Page 1

1.2 Evaluation/Study Methods.....Page 1

2. PROGRAM PROCESS OVERVIEW.....Page 2

3. RECENT PROGRAM HISTORY RELATING TO PROCESS.....Page 4

4. STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....Page 7

**4.1 Whether the EAP has met the level of need, within the limits
 of the available system benefits charge funds.....Page 7**

4.2 Whether the EAP conforms to program design guidelines.....Page 8

4.3 Whether the EAP operates efficiently.....Page 11

5. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....Page 14

1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the activities completed in the process evaluation of the New Hampshire Electric Assistance Program (EAP). The New Hampshire Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) conducted the evaluation as required by the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) as part of Commission Order No.24,820. The evaluation focuses primarily on the processes in place during the 2008-2009 program year, which includes major program changes implemented during the 2006-2007 program year and minor changes incorporated in the 2007-2008 program year.

1.1 PROCESS EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

In Order No. 24,820 issued January 30, 2008 the Commission specified that OEP perform a process evaluation of the EAP once every three years and that the evaluation focus on the following three relatively broad focus areas:

- 1) Whether the EAP has met the level of need, within the limits of the available Benefits Charge (SBC) funds;
- 2) Whether the EAP conforms to program design guidelines; and
- 3) Whether the EAP operates efficiently.

The primary purpose of this evaluation is to assess the various aspects of the program from a process perspective in the context of the three areas above. This is the first process evaluation performed by OEP and since neither the Order nor Monitoring and Evaluation Manual provide specific guidance relative to the intended scope or format, this evaluation is intended to serve as a baseline. This first process evaluation provides a program process overview, which describes generally how the process currently works and a summary of recent program history.

The evaluation is roughly organized into three sections: 1) Program Process Overview, 2) Recent Program History Relating to Process, and 3) Study Findings and Recommendations. Study Findings and Recommendations are organized based on the three broad focus areas listed above.

1.2 EVALUATION/STUDY METHODS

This evaluation consisted primarily of three activities: 1) Verbal and written interviews with staff involved in program implementation and administration; 2) Review of Commission orders, existing procedural manuals, and other reports and program materials relating to the EAP; and 3) general review of software features/reporting information.

The first step in the evaluation was to more fully understand the EAP by reviewing any materials available related to the program including Commission orders and associated

supporting documentation, procedural manuals, EAP Advisory Board Minutes, Community Action Agency (CAA) compliance review reports, Commission audit reports, enrollment reports, sample reconciliation reports, etc.

Informal meetings/interviews were conducted with Commission staff, the EAP Program Administrator, and the NH Fuel Assistance Program Manager. In addition, a questionnaire was sent to the EAP Directors at each of the CAAs, and telephone interviews were conducted with utility staff involved in program implementation. These meetings, interviews, and questionnaire were intended to gain a more thorough understanding of the program and to identify any opportunities that might exist for program improvements.

2. PROGRAM PROCESS OVERVIEW

The EAP, which began in 2002 as part of electric utility deregulation, provides electric discounts to qualifying low-income households through the SBC assessed on all electric customers throughout the state. The program operates through a coordinated effort between NH's six Community Action Agencies (CAAs), the four electric utility companies (Unitil, Public Service of New Hampshire, National Grid, and NH Electric Coop), and the Commission staff with regulatory oversight by the Commission. The Commission oversees all aspects of the program and budget and all changes are reviewed and approved by the Commission through a formal proceeding. The EAP Advisory Board provides advice and recommendations. The EAP Advisory Board, which meets quarterly, has members representing various parties involved in the program. The Board's responsibilities include periodic/on-going review of the EAP, the drafting of policy recommendations and the provision of clarification and guidance to the parties responsible for administering the program. Decision making authority rests with the Commission. The EAP is currently in its eighth operating year.

The various roles of the parties involved in program administration are outlined in four procedural manuals: Fiscal Procedures Manual, CAA Procedures Manual, Utility Procedures Manual, and a Monitoring and Evaluation Manual. Each of these manuals describes procedural guidelines and requirements as they apply specifically to the various administrative aspects of the program. These manuals, in addition to Commission Orders, document the design guidelines for the program.

The CAAs are the primary liaison between potential customers and the program. They collect and evaluate applications/recertifications, enroll, deny, or wait-list potential customers and assign a discount tier based on established criteria approved by the Commission. They also determine when a participant should be removed from the program. The specific criteria for determining eligibility or termination are detailed in the CAA Procedures Manual. Customers are enrolled throughout the year on a continual basis. This is different from similar assistance programs such as the NH Fuel Assistance Program (FAP)¹, which enrolls customers once a year during the heating season. EAP customers are eligible to receive their approved discount for 12 months (or 24 months if all members of the household are over 65) from the date that their utility company first applies the discount. They can be removed from the program if they have not

¹ This program is also known as the Low Income Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

applied for recertification prior to their renewal date, if they are determined ineligible during recertification, or if they move without notifying the CAA. Enrolled customer and discount tier information (or termination information) is sent to the individual utility company where the customer resides.

The utilities are responsible for applying discounts to enrolled customer's bills and for collecting the SBC from all ratepayers as established by the Commission. The program is designed so that individual utilities reconcile the difference between the SBC they receive and the EAP benefits they pay out in any given month. Any net surplus in a given month, less administrative expenses approved by the Commission, is transferred to the EAP Fund held by State Treasury. In the case where utilities pay out more benefits in any given month than they collect, they submit an invoice to the Commission, and Treasury reimburses them out of the fund.

The Commission is responsible for fiscal oversight of the program. Commission staff reviews monthly reconciliation information from the utilities to ensure accuracy and authorizes the Treasury to make payments back to the utilities if necessary. The program provides additional fiscal oversight through annual fiscal audits of the utilities and the CAAs. Commission staff also analyzes projected and actual revenues and current and projected expenditures to advise the EAP Program Administrator of the amount of funds remaining to be obligated in any given month or to implement a wait list. The EAP Program Administrator then disseminates this information to the individual CAAs and determines which wait-listed customers to enroll.

Total enrollment in the program is managed to provide benefits to approximately 30,000 customers as specified by the Commission. This target is maintained through attrition, meaning that as people are removed from the program (on average 700 per month) new customers are enrolled as funds become available. Managing total enrollment in this manner is intended to result in the least amount of disruption to the customer.

When a wait list is implemented, customers are certified as eligible but notified via letter that they have been placed on the list. Wait-listed customers must be re-certified every 12-24 months as appropriate. Enrollment is determined from a statewide wait list with the lowest Federal Poverty Guideline (FPG) households being enrolled before higher FPG households. This policy is intended to promote the Commission's desired outcome to "target the greatest benefit to those customers most in need, with need being determined by the customer's FPG ranking." This can result in some eligible customers remaining on the wait list for a significant length of time.

Implementation of the program requires continuous communication and data/information exchange between the CAAs and the utilities. The CAAs send a daily "Certification Notification Transaction" to each of the individual utilities that provides newly enrolled customer information or discount tier changes for re-certified customers. This information is accessed by the utilities by email via a security-protected hyperlink. CAAs also send "Removal Notifications" that lists customers to be removed from the program. When the utilities receive these notifications they manually² update their customer's information and the changes are generally updated on their

² Unutil is an exception as their company has developed a customized computer program that electronically imports the CAA enrollment data into their own computer system. Any inconsistent data between the CAA and the utility can be immediately identified through an exception report. This provides information that can be used to identify and correct data inconsistency problems on a continual basis rather than at the end of the month through the Utility Transmission File.

next billing cycle. The utilities send a Utility Transmission File back to the CAAs on a monthly basis. This transmission file provides data that is stored in the EAP database and includes customer information, utility enrollment date, actual bill amount, bill to income percent, and actual benefit, etc. CAAs scrutinize these transmissions utilizing various reports to identify inconsistencies between the utility's data and the CAA's data and work with the utilities to correct the errors. Timely correction is critical since these errors often result in errors on the customer's bill. Corrections are not verified until after submission of the next month's Utility Transmission File.

The customer's re-certification date is determined based on the date that the individual utility company first applies the discount. The CAA is notified of this date through the Utility Transmission File that is sent to the CAAs from the utilities on a monthly basis.

Customers may be removed from the program following manual review if they fail to apply for recertification, if they are determined to be ineligible at the time of recertification, or if they disconnect utility service and don't reconnect at another location elsewhere within 60 days. The process utilizes two missed monthly Utility Transmissions as the trigger for potentially removing customers from the program. Missed monthly Utility Transmissions are intended to indicate that the customer has moved and the utility is no longer sending them a bill. CAA and utility staff coordinate on all potential removal cases that have been triggered by missed monthly Utility Transmissions to ensure that customers are not removed from the program in error.

3. RECENT PROGRAM HISTORY RELATING TO PROCESS

2006:

On September 1, 2006 multiple EAP program changes were approved by the Commission as part of Order No. 24,664 including the following:

- Making the EAP a uniform statewide program;
- Redesigning to provide benefits to approximately 30,000 customers;
- Retaining a tiered discount design but modifying the benefit criteria level to use % of FPG rather than household income alone. Multiple potential tier discount scenarios were presented and evaluated by the Commission. The Commission opted to approve discount tier scenario #6, which has six benefit levels ranging from at or below 75% of FPG to 185% of FPG (applying the discount to the entire bill) with an average annual benefit of approximately \$400/year;
- Redesigning the EAP to target benefits to the neediest households according to FPG with the largest percent discount going to lowest FPG group and lowest discounts going to the highest FPG group and with no discount less than 5% of bill; and
- Changing the expected household contribution to be between 4% and 4.5% of gross household income and no longer distinguishing between discount levels for electric heat vs. non-electric heat customers.

The Commission staff and the Advisory Board were directed to monitor expenditures and adjust enrollment to balance income and expenses during the course of the program year. The Advisory

Board was also requested to review all assumptions behind program design changes and recommend changes if necessary and to review program manuals and recommend revisions.

2007:

On April 5, 2007 the Commission issued an order (No. 24,738) that was part of a proceeding to evaluate ways to streamline the EAP administrative process and reduce administrative costs. The Commission directed involved parties to develop recommendations for streamlining the administrative processes based on their past experience with the program. They indicated that they did not expect the review to result in any significant redesign of the basic tiered discount structure or significant program design changes since this was recently done and significant changes would likely result in an increase in administrative and implementation costs.

On October 24, 2007 the Commission issued Order No. 24,795, which again looked at ways to streamline the EAP administrative processes with recommendations of the parties in hand. The Commission approved multiple process changes including the following:

- Streamlining recertification process by limiting the time frame and number of times that a customer is sent a letter reminding them to re-apply for certification;
- Modifying the file format for data transfer between CAAs and utilities to an Excel format to eliminate data errors that were occurring;
- CAA's manually identifying participants to be removed from the program and transmitting this information electronically to utilities;
- Evaluating possible automation of the enrollment process by the utilities;
- Implementing several software and system platform measures to improve data security, hardware, and data storage;
- Utilization by the CAAs of the existing Microsoft SQL Server 2005 reporting system or utilization of Report Mill to develop ad hoc reports and identifying individuals to be trained;
- Establishment of service agreements for software support, system management, and hardware support;
- Evaluating the feasibility of developing and implementing a system of having other social service agencies share their income determination information with CAAs;
- Updating program manuals to reflect current practices; and
- Requiring all CAAs to have an OMB Circular A-133 audit once every 3 years in addition to the OMB Circular A-122 audit performed each year, with copies to be submitted to the Advisory Board and Commission in addition to Staff auditors.

As part of this proceeding, the Commission requested that the Advisory Board keep the Commission informed regarding the parties' progress implementing the recommendations. There was also discussion of completing both a process evaluation and an impact evaluation of the EAP but the Commission deferred ruling on evaluation recommendations until they had the opportunity to consider report findings that would be submitted by the parties. This report was to address the expected cost and recommended start date of a process evaluation, the goals and outcomes to be reviewed in an impact evaluation, the start date for impact evaluation, and how impact evaluations were to be conducted.

2008:

On January 30, 2008 the Commission issued Order No. 24,820 approving a specific program goal and measurable outcomes as well as procedures set forth in the EAP Monitoring and Evaluation Manual dated November 20, 2007. The purpose of developing this goal and outcomes was to establish a benchmark for measuring program results. The approved program goal and outcomes were approved as follows:

Program Goal: “The goal of the EAP is to enable residential customers with low incomes to manage and afford electricity, within the limits of available SBC funds and the program design established by the Commission.”

Outcomes:

- 1) The program will provide benefits to approximately 30,000 households;
- 2) The program will target the greatest benefit to households in the lowest percentage of poverty brackets;
- 3) The program will minimize the number of households on a waiting list for the program;
- 4) The program will appropriately balance the need for electric bill assistance with the need for administrative efficiency; and
- 5) The program will deliver any other outcomes as from time to time will be determined by the Commission.

The goal and outcomes listed above were developed to provide measurable outcomes against which the EAP could be evaluated to assess the impact of the program. As part of this proceeding, the Commission determined that a costly formal impact evaluation of the EAP was not necessary since data and reports outlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual could provide the necessary information for evaluating the effectiveness of the program as well as information to inform future decisions.

This order also documented that the OEP was to conduct a process evaluation once every three years and that the first process evaluation coordinated by OEP should take place no later than 2009 with a final report of the evaluation submitted to the Commission no later than April 1, 2010.

On September 30, 2008 as part of Order No. 24,903, the Commission reviewed, and after significant deliberation, approved the EAP Advisory Board’s recommendation to increase the low-income portion of the SBC from 1.2 mills per kilowatt-hour (kWh) to 1.5 mills per kWh (1 mil per kWh = \$.001). Increasing the funds available for the EAP program was necessary in order to meet the program outcomes established above. The Commission also reviewed the status of implementation of EAP administrative efficiency improvements. All were being implemented or were in progress except for automation of the utility enrollment and removal processes, which were still being evaluated.

2010:

On January 14, 2010, Senate Bill (SB300) was enacted into law, effective immediately. This legislation expanded coverage of the EAP by shifting a portion of the SBC from the Low Income Energy Efficiency Program to EAP through the end of fiscal year 2011. This provided additional

revenue that was used to move a significant number of qualified customers from the wait list into the program.

4. STUDY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section highlights evaluation findings and provides suggested recommendations as appropriate. Findings and recommendations are organized based on the three study focus areas identified by the Commission in Order No. 24,820.

4.1 WHETHER THE EAP HAS MET THE LEVEL OF NEED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE AVAILABLE BENEFITS CHARGE FUNDS

Finding #1: This evaluation indicates that the EAP has met the level of need within the limits of the available benefits charge funds, at least through the end of the 2008-2009 program year. Some of the key objectives of the program are to provide benefits to approximately 30,000 customers, to target the greatest benefit to households in the lowest percentage of poverty brackets, and to minimize the number of customers on a waiting list. Enrollment data indicates that the approximately 30,000 customer goal was achieved. However, maintaining this goal required increasing the benefits charge funds available to the program. This increase in funds was implemented on October 1, 2008 as part of Commission Order No. 24,903 when the Commission approved an increase in the SBC for the EAP from 1.2 mills per kWh to 1.5 mills per kWh. This is the maximum increase allowed by the Commission per statute.

Even with the additional funds, a wait list had to be implemented in March 2009 and by the end of the 2008-2009 program year there were almost 8,000 customers on the wait list. In January 2010, SB300 was enacted into law effective immediately. This legislation expanded coverage of the EAP by shifting a portion of the SBC from the Low Income Energy Efficiency Program to the EAP through the end of fiscal year 2011. These additional funds allowed for a mass enrollment from the wait list and by the end of January 2010, the wait list was reduced from over 8000 to approximately 400. Unfortunately enrollment data as of March 16, 2010 show that the wait list has increased to almost 3,500 people even with approximately 35,300 customers already receiving benefits. Although it is difficult to pinpoint the causes of this significant increase in need, it is likely related to current economic conditions.

Recommendation (4.1.1): *If enrollment data continues to show an increasing demand for the program, the Advisory Board and the Commission should immediately begin evaluating whether it is possible to meet the current program objectives listed above. In addition, the administrative burden of reviewing and enrolling more potential customers and maintaining a significant wait list with existing resources should also be considered. Alternative strategies for achieving these desired outcomes should be evaluated, including consideration of recommending a permanent increase to the SBC for the program as opposed to shifting funds between the programs. This is important not only to address the immediate significant increase in need for the program but also to address*

the intended reduction in funds at the end of fiscal year 2011 when the SBC returns to 1.5 mills per kWh.

Finding #2: The current tier structure and associated discount percentages were approved by the Commission on September 1, 2006 as part of Commission Order No. 24,664. The discount percentages are designed and calculated to provide a benefit of approximately 4.0% - 4.5% of the gross household income for each tier level as agreed upon by the Commission. It was determined that this percentage was a reasonable target for low-income affordability of electric bills. The current percentage discounts in the table are based on assumptions relating to FPG, electric bill average kWh/month, and kWh cost/month using 2006 data. Assumptions and data associated with the current percent discount table are being periodically assessed on an informal basis.

Recommendation (4.1.2): *Although the evaluation found that the assumptions and data associated with the current percent discount table are being periodically assessed on an informal basis, we recommend that the Advisory Board develop a more formal schedule to review the assumptions and percent discounts using current data on FPG, electric bill usage, and cost to ensure that the 4 to 4.5% target intended by the current program design continues to be maintained.*

Finding #3: The evaluation indicates that the program outcome to target the greatest benefit to households in the lowest percentage of poverty brackets is being achieved. The table of discount percentages was designed with this concept in mind with a 70% discount being given to the lowest income tier and 5% being given to the highest. If changes are required in order to meet other program outcomes, such as continuing to provide benefits to approximately 30,000 customers or minimizing the number of customers on a wait list, then the percentage discounts will likely need to be re-evaluated as well.

Finding #4: The program guidelines allow enrolled customers to re-apply prior to their annual or biennial re-certification when there has been a decrease in income but they don't allow re-evaluation if the CAAs know that there has been an increase in household income (for example, when a household applies for FAP after they've been enrolled in the EAP).

Recommendation (4.1.3): *The Advisory Board should consider evaluating whether it is a more responsible use of ratepayer dollars to remove a customer from the program if their household income increases prior to their re-certification date, especially given the current overwhelming demand for benefits. Implementing this change would require modification of the enrollment letter so as not to guarantee enrollment for a year if household income increases.*

4.2 WHETHER THE EAP CONFORMS TO THE PROGRAM DESIGN GUIDELINES

Finding #5: Overall OEP's evaluation indicates that for the most part the EAP is conforming to the program design guidelines.

Finding #6: Program design guidelines are documented in four procedural manuals: Fiscal Procedures Manual, CAA Procedures Manual, Utility Procedures Manual, and the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual. These manuals are periodically reviewed and updated to reflect the current program design as approved by the Commission. The evaluation found that manuals with various, sometimes older, revision dates were in circulation and that the CAA Procedures Manual had no revision date so there was no way to determine if it was the most recent version.

Recommendation (4.2.1): *We would recommend that the final version of each of the procedural manuals have the latest revision date clearly displayed on the front page and, if a particular manual was approved as part of a Commission order (such as the EAP Monitoring and Evaluation Manual), the order number and approval date be displayed on the front page as well. We would also recommend that only the final versions as submitted to the Commission be made available to staff involved in program implementation and that they be distributed in PDF format only so that interim draft word versions aren't circulated.*

Finding #7: Program design guidelines require that the CAAs, utilities, and OEP be audited annually to assure compliance with program parameters and, in the case of OEP, to assure compliance with a Memo of Understanding. The evaluation found that this aspect of the program was working well and conforms to the program design guidelines. In addition, the audit report itself fully documents that design guidelines relating to fiscal management and oversight of the EAP are being met by all involved parties, except as specifically noted in the “Audit Issues” section of the report. The EAP design guidelines requiring annual auditing of essentially all financial aspects of the program help to ensure that financial accounting is accurate and that appropriate controls are in place.

Finding #8: In addition to the auditing procedures noted above, the program design guidelines require that the Program Administrator perform annual compliance monitoring of each of the CAAs to assure that the CAA staff is following all EAP policies and regulations. These requirements are outlined in the EAP Monitoring and Evaluation Manual. The Program Administrator also performs desk monitoring at least weekly via online review of the records of each CAA. This allows the Program Administrator to monitor compliance with timeframes and to contact agencies that have exceeded time limits. OEP reviewed CAA compliance monitoring reports for program years 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 and found that compliance monitoring of the CAAs is being performed in accordance with the design guidelines. In addition, the compliance monitoring reports document that each of the CAAs are conforming to the evaluation criteria specifically outlined in the Compliance Monitoring Section of the Manual.

Recommendation (4.2.2): *The annual CAA evaluations, as well as the ongoing desk auditing, are important components of the program since they provide a formal mechanism for assuring consistency amongst the multiple CAA offices throughout the state. The CAA Compliance Monitoring evaluation criteria however, seem to focus primarily on evaluating only the intake and initial enrollment aspects of the program. Consideration should be given to expanding the CAA Compliance section of the*

Monitoring and Evaluation Manual to include an annual systematic review of other aspects of the CAA's implementation of the program such as Recertification, Customer Relocation (Moves), Withdrawal or Removal from the Program, and enrolling from the wait list. As discussed later in this report, OEP's evaluation found that some aspects of program implementation that occur after initial enrollment seem to be administratively problematic. While informal evaluation of these areas may be currently occurring, annual systematic evaluation and reporting by the Program Administrator may help to identify causes and possible solutions to some of these problematic areas of the program, which are discussed later in the evaluation.

Finding #9: The EAP Monitoring and Evaluation Manual requires that data be collected and reported on a periodic basis to provide continuous feedback on the achievement or lack thereof of intended program results and to inform future decisions regarding the EAP (see Section 3 of the Monitoring and Evaluation Report for specific data and reports). In January 2008 (Order No. 24,820) the Commission adopted a formal written goal of the EAP and approved specific measurable outcomes against which the EAP would be evaluated. This goal and associated measurable outcomes were incorporated into the EAP Monitoring and Evaluation Manual. The intent of establishing this goal and associated measurable outcomes was to provide a framework for future evaluation of the impact of the program. At that time, the Commission was evaluating the need for completing a formal impact evaluation. The Commission determined that a costly formal impact evaluation of the EAP was not necessary since the data and reports outlined in the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual, and specified in the Order, could provide the necessary information for evaluating the impact of the program as well as provide information for future decision-making.

OEP's process evaluation found that many of the reports listed in the Monitoring and Evaluation manual are not being generated on a periodic basis and some of these reports, as currently designed, may not be providing the appropriate information necessary to assess the program's achievement or lack thereof or to inform future decision making. In addition, the data used to generate many of these reports may have a certain level of inaccuracy due to multiple data transmission problems that have occurred over the years between the utilities and CAAs. Data transmission problems between the utilities and the CAAs still continue to be a problem.

Recommendation (4.2.3): *We would recommend that the Advisory Board consider creating a sub-committee to evaluate the content of each of the reports listed in Section 3 of the Monitoring and Evaluation manual to determine whether they are necessary to assess the measurable outcomes of the program, the impact and costs of the program, and whether they provide information necessary to inform future decision making. We also recommend that the sub-committee determine whether the data included in each report is appropriate and if it is presented in a useful format. For example, in some cases it would be most beneficial to see information summarized over a specific period of time. OEP would also recommend that the Advisory Board establish a routine schedule to review these reports (or trends that the reports may show), possibly annually at the end of a program year. The sub-committee should consult with the EAP Administrator regarding any potential software programming changes that may be necessary to develop*

useful evaluation and future decision-making reports. Section 3 of the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual would need to be updated if changes are made to the list of reports.

Recommendation (4.2.4): *In addition, OEP would recommend that the Program Administrator continue working with the utilities and the EAP software contractor to determine mechanisms for eliminating data transmission errors between the utilities and EAP database. If the accuracy of data transmitted from the utilities to the EAP database cannot be consistently received, the Advisory Board may want to explore the possibility of obtaining summarized information in report format directly from each individual utility on a monthly basis. Some report information contained in the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual currently comes to the Commission in this format (e.g., total number of accounts for non-EAP vs. EAP, total revenue for non-EAP vs. EAP, arrearage report for non-EAP vs. EAP).*

Finding #10: In addition, one utility reported that they received removal information for other utility's customers in addition to their own as part of the CAA's transmissions to them. Although this is not likely typical, there is potential concern about customer confidentiality.

4.3 WHETHER THE EAP OPERATES EFFICIENTLY

Finding #11: This process evaluation seemed to indicate that the fiscal oversight and fiscal management aspects of the EAP operate efficiently. Implementation of other aspects of the program by design requires daily communication and data/information exchange between the individual CAAs and the individual utilities. This combined with the fact that the program is designed to enroll and remove customers on a continuous basis throughout the year, makes the process administratively complex. This process evaluation identified several potential areas where administrative inefficiencies could be improved as further discussed below.

Finding #12: The existing software used to implement the program appears to have caused, and continues to cause, administrative inefficiencies. During fiscal year 2008, the CAAs were able to enter into a contract to provide software and hardware support. Some software changes have been incorporated, and others are in process, that has improved several aspects of the program (e.g., applying notes to both FAP and EAP cases so that double entry is not required, new removal button/spreadsheet, and new reports that can be accessed by CAA staff). However, CAA staff raised multiple administrative efficiency issues relating to software. Of particular concern are significant administrative inefficiencies caused by the software's Unique ID that impact multiple aspects of the process and result in a significant amount of extra administrative time.

Other software related issues that were mentioned include (but are not limited to):

- Difficulty of removing an individual from the household especially if they are the customer of record
- Desire to provide a "pre-application" feature similar to FAP software;
- Ability to edit wait-listed applications;
- Ability to move denied applications;

- Lack of reporting capability for CAA staff (e.g., tracking number of customers in the program at any given date, providing information broken down by towns and information relative to customer dollar savings); and
- General slowness and increase in software bugs

In addition, ad hoc reporting capability for end users continues to be limited.

Recommendation (4.3.1): *We would recommend that the Program Administrator, Advisory Board, and software programmers fully evaluate the potential cost of re-designing the database to remove the Unique ID vs. the true administrative costs to the CAAs of retaining it. This evaluation should also assess whether removal of the Unique ID will truly improve the administrative issues that users are currently experiencing related to the Unique ID. EAP Directors at each CAA should be informed of evaluation results as they relate to removal or retention of the Unique ID and additional training should also be provided to all software users to limit complications involving the Unique ID.*

Recommendation (4.3.2): *We would recommend that the Program Administrator and software programmers continue to work collaboratively with the EAP Directors and their staff at each of the CAAs to identify, document, and prioritize software and reporting improvements, including ad hoc reporting capability for end users, that are necessary to improve administrative efficiency.*

Recommendation (4.3.3): *The Program Administrator and Program Directors should continue working with all CAA staff involved in program implementation to ensure that they understand how to use the software effectively, especially as new reports and software enhancements are developed.*

Finding #13: The data information transfer process is complex and involves daily data exchange between the CAAs and the utilities. CAAs transmit enrollment and tier changes to the utilities via enrollment transmission reports and removal transmission reports. Utilities enter updated customer information into their systems manually and send a monthly Utility Transmission file to the CAAs, which contains data that is incorporated into the EAP system.

This process is inefficient in that a significant amount of CAA and utility staff time is spent trying to identify and correct errors on both ends that occur in data transmission (or transmissions not going through) resulting from data entry errors, old account number information, incorrect Unique ID numbers or inconsistent customer of record information. CAA staff must scrutinize monthly Utility Transmission files through a Transmission Error Report and other administrative reports, research to find the source of the errors, and then communicate with the individual utility to correct them. They also scrutinize each month's withdrawal reports and communicate with utility staff to verify why customers are on the list. The software automatically changes a customer's status to "withdrawn" if there are two missed utility transmissions. This was originally intended to notify CAAs that a customer is no longer receiving electrical service from the utility but cases can be triggered as "withdrawn" because of other data inconsistency problems as well.

This process is also particularly inefficient because it can take up to 60 days from the date the transmission error to verify that identified problems have been corrected and incorporated into the customer's bill. Verification that corrections have been made can only occur after receiving the next month's Utility Data Transmission file.

Information exchange and efficiency as it relates to customer moves appears to have been improved now that utilities are routinely providing CAAs with a list of client moves.

Finding #14: Our evaluation found that the removal process is administratively burdensome and time consuming because, unlike the FAP where the program year ends on a specific date and all customers are no longer enrolled, EAP customers are removed on a rolling basis throughout the year depending on their re-certification date. Customers are removed from the program if they don't apply for recertification or if they no longer qualify for the program. They can also be removed if they move from one utility to another without notifying the CAA and the CAA receives two missed transactions from the utility. Because there are multiple factors affecting whether a customer should be removed from the program or not, such as whether they have scheduled an appointment for recertification or complicating factors of moving from one utility to another, or customers being flagged as "withdrawn" in error, removals require manual evaluation to assure that customers are not being removed from the program in error.

Reducing the administrative complexity of removals may be difficult because continual enrollment and termination is an integral part of this program's design. In the EAP, new customers are only able to be enrolled as funds are made available through attrition when customers leave the program.

Software improvements have recently been implemented including development of a removal button and associated new Excel spreadsheet, which have helped to streamline portions of the removal process and improve efficiency.

Recommendation (4.3.4): *If the Advisory Board and Commission ever opt to consider an entire redesign of the EAP, the concept of mirroring the EAP after the FAP should be evaluated in terms of closing out the program year.*

Finding #15: The EAP is similar in many ways to the FAP and clients sometimes apply for both programs at the same time of the year.

Recommendation (4.3.5): *We would recommend that the Advisory Board and Commission continue evaluating mechanisms for making the FAP and EAP as administratively similar as possible to improve efficiency. For example, intake documentation and program rules for both programs (e.g., income qualification criteria) could be evaluated. FAP software features that would be beneficial in the EAP portion of the database should be evaluated for potential use in EAP. Some features such as the ability to have notes apply to both EAP and FAP cases when entered have already helped to improve efficiency.*

Finding #16: In addition to being difficult for customers, maintaining a wait list for an extended period of time for a significant number of customers can be administratively burdensome for the CAAs. CAAs are unable to keep current with household changes that may occur and therefore there are often returned letters, wrong account numbers, and other problems that need to be fixed at a later date.

In addition, mass wait-list enrollments are challenging and administratively burdensome for both the utilities and the CAAs. The recent mass wait-list enrollment required the CAAs and the utilities to spend considerable amounts of time identifying and correcting data inconsistency problems for mass numbers of customers within a very short period of time. It also resulted in problems with customer recertification dates not being updated properly. This recertification date problem caused (and continues to cause) a significant amount of time being spent manually evaluating and correcting recertification dates for customers that had previously received benefits but were later wait-listed.

Finding #17: CAA staff involved in program implementation appear to be periodically consulted on an informal basis regarding program improvements.

Recommendation (4.3.6): *In addition to the recommendations previously discussed, we would also suggest that CAA staff at all levels of program implementation continue to be periodically consulted for ideas that could improve program efficiency in terms of potential software and reporting improvements and general program implementation. Some examples mentioned as part of this review include allowing submission of applications/ supporting materials by mail for re-certifications rather than requiring in-office or home meetings, elimination of duplicate copies of all application materials for both the EAP and FAP, utilizing a “pre-application” process, setting aside one day a month to focus entirely only on EAP applications, and providing a mechanism for making all cases in process “current” to the new program year.*

5. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following section is intended to provide a short synopsis of the recommendations suggested in this evaluation. For a full description of any individual recommendation please refer to the corresponding recommendation number in Section 4.

- **Recommendation 4.1.1** – The Advisory Board should evaluate mechanisms to address increased demand for the program.
- **Recommendation 4.1.2** – The Advisory Board should consider developing a formal schedule to periodically assess the assumptions and data associated with the current percent discount table.
- **Recommendation 4.1.3** - The Advisory Board should consider evaluating program policy as it relates to allowing customers to remain in the program until their recertification date if even if their household income increases.

- **Recommendation 4.2.1** - Revision dates on procedural manuals should be accurate and manuals should be distributed in PDF format only.
- **Recommendation 4.2.2** – Consideration should be given to expanding the EAP Monitoring and Evaluation Manual to include review of the CAA’s program implementation beyond intake and initial enrollment.
- **Recommendation 4.2.3** – Advisory Board should consider creating a sub-committee to evaluate the content and usefulness of each of the reports listed in Section 3 of the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual.
- **Recommendation 4.2.4** – The EAP Program Administrator should continue working with the utilities and the software contractor to improve the accuracy of the data being transferred on a monthly basis from the utilities to the EAP database.
- **Recommendation 4.3.1** - The Advisory Board should consider fully evaluating the costs of fixing problems associated with the Unique ID vs. the administrative costs of retaining it.
- **Recommendation 4.3.2** - The EAP Program Administrator and the software programmers should continue working with EAP Directors and their staff to improve the EAP software.
- **Recommendation 4.3.3** – The EAP Program Administrator and Program Directors should continue working with staff on software training issues.
- **Recommendation 4.3.4** – If entire program redesign is ever considered, the concept of closing out the program year similarly to the FAP program should be evaluated and considered.
- **Recommendation 4.3.5** – Mechanisms for making the FAP and the EAP as administratively similar as possible should be evaluated.
- **Recommendation 4.3.6** – CAA staff at all levels of program implementation should be consulted on a periodic basis for ideas that could improve program efficiency.

EAP Municipal Report October 2002 - August 2010

Distribution of household (HH) income data is suppressed where 10 or fewer recipients in town

Town	HHs < 75%	HHs 76% -	HHs 101% -	HHs 126% -	HHs 151% -	HHs 176% -	Total HHs	Total Benefits	Average Benefit
	FPG	100% FPG	125% FPG	150% FPG	175% FPG	185% FPG			
Pittsburg	41	56	49	43	18	4	211	\$110,117.07	\$521.88
Clarksville	18	16	17	16	20	1	88	\$39,252.99	\$446.06
Stewartstown	63	82	78	63	54	23	363	\$194,198.07	\$534.98
Colebrook	208	237	205	158	93	27	928	\$505,532.81	\$544.76
Columbia	39	57	37	35	18	3	189	\$110,061.33	\$582.34
Wentworths Location							8	\$2,683.33	\$335.42
Errol	12	30	39	20	13	7	121	\$44,645.68	\$368.97
Millsfield							2	\$456.63	\$228.32
Stratford	80	154	119	75	40	12	480	\$234,153.55	\$487.82
Dummer	5	10	13	12	7	5	52	\$25,287.63	\$486.30
Stark	15	27	37	18	13	12	122	\$66,185.28	\$542.50
Northumberland	96	166	156	196	102	31	747	\$329,713.17	\$441.38
Milan	35	47	67	63	31	9	252	\$132,303.93	\$525.02
Lancaster	147	220	198	179	66	25	835	\$410,219.26	\$491.28
Berlin	641	747	648	548	331	121	3,036	\$1,312,428.76	\$432.29
Jefferson	15	34	32	23	22	2	128	\$63,014.51	\$492.30
Gorham	96	126	110	135	81	29	577	\$250,512.61	\$434.16
Randolph	7	8	13	4	7	1	40	\$16,094.40	\$402.36
Whitefield	71	139	134	109	59	32	544	\$275,014.37	\$505.54
Shelburne	6	2	3	11	8	6	36	\$11,995.75	\$333.22
Dalton	38	58	87	75	41	16	315	\$159,084.50	\$505.03
Littleton	19	23	19	19	13	3	96	\$51,004.38	\$531.30
Carroll	18	30	28	9	13	9	107	\$69,803.77	\$652.37
Bethlehem	91	103	85	95	76	26	476	\$211,162.52	\$443.62
Monroe	20	14	37	28	15	10	124	\$73,456.56	\$592.39
Lyman	14	31	27	21	12	4	109	\$68,366.35	\$627.21
Lisbon	79	99	108	83	47	24	440	\$236,219.26	\$536.86
Chatham	12	16	5	9	1	2	45	\$36,999.01	\$822.20
Sugar Hill	20	7	12	23	9	4	75	\$45,585.26	\$607.80
Franconia	19	29	28	24	20	5	125	\$56,370.31	\$450.96
Jackson	13	20	8	16	4	1	62	\$46,635.82	\$752.19
Bath	52	29	54	48	25	6	214	\$113,581.80	\$530.76
Landaff	11	14	10	21	4	2	62	\$25,076.61	\$404.46
Lincoln	54	138	145	96	42	17	492	\$250,429.70	\$509.00
Easton	11	12	2	5	3	4	37	\$26,880.34	\$726.50
Haverhill	93	138	106	154	58	30	579	\$363,370.06	\$627.58
Bartlett	74	90	98	81	49	25	417	\$229,119.34	\$549.45
Benton	9	5	17	8	10	2	51	\$22,133.16	\$433.98
Woodstock	53	61	79	68	37	17	315	\$177,479.64	\$563.43
Conway	471	584	449	384	230	112	2,230	\$1,344,170.07	\$602.77
Piermont	26	18	23	21	11	3	102	\$65,201.90	\$639.23
Thornton	71	86	93	59	50	26	385	\$274,208.71	\$712.23
Albany	52	68	38	44	23	9	234	\$134,727.27	\$575.76
Waterville Valley							1	\$454.05	\$454.05
Warren	53	48	68	69	32	16	286	\$159,367.39	\$557.23
Eaton	5	8	3	7	1	2	26	\$12,423.00	\$477.81
Madison	64	80	61	85	61	25	376	\$200,568.59	\$533.43
Orford	12	25	24	16	11	3	91	\$65,752.15	\$722.55
Ellsworth	6	2	2	1	0	0	11	\$9,893.42	\$899.40
Tamworth	156	200	189	157	61	39	802	\$452,643.21	\$564.39
Wentworth	31	48	57	25	16	8	185	\$112,828.60	\$609.88

Sandwich	30	39	27	23	19	6	144	\$85,021.04	\$590.42
Rumney	73	67	70	42	48	11	311	\$202,897.71	\$652.40
Campton	104	136	149	119	67	37	612	\$340,042.53	\$555.63
Freedom	42	47	63	44	35	8	239	\$151,184.31	\$632.57
Lyme	17	13	27	16	5	3	81	\$42,277.78	\$521.95
Dorchester	17	25	17	18	18	4	99	\$59,842.16	\$604.47
Ossipee	296	315	274	204	144	76	1,309	\$791,399.24	\$604.58
Groton	17	33	26	34	24	13	147	\$68,540.94	\$466.26
Plymouth	164	206	170	142	86	36	804	\$462,433.01	\$575.17
Effingham	71	86	62	85	37	20	361	\$208,576.93	\$577.78
Holderness	29	43	55	42	40	13	222	\$107,952.54	\$486.27
Moultonborough	87	77	94	124	67	30	479	\$272,741.77	\$569.40
Hanover	10	19	20	16	6	1	72	\$39,583.43	\$549.77
Tuftonboro	56	80	57	70	57	20	340	\$175,667.60	\$516.67
Center Harbor	45	20	24	19	17	1	126	\$93,563.72	\$742.57
Ashland	15	9	13	8	3	2	50	\$35,274.50	\$705.49
Canaan	67	144	79	91	52	16	449	\$223,611.49	\$498.02
Hebron	17	15	27	23	11	2	95	\$46,066.02	\$484.91
Bridgewater	14	26	29	32	17	2	120	\$60,600.87	\$505.01
Orange							10	\$8,558.61	\$855.86
Meredith	354	307	298	240	182	52	1,433	\$854,685.80	\$596.43
Alexandria	42	29	45	47	14	10	187	\$108,900.18	\$582.35
Wakefield	193	231	218	193	112	83	1,030	\$615,461.36	\$597.54
Lebanon	255	354	278	173	99	48	1,207	\$567,008.38	\$469.77
New Hampton	62	71	50	68	32	14	297	\$197,936.00	\$666.45
Wolfeboro	1	5	5	4	3	1	19	\$9,208.58	\$484.66
Bristol	102	110	115	107	52	18	504	\$269,368.04	\$534.46
Enfield	62	85	121	86	38	18	410	\$197,228.39	\$481.04
Gilford	194	233	215	286	130	70	1,128	\$589,847.91	\$522.91
Brookfield	11	13	18	9	16	0	67	\$37,943.03	\$566.31
Laconia	1184	1074	971	676	390	197	4,492	\$1,986,582.67	\$442.25
Alton	178	118	151	163	114	39	763	\$418,783.49	\$548.86
Grafton	72	71	57	45	29	15	289	\$197,567.13	\$683.62
Danbury	53	66	47	39	22	10	237	\$142,810.92	\$602.58
Plainfield	30	38	17	19	7	6	117	\$72,336.84	\$618.26
Sanbornton	52	45	60	53	30	17	257	\$136,243.98	\$530.13
Grantham	14	13	13	16	8	3	67	\$35,888.90	\$535.66
New Durham	72	73	67	67	47	10	336	\$208,059.15	\$619.22
Hill	46	32	52	46	26	14	216	\$125,805.55	\$582.43
Springfield	38	38	34	27	10	7	154	\$88,506.66	\$574.72
Milton	269	258	266	172	96	39	1,100	\$693,962.20	\$630.87
Wilmot	39	41	18	20	24	7	149	\$78,082.52	\$524.04
Middleton	59	72	68	51	37	15	302	\$205,831.07	\$681.56
Belmont	450	421	400	345	260	89	1,965	\$1,064,548.86	\$541.76
Cornish	34	38	57	37	22	19	207	\$111,561.74	\$538.95
Franklin	720	523	560	435	241	119	2,598	\$1,318,704.20	\$507.58
Gilmanton	111	89	112	107	60	21	500	\$283,674.48	\$567.35
Andover	57	47	44	68	46	23	285	\$162,713.41	\$570.92
Tilton	190	159	176	154	102	34	815	\$448,464.08	\$550.26
Croydon	21	21	19	23	11	4	99	\$60,812.10	\$614.26
New London	25	34	48	38	12	13	170	\$89,712.83	\$527.72
Northfield	164	167	138	157	105	41	772	\$430,265.97	\$557.34
Sunapee	80	59	68	65	40	16	328	\$199,988.50	\$609.72
Salisbury	27	17	33	32	14	11	134	\$57,167.91	\$426.63
Claremont	821	930	814	624	376	177	3,742	\$1,688,365.02	\$451.19

Farmington	406	328	281	302	188	42	1,547	\$900,241.26	\$581.93
Newport	472	454	475	338	216	77	2,032	\$1,121,047.26	\$551.70
Barnstead	137	90	137	99	84	39	586	\$353,705.39	\$603.59
Canterbury	25	21	40	15	19	5	125	\$63,118.95	\$504.95
Sutton	34	28	41	33	24	7	167	\$97,494.63	\$583.80
Loudon	94	100	109	115	76	37	531	\$287,565.83	\$541.56
Warner	86	79	79	64	34	21	363	\$233,221.76	\$642.48
Boscawen	168	120	151	124	69	47	679	\$319,584.31	\$470.67
Newbury	35	40	49	35	23	6	188	\$103,828.96	\$552.28
Rochester	1919	1877	1469	1105	612	215	7,197	\$3,945,534.22	\$548.22
Webster	24	14	31	37	23	18	147	\$74,811.53	\$508.92
Strafford	46	48	56	38	42	7	237	\$127,455.89	\$537.79
Pittsfield	186	178	186	160	91	26	827	\$426,730.89	\$516.00
Goshen	38	28	30	38	15	11	160	\$83,497.26	\$521.86
Charlestown	272	230	246	293	156	70	1,267	\$662,259.73	\$522.70
Unity	39	47	43	31	33	11	204	\$122,390.79	\$599.95
Chichester	39	43	50	41	19	5	197	\$94,847.55	\$481.46
Concord	1405	1192	1197	1061	634	303	5,792	\$2,073,432.70	\$357.98
Barrington	209	187	178	148	99	55	876	\$537,849.05	\$613.98
Somersworth	798	511	443	349	219	85	2,405	\$1,380,634.11	\$574.07
Bradford	63	68	45	64	31	14	285	\$164,992.92	\$578.92
Lempster	66	53	77	52	22	6	276	\$177,117.85	\$641.73
Northwood	101	74	71	73	59	22	400	\$259,262.30	\$648.16
Acworth	35	44	45	33	18	12	187	\$92,976.84	\$497.20
Epsom	96	146	136	120	81	36	615	\$305,701.83	\$497.08
Hopkinton	65	73	86	76	53	33	386	\$179,559.86	\$465.18
Dover	1225	912	757	636	337	139	4,006	\$1,951,578.76	\$487.16
Washington	46	29	40	39	25	10	189	\$120,693.79	\$638.59
Pembroke	269	194	230	232	136	45	1,106	\$515,420.26	\$466.02
Rollinsford	63	54	58	37	27	16	255	\$142,777.95	\$559.91
Henniker	110	94	102	100	64	23	493	\$260,660.98	\$528.72
Deerfield	96	54	56	59	33	11	309	\$215,890.37	\$698.67
Madbury	20	20	25	26	13	4	108	\$69,901.42	\$647.24
Hillsborough	253	225	263	230	161	63	1,195	\$627,503.26	\$525.11
Langdon	21	27	29	24	13	5	119	\$65,866.07	\$553.50
Nottingham	55	29	50	62	35	12	243	\$137,612.03	\$566.30
Marlow	29	16	31	36	20	12	144	\$79,573.60	\$552.59
Bow	37	30	41	49	26	13	196	\$101,956.70	\$520.19
Allenstown	254	215	232	251	164	48	1,164	\$589,712.78	\$506.63
Lee	73	74	75	72	41	18	353	\$188,328.85	\$533.51
Alstead	67	66	80	71	36	13	333	\$179,116.77	\$537.89
Durham	15	26	48	25	12	6	132	\$62,503.09	\$473.51
Walpole	101	52	72	64	35	19	343	\$218,813.45	\$637.94
Windsor	5	7	14	4	3	3	36	\$21,672.63	\$602.02
Dunbarton	30	22	44	30	12	9	147	\$86,450.05	\$588.10
Weare	200	149	150	147	105	48	799	\$491,598.21	\$615.27
Stoddard	30	25	37	16	6	4	118	\$66,562.29	\$564.09
Newington	5	14	6	12	5	2	44	\$33,426.33	\$759.69
Deering	76	23	65	60	33	17	274	\$198,551.07	\$724.64
Hooksett	274	282	304	329	155	48	1,392	\$660,656.81	\$474.61
Antrim	84	108	109	100	45	23	469	\$239,393.42	\$510.43
Portsmouth	419	506	399	285	172	56	1,837	\$871,192.24	\$474.25
Candia	43	58	46	62	31	11	251	\$158,787.40	\$632.62
Newmarket	260	193	163	145	79	28	868	\$483,385.41	\$556.90
Epping	174	145	127	149	91	21	707	\$438,257.19	\$619.88

Raymond	311	278	327	296	169	75	1,456	\$860,928.96	\$591.30
Greenland	35	37	33	41	15	5	166	\$99,160.47	\$597.35
New Castle	0	2	6	2	2	1	13	\$4,984.58	\$383.43
Gilsum	29	27	31	21	19	5	132	\$69,528.07	\$526.73
Goffstown	269	213	263	245	200	96	1,286	\$740,290.14	\$575.65
Surry	19	13	11	10	8	9	70	\$37,324.77	\$533.21
Rye	47	52	61	45	27	8	240	\$125,810.64	\$524.21
Stratham	43	29	32	27	18	8	157	\$88,018.52	\$560.63
Newfields	5	4	3	10	8	9	39	\$15,007.90	\$384.82
Sullivan	17	30	22	17	15	10	111	\$73,455.35	\$661.76
Manchester	7122	5869	4919	4098	2360	1102	25,470	\$11,471,623.96	\$450.40
Bennington	62	47	29	40	28	19	225	\$124,905.46	\$555.14
Auburn	41	50	77	51	36	10	265	\$166,663.03	\$628.92
Francestown	12	6	13	22	12	6	71	\$48,358.52	\$681.11
Exeter	342	387	347	307	221	97	1,701	\$763,074.46	\$448.60
New Boston	62	35	45	45	45	15	247	\$144,376.48	\$584.52
Nelson	30	18	22	7	4	5	86	\$65,846.99	\$765.66
Westmoreland	12	21	22	25	14	7	101	\$72,910.23	\$721.88
Fremont	72	41	37	63	29	18	260	\$161,662.97	\$621.78
Brentwood	43	21	25	23	14	4	130	\$106,433.16	\$818.72
Chester	31	25	32	26	19	10	143	\$94,016.36	\$657.46
Hancock	39	27	33	39	19	10	167	\$86,605.33	\$518.59
North Hampton	44	56	63	55	23	11	252	\$160,949.83	\$638.69
Keene	666	720	684	673	342	188	3,273	\$1,709,418.31	\$522.28
Greenfield	24	22	38	31	18	5	138	\$71,390.89	\$517.33
Roxbury	8	6	5	4	6	4	33	\$13,158.40	\$398.74
Bedford	121	97	103	116	69	36	542	\$337,201.06	\$622.14
Hampton	256	192	237	128	114	37	964	\$425,041.31	\$440.91
Harrisville	10	25	13	15	15	2	80	\$50,983.83	\$637.30
Hampton Falls	15	12	4	4	7	2	44	\$26,302.08	\$597.77
Sandown	80	65	72	67	49	15	348	\$218,483.99	\$627.83
Kensington	9	11	11	14	5	3	53	\$23,231.13	\$438.32
Danville	104	89	68	76	56	26	419	\$217,393.26	\$518.84
Kingston	99	79	72	59	52	21	382	\$232,690.28	\$609.14
East Kingston	19	21	18	8	9	3	78	\$33,945.61	\$435.20
Lyndeborough	21	21	26	26	11	6	111	\$64,994.76	\$585.54
Londonderry	296	227	282	241	144	69	1,259	\$899,681.78	\$714.60
Peterborough	203	123	143	121	89	39	718	\$337,514.18	\$470.08
Amherst	97	84	80	72	81	35	449	\$320,021.22	\$712.74
Derry	741	658	663	617	364	131	3,174	\$1,880,873.91	\$592.59
Chesterfield	74	74	55	69	45	16	333	\$196,776.80	\$590.92
Mont Vernon	15	12	19	25	20	10	101	\$58,811.51	\$582.29
Marlborough	69	93	66	50	37	22	337	\$176,824.45	\$524.70
Dublin	17	22	16	17	20	7	99	\$51,251.55	\$517.69
Hampstead	59	93	88	113	66	23	442	\$208,147.10	\$470.92
Swanzey	275	247	261	263	157	76	1,279	\$749,402.85	\$585.93
Merrimack	258	206	246	270	162	87	1,229	\$810,648.31	\$659.60
Seabrook	462	404	373	307	158	56	1,760	\$1,013,398.55	\$575.79
Litchfield	102	85	94	84	64	33	462	\$347,309.96	\$751.75
South Hampton	7	1	4	18	6	2	38	\$13,434.80	\$353.55
Newton	43	49	44	56	34	13	239	\$118,318.66	\$495.06
Temple	26	15	15	16	17	9	98	\$72,142.32	\$736.15
Plaistow	95	113	93	103	83	22	509	\$210,136.19	\$412.84
Wilton	93	105	106	90	47	20	461	\$255,951.69	\$555.21
Jaffrey	155	150	158	179	82	46	770	\$399,013.12	\$518.20

Troy	115	122	101	103	67	17	525	\$276,969.50	\$527.56
Atkinson	35	26	44	29	26	9	169	\$78,788.52	\$466.20
Milford	356	293	292	255	208	78	1,482	\$785,458.05	\$530.00
Hinsdale	183	179	204	173	133	39	911	\$507,850.45	\$557.46
Winchester	332	270	302	225	153	74	1,356	\$879,308.29	\$648.46
Salem	367	445	498	442	250	96	2,098	\$923,441.82	\$440.15
Windham	57	52	74	73	43	16	315	\$180,273.79	\$572.30
Sharon	0	4	4	1	3	3	15	\$4,502.68	\$300.18
Hudson	473	313	322	310	224	105	1,747	\$1,027,325.94	\$588.05
Richmond	25	27	27	29	14	13	135	\$72,606.00	\$537.82
Fitzwilliam	82	60	67	49	50	21	329	\$182,019.06	\$553.25
Nashua	3794	2911	2274	2002	1169	562	12,712	\$6,205,662.25	\$488.17
Hollis	35	27	48	41	34	20	205	\$120,718.04	\$588.87
Mason	13	1	16	16	2	4	52	\$31,718.82	\$609.98
Brookline	44	30	33	30	29	16	182	\$119,218.34	\$655.05
Rindge	110	78	69	84	49	22	412	\$260,105.44	\$631.32
Greenville	114	91	147	86	67	34	539	\$283,212.57	\$525.44
New Ipswich	85	84	87	74	48	26	404	\$230,960.57	\$571.68
Pelham	113	99	145	97	75	31	560	\$396,578.72	\$708.18
Unknown	3	4	5	0	0	2	14	\$8,585.57	\$613.26
TOTALS	41231	37774	35629	31069	18754	8096	172,553	\$89,626,573.24	\$519.41

EAP Municipal Report August 2009 - August 2010

Distribution of household (HH) income data is suppressed
where 10 or fewer recipients in town

Town	HHs < 75% FPG	HHs 76% - 100% FPG	HHs 101% - 125% FPG	HHs 126% - 150% FPG	HHs 151% - 175% FPG	HHs 176% - 185% FPG	Total HHs	Total Benefits	Average Benefit
Pittsburg	11	13	12	7	5	0	48	\$20,967.63	\$436.83
Clarksville	6	0	6	2	4	0	18	\$3,488.79	\$193.82
Stewartstown	12	19	20	16	14	4	85	\$29,433.95	\$346.28
Colebrook	48	70	46	23	19	7	213	\$86,196.44	\$404.68
Columbia	7	14	4	6	6	1	38	\$19,164.95	\$504.34
Wentworths Location							2	\$615.96	\$307.98
Errol	2	4	8	5	6	2	27	\$8,110.22	\$300.38
Stratford	17	29	16	2	18	5	87	\$29,712.77	\$341.53
Dummer	2	1	2	2	2	2	11	\$4,832.74	\$439.34
Stark	4	10	8	11	1	2	36	\$19,694.63	\$547.07
Northumberland	28	37	23	30	19	10	147	\$48,474.56	\$329.76
Milan	8	12	16	17	4	4	61	\$27,755.87	\$455.01
Lancaster	34	47	46	33	22	5	187	\$76,215.76	\$407.57
Berlin	143	171	123	89	84	24	634	\$238,815.80	\$376.68
Jefferson	1	8	2	6	12	0	29	\$6,741.44	\$232.46
Gorham	23	23	22	18	16	7	109	\$41,006.79	\$376.21
Randolph							3	\$655.05	\$218.35
Whitefield	20	27	16	17	12	10	102	\$47,999.11	\$470.58
Shelburne							9	\$1,655.83	\$183.98
Dalton	11	8	16	17	11	7	70	\$27,990.71	\$399.87
Littleton	8	2	0	2	0	2	14	\$1,117.70	\$79.84
Carroll	2	4	2	1	2	1	12	\$10,504.50	\$875.38
Bethlehem	29	20	16	28	19	0	112	\$36,291.61	\$324.03
Monroe	7	1	7	4	2	2	23	\$11,237.44	\$488.58
Lyman	2	11	5	0	2	4	24	\$10,353.39	\$431.39
Lisbon	16	27	13	16	4	8	84	\$38,840.87	\$462.39
Chatham							3	\$2,261.40	\$753.80
Sugar Hill	4	5	1	8	1	1	20	\$10,487.97	\$524.40
Franconia	6	8	6	2	4	0	26	\$14,367.59	\$552.60
Jackson							5	\$2,337.28	\$467.46
Bath	10	10	17	12	6	0	55	\$21,290.64	\$387.10
Landaff							10	\$3,534.74	\$353.47
Lincoln	6	18	11	7	0	2	44	\$37,596.60	\$854.47
Easton	2	5	1	2	0	4	14	\$5,686.63	\$406.19
Haverhill	14	30	12	25	25	13	119	\$57,213.02	\$480.78
Bartlett	7	18	28	12	2	4	71	\$23,993.60	\$337.94
Benton							7	\$4,190.66	\$598.67
Woodstock	10	6	10	6	2	6	40	\$15,990.68	\$399.77
Conway	101	136	106	51	45	28	467	\$210,298.90	\$450.32
Piermont	8	6	1	2	5	0	22	\$11,247.86	\$511.27
Thornton	2	18	16	20	8	10	74	\$29,886.16	\$403.87
Albany	7	16	8	4	5	1	41	\$17,898.03	\$436.54
Warren	14	7	17	16	10	8	72	\$29,962.94	\$416.15
Eaton	2	1	2	6	1	1	13	\$9,267.18	\$712.86
Madison	16	25	13	20	11	11	96	\$52,589.15	\$547.80
Orford	0	6	7	5	0	2	20	\$13,722.03	\$686.10
Ellsworth							2	\$2,196.57	\$1,098.29
Tamworth	51	49	27	17	1	13	158	\$83,304.30	\$527.24
Wentworth	4	10	8	6	5	6	39	\$11,995.45	\$307.58
Sandwich	10	7	5	4	4	2	32	\$12,554.91	\$392.34

Rumney	5	6	10	5	5	0	31	\$17,684.67	\$570.47
Campton	23	22	37	24	14	16	136	\$59,179.68	\$435.14
Freedom	0	17	11	2	6	0	36	\$17,522.33	\$486.73
Lyme	8	5	4	0	1	1	19	\$6,675.04	\$351.32
Dorchester	5	6	1	4	4	0	20	\$9,441.86	\$472.09
Ossipee	37	71	76	33	37	18	272	\$123,951.06	\$455.70
Groton	7	10	5	8	8	4	42	\$17,235.68	\$410.37
Plymouth	48	54	25	31	22	7	187	\$67,456.37	\$360.73
Effingham	23	27	12	13	8	7	90	\$50,426.87	\$560.30
Holderness	7	2	20	5	14	5	53	\$14,364.71	\$271.03
Moultonborough	25	17	24	18	17	2	103	\$51,732.52	\$502.26
Hanover	2	6	0	6	2	0	16	\$5,419.34	\$338.71
Tuftonboro	10	18	8	22	14	2	74	\$19,309.71	\$260.94
Center Harbor	11	2	7	5	2	0	27	\$27,299.99	\$1,011.11
Ashland	6	4	5	3	0	0	18	\$3,532.19	\$196.23
Canaan	16	35	11	14	7	5	88	\$18,926.28	\$215.07
Hebron	1	1	2	4	6	0	14	\$5,835.69	\$416.84
Bridgewater	2	6	0	10	2	0	20	\$6,752.28	\$337.61
Orange							3	\$1,288.84	\$429.61
Meredith	102	60	60	31	45	11	309	\$154,870.47	\$501.20
Alexandria	17	8	11	11	1	0	48	\$18,973.81	\$395.29
Wakefield	33	55	53	29	14	24	208	\$107,115.38	\$514.98
Lebanon	71	68	53	42	19	13	266	\$67,253.74	\$252.83
New Hampton	4	14	11	10	7	4	50	\$30,794.52	\$615.89
Bristol	37	20	18	10	13	5	103	\$43,027.00	\$417.74
Enfield	17	18	31	23	8	7	104	\$34,196.74	\$328.81
Gilford	57	43	24	35	46	13	218	\$104,739.35	\$480.46
Brookfield	2	4	5	0	4	0	15	\$5,087.06	\$339.14
Laconia	258	215	205	141	96	49	964	\$377,623.95	\$391.73
Alton	54	35	34	23	30	14	190	\$89,698.70	\$472.10
Grafton	18	10	13	10	4	5	60	\$40,552.67	\$675.88
Danbury	16	18	13	2	1	1	51	\$28,696.65	\$562.68
Plainfield	4	11	0	2	2	2	21	\$10,634.11	\$506.39
Sanbornton	14	2	2	6	11	1	36	\$20,102.96	\$558.42
Grantham	4	1	6	2	1	2	16	\$5,553.85	\$347.12
New Durham	13	19	12	11	10	4	69	\$32,492.93	\$470.91
Hill	22	10	8	8	10	8	66	\$31,141.63	\$471.84
Springfield	7	8	6	2	0	0	23	\$11,623.21	\$505.36
Milton	52	48	37	36	23	0	196	\$119,602.72	\$610.22
Wilmot	11	5	1	7	0	1	25	\$12,283.55	\$491.34
Middleton	22	2	17	8	12	8	69	\$49,988.76	\$724.47
Belmont	111	102	53	64	34	13	377	\$178,463.78	\$473.38
Cornish	7	13	14	6	2	4	46	\$22,755.02	\$494.67
Franklin	149	109	102	80	63	48	551	\$213,641.29	\$387.73
Gilmanton	20	22	17	27	6	0	92	\$45,203.81	\$491.35
Andover	12	12	11	4	6	8	53	\$20,564.64	\$388.01
Tilton	27	40	33	22	23	10	155	\$66,559.22	\$429.41
Croydon	5	4	2	7	4	0	22	\$12,821.94	\$582.82
New London	7	8	6	8	2	8	39	\$18,588.72	\$476.63
Northfield	29	36	30	31	35	13	174	\$69,515.72	\$399.52
Sunapee	12	8	8	0	14	5	47	\$12,744.43	\$271.16
Salisbury	5	5	13	12	7	4	46	\$15,023.29	\$326.59
Claremont	163	188	163	119	107	49	789	\$297,804.61	\$377.45
Farmington	102	70	41	37	33	7	290	\$156,628.57	\$540.10
Newport	89	81	83	51	45	14	363	\$167,244.44	\$460.73

Barnstead	25	11	28	11	24	18	117	\$64,834.94	\$554.14
Canterbury	4	6	14	0	6	1	31	\$9,181.17	\$296.17
Sutton	2	2	6	1	1	2	14	\$15,920.70	\$1,137.19
Loudon	12	14	25	20	19	4	94	\$42,372.28	\$450.77
Warner	23	13	14	10	8	4	72	\$40,971.93	\$569.05
Boscawen	36	13	37	20	16	11	133	\$49,595.99	\$372.90
Newbury	12	13	13	11	2	0	51	\$24,423.68	\$478.90
Rochester	364	388	264	158	107	39	1320	\$679,681.38	\$514.91
Webster	8	2	6	2	7	8	33	\$22,477.51	\$681.14
Strafford	4	6	5	7	10	1	33	\$12,943.64	\$392.23
Pittsfield	65	34	42	37	30	0	208	\$90,449.14	\$434.85
Goshen	10	6	6	10	6	1	39	\$12,854.31	\$329.60
Charlestown	58	42	46	54	28	25	253	\$107,611.63	\$425.34
Unity	14	13	10	14	8	6	65	\$32,925.00	\$506.54
Chichester	12	14	12	8	5	1	52	\$23,825.90	\$458.19
Concord	403	289	259	170	142	46	1309	\$413,380.61	\$315.80
Barrington	35	24	37	28	10	14	148	\$81,293.10	\$549.28
Somersworth	87	64	84	57	28	10	330	\$155,429.30	\$471.00
Bradford	7	23	13	12	8	2	65	\$25,143.03	\$386.82
Lempster	12	12	18	13	5	1	61	\$27,672.03	\$453.64
Northwood	20	13	17	7	5	6	68	\$39,809.35	\$585.43
Acworth	6	6	7	2	2	0	23	\$9,949.73	\$432.60
Epsom	13	37	33	22	4	8	117	\$58,785.55	\$502.44
Hopkinton	10	11	20	12	16	6	75	\$26,893.18	\$358.58
Dover	278	176	129	92	69	27	771	\$327,293.37	\$424.51
Washington	11	8	7	8	7	4	45	\$26,760.11	\$594.67
Pembroke	55	33	35	49	30	12	214	\$80,032.52	\$373.98
Rollinsford	19	6	11	0	4	1	41	\$29,552.34	\$720.79
Henniker	24	20	20	17	20	6	107	\$50,771.64	\$474.50
Deerfield	22	13	13	19	5	0	72	\$42,087.91	\$584.55
Madbury	5	4	2	4	0	1	16	\$9,775.78	\$610.99
Hillsborough	58	47	52	41	33	20	251	\$83,282.35	\$331.80
Langdon	10	5	4	4	2	1	26	\$12,619.07	\$485.35
Nottingham	16	5	12	5	6	4	48	\$26,415.46	\$550.32
Marlow	0	2	0	8	7	2	19	\$3,097.65	\$163.03
Bow	6	4	11	14	12	4	51	\$13,613.30	\$266.93
Allenstown	54	45	36	39	37	16	227	\$79,487.73	\$350.17
Lee	13	6	28	11	12	1	71	\$31,312.55	\$441.02
Alstead	11	13	12	8	7	0	51	\$17,758.53	\$348.21
Durham	2	4	6	0	0	0	12	\$4,044.37	\$337.03
Walpole	28	14	14	14	7	8	85	\$34,563.38	\$406.63
Windsor							10	\$5,177.70	\$517.77
Dunbarton	4	8	6	8	0	2	28	\$12,322.33	\$440.08
Weare	48	37	34	34	33	16	202	\$99,656.32	\$493.35
Stoddard	11	5	12	4	4	2	38	\$19,222.39	\$505.85
Newington							7	\$2,853.09	\$407.58
Deering	18	6	8	1	8	5	46	\$40,698.80	\$884.76
Hooksett	58	52	48	43	25	17	243	\$89,850.36	\$369.75
Antrim	11	18	25	8	11	7	80	\$22,426.34	\$280.33
Portsmouth	145	116	84	51	45	11	452	\$182,089.62	\$402.85
Candia	0	1	5	10	10	2	28	\$9,153.64	\$326.92
Newmarket	65	46	39	16	19	5	190	\$91,786.04	\$483.08
Epping	36	23	23	27	18	5	132	\$75,228.66	\$569.91
Raymond	105	43	49	70	22	14	303	\$178,052.32	\$587.63
Greenland	11	10	13	6	2	0	42	\$20,471.25	\$487.41

New Castle							4	\$2,122.38	\$530.60
Gilsum	2	2	5	0	1	1	11	\$5,972.09	\$542.92
Goffstown	71	60	54	41	33	46	305	\$142,587.10	\$467.50
Surry	2	1	0	0	4	5	12	\$8,153.28	\$679.44
Rye	23	12	16	4	2	0	57	\$24,791.90	\$434.95
Stratham	11	10	18	12	4	0	55	\$25,447.79	\$462.69
Newfields	4	0	1	1	4	2	12	\$5,652.52	\$471.04
Sullivan	2	4	0	0	4	6	16	\$4,393.69	\$274.61
Manchester	1904	1408	1120	779	582	339	6132	\$2,130,389.92	\$347.42
Bennington	22	5	2	11	0	12	52	\$23,003.85	\$442.38
Auburn	10	14	11	5	10	4	54	\$26,731.89	\$495.04
Francestown							9	\$2,883.23	\$320.36
Exeter	84	86	75	20	43	33	341	\$163,007.50	\$478.03
New Boston	14	13	10	14	13	8	72	\$28,167.31	\$391.21
Nelson	8	4	2	1	0	0	15	\$15,064.71	\$1,004.31
Westmoreland	4	5	2	4	5	2	22	\$18,092.62	\$822.39
Fremont	13	10	7	8	7	4	49	\$26,140.53	\$533.48
Brentwood	13	6	0	4	1	0	24	\$20,231.18	\$842.97
Chester	2	2	8	7	6	2	27	\$14,048.09	\$520.30
Hancock	0	4	5	6	6	2	23	\$4,257.13	\$185.09
North Hampton	16	7	17	17	7	1	65	\$27,010.05	\$415.54
Keene	135	133	115	83	53	52	571	\$244,244.03	\$427.75
Greenfield	10	2	6	4	4	1	27	\$10,461.93	\$387.48
Roxbury							8	\$3,167.25	\$395.91
Bedford	41	20	12	28	12	7	120	\$70,424.73	\$586.87
Hampton	54	54	48	31	41	16	244	\$93,947.83	\$385.03
Harrisville	1	7	1	1	4	2	16	\$14,847.67	\$927.98
Hampton Falls	6	2	1	0	4	1	14	\$7,166.94	\$511.92
Sandown	22	11	14	13	2	5	67	\$38,104.04	\$568.72
Kensington	1	7	5	2	1	1	17	\$4,805.67	\$282.69
Danville	19	8	8	16	19	4	74	\$34,889.49	\$471.48
Kingston	13	16	19	0	8	5	61	\$38,321.50	\$628.22
East Kingston	0	5	0	4	0	2	11	\$5,818.52	\$528.96
Lyndeborough	10	10	7	5	0	0	32	\$14,231.69	\$444.74
Londonderry	65	54	70	46	30	18	283	\$158,973.16	\$561.74
Peterborough	40	29	33	28	19	17	166	\$61,320.24	\$369.40
Amherst	23	17	22	10	24	6	102	\$55,913.99	\$548.18
Derry	164	151	118	98	78	41	650	\$326,060.13	\$501.63
Chesterfield	14	18	2	11	10	2	57	\$37,748.18	\$662.25
Mont Vernon	1	0	0	1	7	5	14	\$1,255.90	\$89.71
Marlborough	17	14	17	12	8	0	68	\$22,122.70	\$325.33
Dublin	4	8	5	6	6	1	30	\$8,486.30	\$282.88
Hampstead	8	19	13	18	14	5	77	\$27,043.24	\$351.21
Swanzey	58	53	53	48	49	31	292	\$136,598.51	\$467.80
Merrimack	80	55	58	77	53	22	345	\$196,826.48	\$570.51
Seabrook	105	84	64	54	35	8	350	\$205,763.89	\$587.90
Litchfield	7	30	16	18	17	11	99	\$55,675.79	\$562.38
South Hampton							8	\$4,065.45	\$508.18
Newton	10	11	12	10	10	5	58	\$20,384.17	\$351.45
Temple	6	2	2	1	6	8	25	\$15,380.04	\$615.20
Plaistow	24	29	29	10	22	4	118	\$44,319.58	\$375.59
Wilton	25	2	17	19	0	1	64	\$42,636.95	\$666.20
Jaffrey	42	43	28	28	22	13	176	\$69,466.52	\$394.70
Troy	30	35	14	10	11	7	107	\$57,263.47	\$535.17
Atkinson	8	2	6	1	4	0	21	\$14,611.41	\$695.78

Milford	63	90	66	49	63	18	349	\$119,142.82	\$341.38
Hinsdale	31	25	37	23	47	10	173	\$74,519.93	\$430.75
Winchester	76	43	53	14	36	16	238	\$142,573.57	\$599.05
Salem	82	102	83	75	49	12	403	\$137,727.64	\$341.76
Windham	18	13	13	4	17	2	67	\$32,876.30	\$490.69
Sharon							7	\$1,769.90	\$252.84
Hudson	128	75	63	82	57	29	434	\$190,025.81	\$437.85
Richmond	12	4	7	6	2	5	36	\$17,408.29	\$483.56
Fitzwilliam	31	16	22	12	18	2	101	\$47,124.97	\$466.58
Nashua	1003	744	536	405	322	141	3151	\$1,151,634.20	\$365.48
Hollis	10	5	13	11	12	10	61	\$25,952.67	\$425.45
Mason	0	0	5	6	1	1	13	\$6,982.68	\$537.13
Brookline	6	8	7	11	8	4	44	\$21,414.67	\$486.70
Rindge	33	16	18	18	18	4	107	\$55,524.83	\$518.92
Greenville	24	19	17	11	16	8	95	\$36,811.83	\$387.49
New Ipswich	17	22	22	8	12	11	92	\$27,406.97	\$297.90
Pelham	24	22	31	14	17	11	119	\$55,680.64	\$467.90
TOTALS	9720	8250	7109	5391	4295	2108	36873	\$15,544,353.02	\$421.56