**To:** The Governor

**From:** Grace Sam, Policy Analyst

**Date:** March 9, 2026

**Subj**: Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program - Design Alternatives for 2026-27 Program Year

This analysis was done in response to your request to recommend changes to the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for program year 2026-27 (FFY27) to ensure that the federal funds the state receives provide maximum benefit to those residents who most need assistance with their energy costs, while minimizing the likelihood of a major protest.

**Background**

Under the *Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program* (LIHEAP) states receive federal funds every year to help low-income households with their heating costs. Federally mandated basic requirements aside, the state has broad discretion to determine eligibility, assistance amounts and timing. In the recent iterations of the program, most of the funds have been used to operate the *Heating Assistance Program* which makes grants to households based on income level, household size, and type of energy used for heating. A portion of the funds have been used to operate the *Crisis Program* (which helps families with emergency needs) and the *Weatherization Program* (which helps low-income households to improve their home’s ability to retain heat).

The causal model in Figure 1 illustrates factors affecting households’ need for heating assistance and the program alternatives (in grey) that can influence change in each of the primary factors at play.
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Figure 1 – Causal model illustrating factors and in grey are corresponding programs affecting the need for heating assistance in the state

Last Year’s Heating Assistance Program Performance Overview:

Last year, based on Congressional Delegation’s assurance that the state would receive at least 6% more federal funds for the 2025-26 program year than in the previous year, the state increased the cash grants under the program by 10% and increased the eligibility limit from 125% of poverty to 150% of poverty.

However, the state funding increased by only 0.3%. Since the federal budget had not passed until early October, the state did not learn the actual allocation until after the program was underway. The State Department of Human Services projected that the program would run out of funds by February, prompting the early closure of the program. The state stopped taking applications for Heating Assistance grants after January, 2 months earlier than the March 31 deadline that had been originally announced.

* Explanation for program’s early closure

Figure 2 illustrates possible factors leading to a program’s early end.
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Figure 2 – Model illustrating factors leading to program’s early end

With increased benefit levels and relaxed eligibility limits, funds were being spent at a much faster rate than before.The analysis below illustrates how the change in number of participants was underestimated causing funds to be spent at a much faster rate than planned, and how program funds would have been exhausted even if the expected higher funding (i.e. planned’ scenario - 6% increase in funding) was received.

Government spending on heating assistance can be understood as

*Spending = Grant per participant \* No. of Participants*

As Table 1 shows, 11% more funds were expected to be available for spending on the *Heating Assistance Program*. In response, the grant levels were increased by 10%. This suggests that the expectation was that the number of participants would increase by 1% at most. But as the last column in Table 2 shows, the number of participants grew by over 10%. And by January, over $74 million had been spent on the program. If allowed to continue, as the last row in Table 2 with projected estimates show, by February, the program would have exceeded even the ideal ‘Planned’ budget in Table 1.

The 0.3% increase in funding (compared to the planned 6% increase), and a higher than anticipated number of participants, combined with the 10% higher benefit level, meant that if the *Heating Assistance* program continued, it would surpass the budget and would eat into the funds set aside for *Crisis Assistance* and *Weatherization.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Year** | **Federal Allocation** | **Heating Assistance** |
| 2024-25 | $138,649,965 | $78,276,130 |
| 2025-26 (FFY26) ‘Planned’ | $146,968,963 | $86,886,504 |
| % Change | 6% | 11% |

Table 1 – Planned estimates for FFY26 *Heating Assistance Program*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2024-25 (FFY25)** | | **2025-26 (FFY26)** | |  |
| **Month** | **#Actual Participants** | **Actual Spending** | **#Actual Participants** | **Actual Spending** | **% Change in #Participants** |
| October | 69,213 | $30,136,528 | 78,211 | $33,852,695 | 13% |
| November | 37,573 | $15,616,296 | 43,960 | $18,121,726 | 17% |
| December | 23,730 | $9,393,136 | 27,052 | $10,594,099 | 14% |
| January | 25,708 | $9,158,485 | 30,335 | $11,673,390 | 18% |
| Interim Total | 156,224 | $64,304,445 | 179,559 | **$74,241,910** | 15% |
|  | | | | | |
| **Month** | **#Actual Participants** | **Actual Spending** | **#Projected Participants** | **Projected Spending** |  |
| February | 27,685 | $9,314,859 | 31,976 | $13,221,146 |  |
| Projected Total | | | 211,535 | **$87,463,056** |

Table 2 – Program in FFY26: Actual change in the number of participants, and projected expenditure by February’26

*FFY26 February Projection:*

*#Projected February Participants = #Particpants in February in FFY25 \* Average % change in participants between October’25-January’26*

*$Projected Spending till February= #Projected February Participants \* Average spending per participant between October’25-January’26*

Lower income households can be reasonably expected to have poorer quality homes and hence higher energy expenses. They often have older & energy-inefficient homes and are unable to weatherize or upgrade to efficient systems. With the lower income combined with high energy expenses, we expect the need for assistance to be higher for those with lower incomes for each fuel type and household size.

Under the *Heating Assistance Program*, anyone eligible can benefit, which with relaxed eligibility included people between 125-150% of poverty level as well. An analysis of the program’s beneficiaries shows that it enabled households between 125% and 150% of the poverty limit to get heating assistance, but the number of participants under 125% of the poverty limit lowered compared to the previous year. This decrease could have been a result of the early closure of the program and the now-eligible higher-income households crowding the poorer segment out. i.e. given the miscalculation in the number of participants and the reduced Federal funding, the funds available were limited, and the newly eligible higher income segment benefiting from it came at the cost of the poorest and *higher need* segments being ‘crowded out’ of the program.

In this light, the *Heating Assistance Program* was not effective in directing the funds to those who need it the most. The *Crisis Program* assistshouseholds without heat or in imminent danger of being without heat. With *Heating Assistance* budget almost exhausted, the *Crisis Assistance Program* would be more effective in targeting funds to go to those who need it the most. This could have been the rationale behind the state closing the program early and shifting assistance via *Crisis Funds* instead. If the miscalculation were identified early on, the program could have switched back to 2024 eligibility and benefit levels. Politically, this change could have been partly attributed to the reduced funding which would have mitigated the criticisms to some extent.

The experience with 2025 program design and the analysis above establishes that changes are necessary. The following sections of the memorandum consider design alternatives for the upcoming program year. Before analyzing different program alternatives, the following section will briefly consider some overarching participation aspects of the program.

Other considerations

For the program designs for 2026-27 (FFY27), in addition to considerations of Federal funding, eligibility, degree and distribution of assistance, the participation rate of the eligible households in the program needs attention too. As Table 3 shows, only about 40% of the eligible low-income households took part in the program in 2024. This indicates the need for awareness drives educating residents about the benefits of the program. An additional 0.5% of the funds will be allocated to the administration cost to be directed towards this. The analysis below adjusts to the increased number of participants resulting from this by considering population growth rates of over 1% (i.e. higher than the average 0.5% population growth rate).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Participation Rate by Household Size, 2024** | | | | | |
| **Household Income** | **#Households** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 - $4,999 | 114,539 | 42% | 42% | 42% | 42% | 42% | 42% |
| $5,000 - $9,999 | 79,587 | 40% | 42% | 42% | 42% | 42% | 42% |
| $10,000- $14,999 | 138,965 | 32% | 34% | 40% | 42% | 42% | 42% |

Table 3 – Low Household Participation Rate in LIHEAP. Even amongst the groups with the highest benefit levels, the participation rate was around 40%. The participation rate for other groups with lower benefit levels was lower

Households’ time constraints and difficulty in accessing and applying to the program should be evaluated to see if that was a factor in the poorer households being ‘crowded out’ in the last program year. While the program closing early and the shortage of funds are primary factors behind the drop in the number of participants who earn less than 125% of poverty limit, the fact that the new and relatively high-income beneficiaries were able to benefit and crowd out this group suggests that there would be value in assessing the hurdles, if any, in applying to the program for lower income groups. If process hurdles were in fact a factor in the ‘crowding out’, processes can be improved to make it easier for beneficiaries.

**Program Design Alternatives for program year 2026-27**

The issue in consideration is that the program should provide maximum benefit to residents who most need assistance with their energy costs using the federal funds available. Need is determined by the cost of heating – which depends on household size, housing quality, demography, weather condition, and the energy source used, relative to income. Since for a given household size and energy source, we expect poorer households to have higher heating expenses, need as defined by heating expense relative to income is expected to be higher for the poorer households in each household size and energy source group.

Figure 3 illustrates the program objectives and the factors affecting it. Primary objectives include keeping program spending within funding provided, minimizing the risk of protests and distributing funds such that those with highest need get the most benefit. In green are some of the dimensions in which the policy alternatives considered below vary.
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Figure 3 – Program objectives. Primary program objectives are outlined in purple.

Policy Alternatives

The 2025 program alternative revealed that extending benefits up to 150% poverty limit won’t be feasible without significant reduction in benefits or a significant increase in program funding. Given that funding is expected to decrease, the alternatives outlined below restrict eligibility to those earning below 125% of poverty. The following sections outline program alternatives for FFY 2027.

Each of the alternatives is evaluated in terms of the impact on program spending, number of beneficiaries and proportion of heating cost covered. Model in Figure 4 illustrates factors that affect program spending. Since funds are set aside for *Weatherization* and *Crisis Assistance* depends on emergency claims made, total program spending can be understood as –

*Program Spending = Administrative cost + Heating Assistance Program Cost + Weatherization funds + Crisis Assistance funds*

where, *Heating Assistance Program Cost = ∑number of participants in each group \* benefit level for each group = ∑ benefit level for each participant*

*Crisis Assistance Program Cost = ∑ grant made to each beneficiary*

A diagram of a diagram

Description automatically generated Figure 4 – LIHEAP: Factors determining program spending

Figure 5 illustrates a model to understand the *Heating Assistance* program’s impact on need. The impact on each participating household can be understood by

*% heating cost covered = Benefit received from heating assistance program/heating cost*
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Alternative 1 – ‘Readjusting Max Grants & Setting Minimal Assistance’

In the recent iterations of the program, the benefit received by some of the poorest households was almost twice the average heating expense for their income group. Table 4 presents the average heating expense in 2024. The average heating expense for a household earning less than $5000 and using electricity or natural gas was $504 and $621 respectively. In 2024, the average benefit for such households was $792 for electricity and $832 for natural gas users. Thus, the benefits level for some groups (groups defined basis income, household size, and energy source which determined the benefit level for the group) were over 100%.

The ‘Readjusting Max Grants & Setting Minimal Assistance’ alternative adjusts benefits to redistribute the funds to have a wider ‘deeper’ impact on the households being assisted. i.e. it aims to shift funds from households that are being ‘over-assisted’ (as discussed above) to those for whom the proportion of the heating expense met is low and can be improved by having a larger proportion of the heating expense being covered by the program.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Electricity** | **Natural Gas** | **Propane** | **Fuel Oil** |
| All incomes | $509 | $724 | $1,206 | $1,443 |
| Less than 5k | $504 | $621 | NA | NA |

Table 4 – Average expense on space heating in 2024

The benefits till now were calculated from historic logic and it is possible that at the time the original benefit logic was created, these groups’ heating costs were significantly higher due to more extreme winters, older homes or poorer insulation. This program design chooses to reallocate assistance from the ‘over-assisted’ groups as the 2024 energy bill estimates show that the average heating cost for poor households is not starkly higher than that of higher income groups.

All households earning below 125% of the poverty limit are eligible to participate. The program aims to distribute funds in such a way that all eligible households get significant respite from heating cost. Households earning below 100% of the poverty limit are poorer and are expected to have higher need for assistance owing to higher burden – since heating costs are expected to not vary starkly between income groups, a lower income with similar heating cost implies higher burden. This group should have a higher proportion of the heating cost alleviated by the program than households earning between 100-125% of the poverty-limit. The benefit level is set based on average heating cost for each fuel type and is adjusted for household size and income level. The details of benefit level for each group are available in Appendix A – Alternative1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **% Heating cost met by program** | | **HH size** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 81% | 68% | 68% | 60% | 65% | 63% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 62% | 45% | 39% | 32% | 33% | 33% |

Table 5.a – Program year 2026-27. Average proportion of the heating needs met under Alternative 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **% Heating cost met by program** | | **HH size** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 96% | 68% | 59% | 47% | 47% | 43% |
| **Other** | 40% | 33% | 25% | 23% | 22% | 19% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 36% | 17% | 17% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| **Other** | 15% | 9% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |

Table 5.b – Program year 2024-25. Average proportion of the heating needs met

Table 5 presents an overview of the expected program impact on the proportion of need met for each of the eligible income groups for program year 2026-27 (Table 5.a) and compares it against program year 2024-25 (Table 5.b). Table 1 in Appendix B presents the detailed resource-wise breakdown of the proportion of need met for each household size. We compare only electricity and natural gas here as the program maintains the benefit level for other energy sources at the same level as 2024. As the highlighted cells in Table 5.a show, the redistribution of funds in this program design allows at least 65% of the need to be met for all household sizes earning below the poverty limit, and over 30% of the heating need to be met for households earning between 100-125% of the poverty limit. Thus, this alternative adjusts the benefit for the poorest segment with high degree of assistance (‘over-assistance’ for some groups) and redistributes it to other groups earning below the poverty limit. The redistribution makes the program more effective for all household sizes.

An unintended dynamic impact of the program could result from the higher proportion of need being met for one-person households (81%) relative to two person households (68%). This could incentivize households to leverage additional benefits by splitting and claiming as separate beneficiaries. Also, the proportion of heating cost covered for fuel oil and other fuel sources is significantly lower. This could incentivize users to adapt and shift to electricity or natural gas. The increased demand for these fuel types could also push suppliers to find ways to lower supply costs or could incentivize them to subsidize the switch to electricity/natural gas for the users to retain their customer base. This tangential impact of the program would be desirable as these other fuel types are costly to subsidize and hence limit the scope of the program by either meeting only a small portion of the heating cost for these fuels (as in this case) or if higher proportion is met, the number of participants would reduce to maintain program cost.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Population growth rate 1%** | | **Population growth rate 2%** | |
|  | **# HH Benefited** | **Est. spending** | **# HH Benefited** | **Est. spending** |
| **<100% FPL** | 174,112 | $76,287,963 | 175,686 | $76,986,120 |
| **125% FPL** | 32,047 | $9,223,587 | 32,340 | $9,311,881 |
| **Total** | 206,160 | $85,511,551 | 208,026 | $86,298,001 |

Table 6 – Estimates of number of households benefited & total program expenditure for Alternative 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan** | **% of previous funding available** | **Total Available to Spend** | **Heating Assistance (60.5%)** | **Crisis Grants (20%)** | **Weatherization (10%)** | **Administration (9.5%)** |
| Medium | 99% | $140,984,111 | $85,295,387 | $28,196,822 | $14,098,411 | $13,393,491 |
| Upper | 100% | $142,374,770 | $86,136,736 | $28,474,954 | $14,237,477 | $13,525,603 |
| Lower | 98% | $139,593,452 | $84,454,038 | $27,918,690 | $13,959,345 | $13,261,378 |

Table 7 – Estimates of funding that could be available for Alternative 1 in program year 2026-27

Table 6 presents an estimate of the impact of the *Heating Assistance* program during the program year in terms of the expenditure and the number of people expected to benefit from the program. Table 7 outlines different funding scenarios. Assuming a population growth rate of 1%, the program is estimated to cost approximately $85.5 million, which will be feasible if federal funding drops by only 1 percentage point. If there is a possibility that the funding can drop by more, the program can first be made available to only people earning below the poverty limit and can be opened to the 100-125% poverty limit segment once Federal funding is released after October, if financially feasible. The Crisis and Weatherization funds will be available to both the groups throughout the program duration, until the funds run out.

In summary, assessing the program using the objectives illustrated in Figure 3, the alternative design could stay within budget whilst serving all the expected number of participants depending on the actual population growth rate and change in federal funding. It redistributes funds and improves the degree of assistance that the program provides to households by increasing the proportion of heating cost covered - the program ensures that eligible households benefit significantly (benefits cover at least 30% of the heating cost). The negative impact on households for whom benefit levels were significantly reduced (the ‘over-assisted’ groups) is expected to be minimal as we expect that the revised benefit covers a significant portion of the heating costs. Any household unable to pay because of this adjustment can leverage assistance under the *Crisis Program*. A caveat of the alternative is that the discussed positive changes relative to 2024 design alternative holds true for electricity and natural gas users only.

Alternative 2 – ‘Enabling’

This program alternative emphasizes ‘*Weatherization’* along with *Heating* and *Crisis Assistance*. Under the *Weatherization Program* low-income households get assistance in improving the ability of homes to retain heat. The positive effects of weatherizing are multifold. In addition to increasing efficiency of consumption (by reducing wastage) and thereby reducing demand over multiple time periods, it also increases employment and income for those involved in the work as the program aims to employ low-income and unemployed individuals to weatherize homes.

In addition to the usual 10% of the funds that are set aside for *Weatherization*, the alternative uses ~$6 million (i.e. an additional 5% of the funds) to proactively weatherize households for whom the heating bill in previous years was more than 30% of the average bill for a household of the same size and using the same energy source. On average, weatherizing a home costs about $6000. Given the funding, approximately 970 households which had higher than average heating bill are expected to benefit from this.

Currently we do not have the household-level heating bill data to identify the exact number of households that incur unusually high heating costs. We assume that the need for weatherization is higher in low-income groups. The average electricity heating bill in 2024 in for the 0-$5000 income segment was $504, while the average bill for $66-90k income segment was $473; $30 lower. Similar calculation for natural gas households gives a difference of $90. Assuming that the difference in average heating bills between the two income groups is owing to better insulated homes, we expect the program to lower aggregate heating costs by ~$30,000-$90,000 per year. The cumulative benefit of weatherization over the years makes it valuable in lowering program cost and household need beyond the year.

A key aspect in impact consideration for the *Heating Assistance Program*, in addition to the number of beneficiaries and cost of the program, is the ‘degree’ of assistance, i.e. the proportion of heating needs that the program meets for each participating household. The proactive weatherizationof households indirectly helps with the purpose of the *Heating Assistance Program* as it reduces program costs by lowering heating costs; cost savings in the range of $30k -90k per year. Emphasis on weatherizing homes improves the impact of the *Heating Assistance* program as for the same benefit amount, a weatherized household will have higher ‘degree’ of assistance - higher % of the heating cost met by the program - by reducing the cost itself.

Under this alternative the *Heating Assistance* program’s benefit levels have been decided using the average heating cost in 2024. So, for the poorest segment (earning between 0-$999) who use electricity or natural gas for heating, the benefit level is set equal to 95% of the group’s average heating cost in 2024, and 55% of the average cost for other heating sources. To illustrate, for a 2-person household earning $500 and using electricity, the program benefit will be $502, which is 95% of the average electricity heating cost for a 2-person household in 2024. Assistance for each subsequent income group is lowered by 2.5% and 3% for electricity and natural gas users and other fuel users respectively. The details of benefit level for each group are available in Appendix A – Alternative2.

Table 8 presents an overview of the program impact on the proportion of need met for each of the eligible income groups for program year 2026-27 (Table 8.a) and compares it against program year 2024-25 (Table 8.b). Table 2 in Appendix B presents the detailed resource-wise breakdown of the proportion of need met for each household size.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **HH size** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 78% | 71% | 64% | 57% | 52% | 47% |
| **Other** | 28% | 22% | 20% | 17% | 16% | 15% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 55% | 39% | 24% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| **Other** | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |

Table 8.a – Program year 2026-27. Average proportion of the heating needs met under Alternative 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2024** | | **HH size** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 96% | 68% | 59% | 47% | 47% | 43% |
| **Other** | 40% | 33% | 25% | 23% | 22% | 19% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 36% | 17% | 17% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| **Other** | 15% | 9% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |

Table 8.b – Program year 2024-25. Average proportion of the heating needs met

Comparing the proportion of need met between the two program years for electricity/natural gas users in the <100% poverty-limit segment shows that Alternative 2 attempts to distribute assistance provided more evenly by adjusting the benefit in favor of larger households. The reduced assistance to ‘other’ fuel users has two-fold underlying objectives. First, propane and other fuel sources are much more expensive and thus reduce program scope if they are assisted as broadly as electricity and natural gas users. Lower assistance level for these increases overall program efficiency (if measured in terms of the number of households benefited and degree of assistance provided) by reducing program cost. This group will have the option to claim additional assistance if needed under Crisis Assistance. Second, the funds saved are used towards the *Weatherization* program outlined above which has a dynamic positive impact in reducing overall need and program costs with the positive effects extending beyond the program period.

Table 9 presents an estimate of the impact of the program during the program year in terms of the expenditures and the number of people expected to benefit from the program. Table 10 outlines different funding scenarios. Assuming a population growth rate of 1%, the program is estimated to cost approximately $77.2 million, which will be feasible if federal funding drops by less than 1 percentage point. The Crisis and Weatherization funds will be available to both the groups throughout the program duration, until the funds run out.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Population growth rate 1%** | | **Population growth rate 2%** | |
|  | **# HH Benefited** | **Est. spending** | **# HH Benefited** | **Est. spending** |
| **<100% FPL** | 174,112 | $69,801,310 | 175,686 | $70,441,010 |
| **125% FPL** | 32,047 | $7,398,815 | 32,340 | $7,469,586 |
| **Total** | 206,160 | $77,200,124 | 208,026 | $77,910,596 |

Table 9 – Estimates of number of households benefited & total program expenditure for Alternative 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plan** | **% previous funding available** | **Total Available to Spend** | **Heating Assistance (55%)** | **Crisis Grants (20%)** | **Weatherization (15%)** | **Administration (10%)** |
| Medium | 99% | $140,984,111 | $77,541,261 | $28,196,822 | $21,147,617 | $13,393,491 |
| Upper | 100% | $142,374,770 | $78,306,124 | $28,474,954 | $21,356,216 | $13,525,603 |
| Lower | 98% | $139,593,452 | $76,776,398 | $27,918,690 | $20,939,018 | $13,261,378 |

Table 10 – Estimates of funding that could be available for Alternative 2 in program year 2026-27

As with Alternative 1, a dynamic impact of the alternative could stem from the lowered proportion of heating cost covered for fuel oil and other fuel sources. This could incentivize users to adapt and shift to electricity or natural gas. The increased demand for these fuel types could also push suppliers to find ways to lower supply costs or could incentivize them to subsidize the switch to electricity/natural gas for the users to retain their customer base.

In summary, assessing the program using the objectives illustrated in Figure 3, the alternative design could stay within budget whilst serving all the expected number of participants depending on the population growth rate and change in federal funding. A distinct characteristic of this policy design is that it gives a higher priority to the long-term impact and efficiency of the program – funds are reallocated from ‘other’ energy sources towards weatherization whose positive effects spill beyond the program period. The reduced support to ‘other’ fuel users funds the proactive weatherization program. Since weatherization is expensive, the number of beneficiaries from it is far fewer than the number of households that experience reduced benefits. This is expected to negatively affect the public reception of the program.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Average Electric Heating Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
| $452 | $528 | $501 | $597 | $527 | $518 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | 90% | 106% | 100% | 119% | 105% | 104% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | 30% | 35% | 33% | 40% | 35% | 35% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | 18% | 21% | 20% | 24% | 21% | 21% |

Table 11.a – Proportion of income spent on electric heating per household size and income group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Average Natural Gas Heating Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
| $643 | $751 | $748 | $764 | $738 | $780 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | 129% | 150% | 150% | 153% | 148% | 156% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | 43% | 50% | 50% | 51% | 49% | 52% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | 26% | 30% | 30% | 31% | 30% | 31% |

Table 11.b – Proportion of income spent on gas heating per household size and income group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Average Propane Heating Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
| $1,651 | $1,611 | $1,611 | $1,611 | $1,611 | $1,611 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | 330% | 322% | 322% | 322% | 322% | 322% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | 110% | 107% | 107% | 107% | 107% | 107% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | 66% | 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% |

Table 11.c – Proportion of income spent on propane heating per household size and income group

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Average Other Fuel Heating Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
| $1,156 | $1,149 | $1,392 | $1,285 | $1,207 | $1,351 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | 231% | 230% | 278% | 257% | 241% | 270% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | 77% | 77% | 93% | 86% | 80% | 90% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | 46% | 46% | 56% | 51% | 48% | 54% |

Table 11.d – Proportion of income spent on other heating per household size and income group

Table 11 – ‘Energy Burden’: Proportion of income spent on heating per household size and income group for different fuel types

Alternative 3 – ‘Alleviating energy burden’

The alternative measures need in terms of ‘energy burden’ which is defined as the proportion of income spent on heating expense. Households with high energy burden are seen as having high need. For each income segment, energy type and household size, the energy burden is calculated using the average heating bill for the household in 2024 and the median income of the group. Table 11 presents the proportion of income spent on heating for different heating sources for households earning up to $3000. The energy burden is lower for higher income groups. Table 3 in Appendix B has data for all income groups.

The alternative aims to alleviate energy burden by giving maximal assistance to groups with highest energy burden. Households earning under 125% of the poverty-limit are eligible to participate. The program identifies household spending over 10% of their income on heating as having high energy burden. The benefit amount for these groups is set at 100% of the average heating bill for their household size and fuel type. To illustrate, a one-person household earning $4999 will get heating assistance of $452 which is equal to the average cost of electric heating in a one-person household. The estimated proportion of heating cost covered by the program for this household is ~100%. For households spending between 5%-10% of their income on heating, the alternative sets the benefit amount at 50%. All other households, if eligible, get $100 in benefit. The details of benefit level for each group are available in Appendix A – Alternative3.

Table 12 compares Alternative 3 to 2024 program design in terms of the extent of assistance provided to each burden group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Average % heating cost met by program** | |
| **Burden: heating cost/income** | **Alternative 3** | **2024 Program** |
| **>=10%** | 100% | |  | | --- | | 64% | |
| **5-10%** | 50% | |  | | --- | | 31% | |
| **1-4.9999%** | 13% | 19% |
| **<1%** | 19% | 19% |

Table 12 – Proportion of heating need met by program for each burden group. Alternative 3 vis-à-vis 2024 Program

As Table 12 illustrates, Alternative 3 allocates funds in such a way that the households with the highest energy burden and hence highest need get maximal benefit from the program.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Population growth rate 1%** | | **Population growth rate 2%** | |
|  | **# HH Benefited** | **Est. spending** | **# HH Benefited** | **Est. spending** |
| **<100% FPL** | 174,112 | $78,043,353 | 175,686 | $78,673,152 |
| **125% FPL** | 32,047 | $5,197,188 | 32,340 | $5,239,734 |
| **Total** | 206,160 | $83,240,541 | 208,026 | $83,912,885 |

Table 13 – Estimates of number of beneficiaries & total program expenditure for Alternative 3

Table 13 presents an estimate of the impact of the program during the program year in terms of the expenditure and the number of people expected to benefit from the program. Table 7 outlined different funding scenarios. Assuming a population growth rate of 1%, the *Heating Assistance* program is estimated to cost approximately $83 million. The Crisis and Weatherization funds will be available to both the groups throughout the program duration, until the funds run out.

Table 14 presents an overview of the expected program impact on the proportion of need met for each of the eligible income groups for program year 2026-27 (Table 14.a) and compares it against program year 2024-25 (Table 14.b). Table 4 in Appendix B presents the detailed resource-wise breakdown of the proportion of need met for each household size. As the highlighted cells in Table 14.a show, the program shifts the degree of assistance provided in favor of other fuel types. This is because the energy burden is highest for them given the high cost of the energy.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **HH size** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 58% | 51% | 43% | 39% | 35% | 33% |
| **Other** | 94% | 81% | 77% | 65% | 56% | 52% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 19% | 16% | 17% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| **Other** | 56% | 33% | 19% | 7% | 7% | 7% |

Table 14.a – Program year 2026-27. Average proportion of the heating needs met under Alternative 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2024** | | **HH size** | | | | | |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 96% | 68% | 59% | 47% | 47% | 43% |
| **Other** | 40% | 33% | 25% | 23% | 22% | 19% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **Electricity or Natural Gas** | 36% | 17% | 17% | 15% | 16% | 16% |
| **Other** | 15% | 9% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |

Table 14.b – Program year 2024-25. Average proportion of the heating needs met

An unintended impact of this program could be that since the program uses heating cost to determine benefit levels for households, suppliers could increase costs in the expectation that usage and their revenues won’t be affected as the program could adjust the benefits to cover for the higher costs.

In summary, assessing the program using the objectives illustrated in Figure 3, the alternative design could stay within budget whilst serving all the expected number of participants depending on the population growth rate and change in federal funding. The alternative measures need in terms of energy burden which incorporates factors that affect heating cost – household size, energy type – and the realized impact of it on the household, which depends on its income. The ‘energy burden’ measure enables the alternative to effectively meet the objective ‘maximum benefit to those who need it the most’. The alternative is ‘energy-source blind’ in the sense that the ‘other’ fuel type users are granted the same proportional assistance as electricity and natural gas users. It differs from Alternative 1 and 2 in this regard as they under-assist this group with program efficiency and long-term benefits in mind. Under Alternative 3, funds are redistributed, and benefits level decrease for some users, but to the extent that the benefit allocation ensures that the ‘energy burden’ for all eligible households is under 5%, the negative impact and protests in response to this are expected to be minimal.

**Summary**

Given the discretionary nature of the program (fixed funding), the policy variables include eligibility filters and grant per recipient. The reduced funding expected for the upcoming year, together with the experience with relaxed eligibility in 2025-26 program year, implied that either benefits would have to be reduced to accommodate the higher number of participants, or the number of participants need to be restricted to those earning below 125% of poverty limit. Since funds are limited and one of the primary objectives is to ensure that the program provides maximum benefit to those who need it the most, the alternatives explored here restricted eligibility to those earning below 125% of poverty limit and focused on fund allocation to improve program impact. Alternatives 1-3 maintain the eligibility at 125% of the poverty limit and differ in terms of the grant per recipient.

Alternative 1 defines benefit logic for electric and natural gas users in such a way that households earning under the poverty limit have on average at least 60% of the heating need covered by the *Heating Assistance Program*. That proportion is 30% for those earning between 100-125% of the poverty limit. It reallocates funds from ‘over-assisted’ groups to improve the degree of assistance that the program provides to larger households and to those in 100-125% segment.

Alternative 2 defines benefit logic such that the proportion of heating cost met for ‘other’ users is reduced vis-a-vis 2024. The savings here are used in the proactive Weatherization program. Like Alternative 1, the revised benefit logic improves the degree of assistance that the program provides to larger households and to those in 100-125% segment. But unlike Alternative 1, the minimal proportion of the heating cost covered for each of the poverty groups is not maintained here as the funds are instead used to weatherize which has a positive impact over the long term.

Alternative 3 is perhaps the easiest to understand. While Alternative 1 and 2 understood need as the heating cost incurred by the household, Alternative 3 defines need in terms of the burden of heating cost. It identifies households spending more than 10% of their income on heating as ‘severe’ need and sets benefit amount equal to the average heating cost for a household of their size and energy type, and identifies households spending between 5-10% of their income on heating cost as ‘high’ need and sets benefit equal to half of the average heating cost for a household of their size and energy type.7 Eligible households spending between 1-5% of their income on heating would get flat assistance of $100.

We have compared the alternatives to 2024-25 program year, as with the previous year’s program ending early, the poorer segments couldn’t take advantage of the program. The program outcomes for the year were thus atypical. The expected funding cut combined with the infeasibility of the expanding eligibility to 150% poverty-limit without significant benefit reductions, and the focus on the objective to ‘maximum assistance to those who need them more’ (which implies that effective assistance should be prioritized over number of participants) make the 2024-25 year the base to assess the proposed new alternatives against.

**Recommendation**

As the discussion above suggests, amongst the alternatives outlined, Alternative 3 fares the best in terms of the primary objectives and is the recommended alternative for the upcoming year.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Primary Objectives** (from POV of Governor) | | | **Other relevant objectives** | |
| **Risk of protests** | **Benefit allocation** | **Expect to serve all participants?** | **Positive long-term impact**  (weatherization) | **Efficiency**  (costly fuel sources disincentivized) |
| Alternative 1  ‘Redistributing’ | High-medium | Higher assistance to lower income groups. But large HH sizes not assisted more | Yes | Low | High |
| Alternative 2  ‘Enabling’ | Very high | Highest | High |
| Alternative 3  ‘Energy burden’ | Low | Max benefit to those who need it the most | Low | Low |

Table 15 – Weighing alternatives against different metrics
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**Appendix A**

Please refer to the ‘Appendix A’ folder for calculations for each alternative.

**Appendix B**

Table 1 – Proportion of heating cost met by the program for each household size and fuel type under Alternative 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HH Size** | **Source** | **Avg. heating cost for HH size X fuel type in 2024** | **Avg. Assistance per HH** | **% Need Met** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **1** | **Electricity** | $452 | $367 | 81% |
| **Natural gas** | $643 | $519 | 81% |
| **2** | **Electricity** | $528 | $357 | 68% |
| **Natural gas** | $751 | $509 | 68% |
| **3** | **Electricity** | $501 | $347 | 69% |
| **Natural gas** | $748 | $499 | 67% |
| **4** | **Electricity** | $597 | $337 | 56% |
| **Natural gas** | $764 | $489 | 64% |
| **5** | **Electricity** | $527 | $334 | 63% |
| **Natural gas** | $738 | $484 | 66% |
| **6+** | **Electricity** | $518 | $333 | 64% |
| **Natural gas** | $780 | $474 | 61% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **1** | **Electricity** | $452 | $267 | 59% |
| **Natural gas** | $643 | $419 | 65% |
| **2** | **Electricity** | $528 | $217 | 41% |
| **Natural gas** | $751 | $369 | 49% |
| **3** | **Electricity** | $501 | $172 | 34% |
| **Natural gas** | $748 | $324 | 43% |
| **4** | **Electricity** | $597 | $160 | 27% |
| **Natural gas** | $764 | $279 | 37% |
| **5** | **Electricity** | $527 | $180 | 34% |
| **Natural gas** | $738 | $239 | 32% |
| **6+** | **Electricity** | $518 | $200 | 39% |
| **Natural gas** | $780 | $211 | 27% |

Table 2 – Proportion of heating cost met by the program for each household size and fuel type under Alternative 2

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HH Size** | **Source** | **Avg. heating cost for HH size X fuel type in 2024** | **Avg. Assistance per HH** | **% Need Met** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **1** | **Electricity** | $452 | $351 | 78% |
| **Natural gas** | $643 | $500 | 78% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,156 | $376 | 33% |
| **Other** | $1,651 | $376 | 23% |
| **2** | **Electricity** | $528 | $374 | 71% |
| **Natural gas** | $751 | $532 | 71% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,149 | $299 | 26% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $299 | 19% |
| **3** | **Electricity** | $501 | $320 | 64% |
| **Natural gas** | $748 | $478 | 64% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,392 | $301 | 22% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $301 | 19% |
| **4** | **Electricity** | $597 | $341 | 57% |
| **Natural gas** | $764 | $436 | 57% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,285 | $249 | 19% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $249 | 15% |
| **5** | **Electricity** | $527 | $275 | 52% |
| **Natural gas** | $738 | $381 | 52% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,207 | $220 | 18% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $220 | 14% |
| **6+** | **Electricity** | $518 | $248 | 48% |
| **Natural gas** | $780 | $362 | 46% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,351 | $221 | 16% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $221 | 14% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **1** | **Electricity** | $452 | $247 | 55% |
| **Natural gas** | $643 | $352 | 55% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,156 | $100 | 9% |
| **Other** | $1,651 | $100 | 6% |
| **2** | **Electricity** | $528 | $204 | 39% |
| **Natural gas** | $751 | $290 | 39% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,149 | $100 | 9% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **3** | **Electricity** | $501 | $122 | 24% |
| **Natural gas** | $748 | $177 | 24% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,392 | $100 | 7% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **4** | **Electricity** | $597 | $100 | 17% |
| **Natural gas** | $764 | $105 | 14% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,285 | $100 | 8% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **5** | **Electricity** | $527 | $100 | 19% |
| **Natural gas** | $738 | $100 | 14% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,207 | $100 | 8% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **6+** | **Electricity** | $518 | $100 | 19% |
| **Natural gas** | $780 | $100 | 13% |
| **Fuel Oil** | $1,351 | $100 | 7% |
| **Other** | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |

Table 3 – ‘Energy Burden’: Proportion of income spent on heating per household size and income group for different fuel types

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |  | **Average Electric Heating Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
|  | $452 | $528 | $501 | $597 | $527 | $518 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Fuel** | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **Type** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | Electric | 90% | 106% | 100% | 119% | 105% | 104% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | Electric | 30% | 35% | 33% | 40% | 35% | 35% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | Electric | 18% | 21% | 20% | 24% | 21% | 21% |
| $3,000 | $3,999 | $3,500 | Electric | 13% | 15% | 14% | 17% | 15% | 15% |
| $4,000 | $4,999 | $4,500 | Electric | 10% | 12% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 12% |
| $5,000 | $5,999 | $5,500 | Electric | 8% | 10% | 9% | 11% | 10% | 9% |
| $6,000 | $6,999 | $6,500 | Electric | 7% | 8% | 8% | 9% | 8% | 8% |
| $7,000 | $7,999 | $7,500 | Electric | 6% | 7% | 7% | 8% | 7% | 7% |
| $8,000 | $8,999 | $8,500 | Electric | 5% | 6% | 6% | 7% | 6% | 6% |
| $9,000 | $9,999 | $9,500 | Electric | 5% | 6% | 5% | 6% | 6% | 5% |
| $10,000 | $10,999 | $10,500 | Electric | 4% | 5% | 5% | 6% | 5% | 5% |
| $11,000 | $11,999 | $11,500 | Electric | 4% | 5% | 4% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $12,000 | $12,999 | $12,500 | Electric | 4% | 4% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 4% |
| $13,000 | $13,999 | $13,500 | Electric | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $14,000 | $14,999 | $14,500 | Electric | 3% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $15,000 | $15,999 | $15,500 | Electric | 3% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| $16,000 | $16,999 | $16,500 | Electric | 3% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% |
| $17,000 | $17,999 | $17,500 | Electric | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $18,000 | $18,999 | $18,500 | Electric | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $19,000 | $19,999 | $19,500 | Electric | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $20,000 | $20,999 | $20,500 | Electric | 2% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $21,000 | $21,999 | $21,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% |
| $22,000 | $22,999 | $22,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% |
| $23,000 | $23,999 | $23,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% |
| $24,000 | $24,999 | $24,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $25,000 | $25,999 | $25,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $26,000 | $26,999 | $26,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $27,000 | $27,999 | $27,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $28,000 | $28,999 | $28,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $29,000 | $29,999 | $29,500 | Electric | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $30,000 | $30,999 | $30,500 | Electric | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $31,000 | $31,999 | $31,500 | Electric | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $32,000 | $32,999 | $32,500 | Electric | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $33,000 | $33,999 | $33,500 | Electric | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $34,000 | $34,999 | $34,500 | Electric | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $35,000 | $35,999 | $35,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| $36,000 | $36,999 | $36,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| $37,000 | $37,999 | $37,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| $38,000 | $38,999 | $38,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| $39,000 | $39,999 | $39,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| $40,000 | $40,999 | $40,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $41,000 | $41,999 | $41,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $42,000 | $42,999 | $42,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $43,000 | $43,999 | $43,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $44,000 | $44,999 | $44,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $45,000 | $45,999 | $45,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $46,000 | $46,999 | $46,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $47,000 | $47,999 | $47,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $48,000 | $48,999 | $48,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $49,000 | $49,999 | $49,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $50,000 | $50,999 | $50,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $51,000 | $51,999 | $51,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $52,000 | $52,999 | $52,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $53,000 | $53,999 | $53,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $54,000 | $54,999 | $54,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $55,000 | $55,999 | $55,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $56,000 | $56,999 | $56,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $57,000 | $57,999 | $57,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $58,000 | $58,999 | $58,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $59,000 | $59,999 | $59,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $60,000 | $60,999 | $60,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $61,000 | $61,999 | $61,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $62,000 | $62,999 | $62,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $63,000 | $63,999 | $63,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $64,000 | $64,999 | $64,500 | Electric | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |  | **Average Natural Gas Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
|  | $643 | $751 | $748 | $764 | $738 | $780 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Fuel** | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **Type** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | Natural Gas | 129% | 150% | 150% | 153% | 148% | 156% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | Natural Gas | 43% | 50% | 50% | 51% | 49% | 52% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | Natural Gas | 26% | 30% | 30% | 31% | 30% | 31% |
| $3,000 | $3,999 | $3,500 | Natural Gas | 18% | 21% | 21% | 22% | 21% | 22% |
| $4,000 | $4,999 | $4,500 | Natural Gas | 14% | 17% | 17% | 17% | 16% | 17% |
| $5,000 | $5,999 | $5,500 | Natural Gas | 12% | 14% | 14% | 14% | 13% | 14% |
| $6,000 | $6,999 | $6,500 | Natural Gas | 10% | 12% | 12% | 12% | 11% | 12% |
| $7,000 | $7,999 | $7,500 | Natural Gas | 9% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% |
| $8,000 | $8,999 | $8,500 | Natural Gas | 8% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% |
| $9,000 | $9,999 | $9,500 | Natural Gas | 7% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% |
| $10,000 | $10,999 | $10,500 | Natural Gas | 6% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| $11,000 | $11,999 | $11,500 | Natural Gas | 6% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 6% | 7% |
| $12,000 | $12,999 | $12,500 | Natural Gas | 5% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| $13,000 | $13,999 | $13,500 | Natural Gas | 5% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 5% | 6% |
| $14,000 | $14,999 | $14,500 | Natural Gas | 4% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $15,000 | $15,999 | $15,500 | Natural Gas | 4% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $16,000 | $16,999 | $16,500 | Natural Gas | 4% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 5% |
| $17,000 | $17,999 | $17,500 | Natural Gas | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $18,000 | $18,999 | $18,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $19,000 | $19,999 | $19,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $20,000 | $20,999 | $20,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $21,000 | $21,999 | $21,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 4% |
| $22,000 | $22,999 | $22,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $23,000 | $23,999 | $23,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $24,000 | $24,999 | $24,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $25,000 | $25,999 | $25,500 | Natural Gas | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $26,000 | $26,999 | $26,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $27,000 | $27,999 | $27,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $28,000 | $28,999 | $28,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $29,000 | $29,999 | $29,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $30,000 | $30,999 | $30,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 3% |
| $31,000 | $31,999 | $31,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $32,000 | $32,999 | $32,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $33,000 | $33,999 | $33,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $34,000 | $34,999 | $34,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $35,000 | $35,999 | $35,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $36,000 | $36,999 | $36,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $37,000 | $37,999 | $37,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $38,000 | $38,999 | $38,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $39,000 | $39,999 | $39,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $40,000 | $40,999 | $40,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $41,000 | $41,999 | $41,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $42,000 | $42,999 | $42,500 | Natural Gas | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $43,000 | $43,999 | $43,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $44,000 | $44,999 | $44,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $45,000 | $45,999 | $45,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $46,000 | $46,999 | $46,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $47,000 | $47,999 | $47,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $48,000 | $48,999 | $48,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $49,000 | $49,999 | $49,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% |
| $50,000 | $50,999 | $50,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% |
| $51,000 | $51,999 | $51,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% |
| $52,000 | $52,999 | $52,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $53,000 | $53,999 | $53,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $54,000 | $54,999 | $54,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $55,000 | $55,999 | $55,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $56,000 | $56,999 | $56,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $57,000 | $57,999 | $57,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $58,000 | $58,999 | $58,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $59,000 | $59,999 | $59,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $60,000 | $60,999 | $60,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $61,000 | $61,999 | $61,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $62,000 | $62,999 | $62,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $63,000 | $63,999 | $63,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |
| $64,000 | $64,999 | $64,500 | Natural Gas | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |  | **Average Fuel Oil Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
|  | $1,651 | $1,611 | $1,611 | $1,611 | $1,611 | $1,611 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Fuel** | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **Type** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | Fuel Oil | 330% | 322% | 322% | 322% | 322% | 322% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | Fuel Oil | 110% | 107% | 107% | 107% | 107% | 107% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | Fuel Oil | 66% | 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% | 64% |
| $3,000 | $3,999 | $3,500 | Fuel Oil | 47% | 46% | 46% | 46% | 46% | 46% |
| $4,000 | $4,999 | $4,500 | Fuel Oil | 37% | 36% | 36% | 36% | 36% | 36% |
| $5,000 | $5,999 | $5,500 | Fuel Oil | 30% | 29% | 29% | 29% | 29% | 29% |
| $6,000 | $6,999 | $6,500 | Fuel Oil | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% | 25% |
| $7,000 | $7,999 | $7,500 | Fuel Oil | 22% | 21% | 21% | 21% | 21% | 21% |
| $8,000 | $8,999 | $8,500 | Fuel Oil | 19% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 19% | 19% |
| $9,000 | $9,999 | $9,500 | Fuel Oil | 17% | 17% | 17% | 17% | 17% | 17% |
| $10,000 | $10,999 | $10,500 | Fuel Oil | 16% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% |
| $11,000 | $11,999 | $11,500 | Fuel Oil | 14% | 14% | 14% | 14% | 14% | 14% |
| $12,000 | $12,999 | $12,500 | Fuel Oil | 13% | 13% | 13% | 13% | 13% | 13% |
| $13,000 | $13,999 | $13,500 | Fuel Oil | 12% | 12% | 12% | 12% | 12% | 12% |
| $14,000 | $14,999 | $14,500 | Fuel Oil | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% | 11% |
| $15,000 | $15,999 | $15,500 | Fuel Oil | 11% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% |
| $16,000 | $16,999 | $16,500 | Fuel Oil | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% | 10% |
| $17,000 | $17,999 | $17,500 | Fuel Oil | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% |
| $18,000 | $18,999 | $18,500 | Fuel Oil | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% | 9% |
| $19,000 | $19,999 | $19,500 | Fuel Oil | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% |
| $20,000 | $20,999 | $20,500 | Fuel Oil | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 8% |
| $21,000 | $21,999 | $21,500 | Fuel Oil | 8% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| $22,000 | $22,999 | $22,500 | Fuel Oil | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| $23,000 | $23,999 | $23,500 | Fuel Oil | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| $24,000 | $24,999 | $24,500 | Fuel Oil | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| $25,000 | $25,999 | $25,500 | Fuel Oil | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| $26,000 | $26,999 | $26,500 | Fuel Oil | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| $27,000 | $27,999 | $27,500 | Fuel Oil | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| $28,000 | $28,999 | $28,500 | Fuel Oil | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| $29,000 | $29,999 | $29,500 | Fuel Oil | 6% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $30,000 | $30,999 | $30,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $31,000 | $31,999 | $31,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $32,000 | $32,999 | $32,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $33,000 | $33,999 | $33,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $34,000 | $34,999 | $34,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $35,000 | $35,999 | $35,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $36,000 | $36,999 | $36,500 | Fuel Oil | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $37,000 | $37,999 | $37,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $38,000 | $38,999 | $38,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $39,000 | $39,999 | $39,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $40,000 | $40,999 | $40,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $41,000 | $41,999 | $41,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $42,000 | $42,999 | $42,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $43,000 | $43,999 | $43,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $44,000 | $44,999 | $44,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $45,000 | $45,999 | $45,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $46,000 | $46,999 | $46,500 | Fuel Oil | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $47,000 | $47,999 | $47,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $48,000 | $48,999 | $48,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $49,000 | $49,999 | $49,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $50,000 | $50,999 | $50,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $51,000 | $51,999 | $51,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $52,000 | $52,999 | $52,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $53,000 | $53,999 | $53,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $54,000 | $54,999 | $54,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $55,000 | $55,999 | $55,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $56,000 | $56,999 | $56,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $57,000 | $57,999 | $57,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $58,000 | $58,999 | $58,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $59,000 | $59,999 | $59,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $60,000 | $60,999 | $60,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $61,000 | $61,999 | $61,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $62,000 | $62,999 | $62,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $63,000 | $63,999 | $63,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $64,000 | $64,999 | $64,500 | Fuel Oil | 3% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | |  | **Average Other Energy Bill in 2024 for HH Size** | | | | | |
|  | $1,156 | $1,149 | $1,392 | $1,285 | $1,207 | $1,351 |
| **Income Level** | | | **Fuel** | **Household Size** | | | | | |
| **Minimum** | **Maximum** | **Median Income** | **Type** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6+** |
| $0 | $999 | $500 | Other | 231% | 230% | 278% | 257% | 241% | 270% |
| $1,000 | $1,999 | $1,500 | Other | 77% | 77% | 93% | 86% | 80% | 90% |
| $2,000 | $2,999 | $2,500 | Other | 46% | 46% | 56% | 51% | 48% | 54% |
| $3,000 | $3,999 | $3,500 | Other | 33% | 33% | 40% | 37% | 34% | 39% |
| $4,000 | $4,999 | $4,500 | Other | 26% | 26% | 31% | 29% | 27% | 30% |
| $5,000 | $5,999 | $5,500 | Other | 21% | 21% | 25% | 23% | 22% | 25% |
| $6,000 | $6,999 | $6,500 | Other | 18% | 18% | 21% | 20% | 19% | 21% |
| $7,000 | $7,999 | $7,500 | Other | 15% | 15% | 19% | 17% | 16% | 18% |
| $8,000 | $8,999 | $8,500 | Other | 14% | 14% | 16% | 15% | 14% | 16% |
| $9,000 | $9,999 | $9,500 | Other | 12% | 12% | 15% | 14% | 13% | 14% |
| $10,000 | $10,999 | $10,500 | Other | 11% | 11% | 13% | 12% | 11% | 13% |
| $11,000 | $11,999 | $11,500 | Other | 10% | 10% | 12% | 11% | 10% | 12% |
| $12,000 | $12,999 | $12,500 | Other | 9% | 9% | 11% | 10% | 10% | 11% |
| $13,000 | $13,999 | $13,500 | Other | 9% | 9% | 10% | 10% | 9% | 10% |
| $14,000 | $14,999 | $14,500 | Other | 8% | 8% | 10% | 9% | 8% | 9% |
| $15,000 | $15,999 | $15,500 | Other | 7% | 7% | 9% | 8% | 8% | 9% |
| $16,000 | $16,999 | $16,500 | Other | 7% | 7% | 8% | 8% | 7% | 8% |
| $17,000 | $17,999 | $17,500 | Other | 7% | 7% | 8% | 7% | 7% | 8% |
| $18,000 | $18,999 | $18,500 | Other | 6% | 6% | 8% | 7% | 7% | 7% |
| $19,000 | $19,999 | $19,500 | Other | 6% | 6% | 7% | 7% | 6% | 7% |
| $20,000 | $20,999 | $20,500 | Other | 6% | 6% | 7% | 6% | 6% | 7% |
| $21,000 | $21,999 | $21,500 | Other | 5% | 5% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 6% |
| $22,000 | $22,999 | $22,500 | Other | 5% | 5% | 6% | 6% | 5% | 6% |
| $23,000 | $23,999 | $23,500 | Other | 5% | 5% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 6% |
| $24,000 | $24,999 | $24,500 | Other | 5% | 5% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 6% |
| $25,000 | $25,999 | $25,500 | Other | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $26,000 | $26,999 | $26,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 5% |
| $27,000 | $27,999 | $27,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 5% |
| $28,000 | $28,999 | $28,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 5% |
| $29,000 | $29,999 | $29,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 5% |
| $30,000 | $30,999 | $30,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $31,000 | $31,999 | $31,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $32,000 | $32,999 | $32,500 | Other | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $33,000 | $33,999 | $33,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% |
| $34,000 | $34,999 | $34,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 4% |
| $35,000 | $35,999 | $35,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 4% |
| $36,000 | $36,999 | $36,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 4% |
| $37,000 | $37,999 | $37,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 4% |
| $38,000 | $38,999 | $38,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 4% |
| $39,000 | $39,999 | $39,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $40,000 | $40,999 | $40,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $41,000 | $41,999 | $41,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $42,000 | $42,999 | $42,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $43,000 | $43,999 | $43,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $44,000 | $44,999 | $44,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $45,000 | $45,999 | $45,500 | Other | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $46,000 | $46,999 | $46,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $47,000 | $47,999 | $47,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% |
| $48,000 | $48,999 | $48,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 3% |
| $49,000 | $49,999 | $49,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 3% |
| $50,000 | $50,999 | $50,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 3% |
| $51,000 | $51,999 | $51,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 3% |
| $52,000 | $52,999 | $52,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 3% |
| $53,000 | $53,999 | $53,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 3% |
| $54,000 | $54,999 | $54,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $55,000 | $55,999 | $55,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $56,000 | $56,999 | $56,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $57,000 | $57,999 | $57,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $58,000 | $58,999 | $58,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $59,000 | $59,999 | $59,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $60,000 | $60,999 | $60,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $61,000 | $61,999 | $61,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $62,000 | $62,999 | $62,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $63,000 | $63,999 | $63,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |
| $64,000 | $64,999 | $64,500 | Other | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% |

Table 4 – Proportion of heating cost met by the program for each household size and fuel type under Alternative 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **HH Size** | **Source** | **#Beneficiaries** | **Avg. heating cost for HH size X fuel type in 2024** | **Avg. Assistance per HH** | **% Need Met** |
| **< 100% FPL** | **1** | **Electricity** | 35,134 | $452 | $242 | 53% |
| **Natural gas** | 33,536 | $643 | $401 | 62% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 6,870 | $1,651 | $1,651 | 100% |
| **Other** | 7,516 | $1,156 | $1,012 | 88% |
| **2** | **Electricity** | 16,442 | $528 | $242 | 46% |
| **Natural gas** | 16,198 | $751 | $424 | 57% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 3,072 | $1,611 | $1,391 | 86% |
| **Other** | 3,480 | $1,149 | $862 | 75% |
| **3** | **Electricity** | 8,056 | $501 | $198 | 40% |
| **Natural gas** | 8,301 | $748 | $340 | 45% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 1,394 | $1,611 | $1,266 | 79% |
| **Other** | 1,676 | $1,392 | $1,044 | 75% |
| **4** | **Electricity** | 6,395 | $597 | $223 | 37% |
| **Natural gas** | 6,740 | $764 | $314 | 41% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 1,054 | $1,611 | $1,143 | 71% |
| **Other** | 1,322 | $1,285 | $761 | 59% |
| **5** | **Electricity** | 4,100 | $527 | $180 | 34% |
| **Natural gas** | 4,442 | $738 | $270 | 37% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 641 | $1,611 | $1,009 | 63% |
| **Other** | 712 | $1,207 | $596 | 49% |
| **6+** | **Electricity** | 2,919 | $518 | $164 | 32% |
| **Natural gas** | 3,156 | $780 | $272 | 35% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 455 | $1,611 | $888 | 55% |
| **Other** | 501 | $1,351 | $655 | 49% |
| **100-125% FPL** | **1** | **Electricity** | 6,293 | $452 | $100 | 22% |
| **Natural gas** | 7,140 | $643 | $100 | 16% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 971 | $1,651 | $1,032 | 63% |
| **Other** | 1,240 | $1,156 | $578 | 50% |
| **2** | **Electricity** | 3,850 | $528 | $100 | 19% |
| **Natural gas** | 4,465 | $751 | $100 | 13% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 479 | $1,611 | $806 | 50% |
| **Other** | 757 | $1,149 | $179 | 16% |
| **3** | **Electricity** | 1,358 | $501 | $100 | 20% |
| **Natural gas** | 1,585 | $748 | $100 | 13% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 169 | $1,611 | $503 | 31% |
| **Other** | 267 | $1,392 | $100 | 7% |
| **4** | **Electricity** | 686 | $597 | $100 | 17% |
| **Natural gas** | 795 | $764 | $100 | 13% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 86 | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **Other** | 134 | $1,285 | $100 | 8% |
| **5** | **Electricity** | 452 | $527 | $100 | 19% |
| **Natural gas** | 529 | $738 | $100 | 14% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 57 | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **Other** | 69 | $1,207 | $100 | 8% |
| **6+** | **Electricity** | 270 | $518 | $100 | 19% |
| **Natural gas** | 319 | $780 | $100 | 13% |
| **Fuel Oil** | 35 | $1,611 | $100 | 6% |
| **Other** | 42 | $1,351 | $100 | 7% |