

April 30, 2014

Ms. Kirsten Walli
Board Secretary
Ontario Energy Board
2300 Yonge Street, 27th Floor
Toronto, ON M4P 1E4

Dear Ms. Walli:

RE: EB-2008-0150 - Reporting on Winter Warmth for 2013

In the February 4, 2011 letter, the Ontario Energy Board (the “Board”) requested the following:

“The Board understands that Enbridge and Union receive a final report each year from their respective United Way agency that provides summary statistics on the delivery of the Winter Warmth program. The information contained in these reports is similar to that set out in Attachment A to this letter. As such, the Board currently considers that the filing of these final reports will be adequate for the purpose of enabling the Board to evaluate the provision of emergency financial assistance to natural gas consumers.”

In the December 21, 2011 letter, the Board requested the following,

“The Board is adding a reporting requirement under which a natural gas distributor must identify the month in which the distributor’s Winter Warmth and/or LEAP funding was depleted. This information will enable the Board to assess, and compare across distributors, the length of time that Winter Warmth and LEAP funding has been available to assist low-income customers.

Given that Union is now offering its Winter Warmth program on an annual basis, its report should be filed on an annual basis and cover the entirety of the preceding calendar year. The information to be filed annually by Union is set out in Attachment A to this letter.”

In the August 30, 2012 letter, the Board supported the annual deadline for natural gas distributors of March 30 should be amended to April 30 to coincide with the filing deadline for electricity distributors.

Attached are the Union Gas Winter Warmth 2013 Year End Report and Summary Sheet prepared by the United Way of Chatham-Kent. In response to the questions asked in Attachment A to the December 21, 2011 letter from the Board, funding for the Winter Warmth Program comes exclusively from the late-payment class action settlement. All Union funds are held by the trustee for that settlement, United Way of Chatham-Kent. No other funds from non-distributor



uniongas

A Spectra Energy Company

CELEBRATING
100 YEARS
Est. 1911

sources (i.e. donations) contributed to the Winter Warmth program. For 2013 year the Winter Warmth funds were not depleted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 519-436-5476

Sincerely,

[original signed by]

Chris Ripley
Manager, Regulatory Applications

c.c: United Way of Chatham-Kent



Union Gas Winter Warmth

2013 Year End Report

Prepared by: United Way Chatham-Kent



Sponsored by



2014 APRIL 11



Table of Contents

Summary.....	1
Section A: <i>Grant Disbursements</i>	2
Section B: <i>Household Composition</i>	3
Section C: <i>Funding Impact</i>	4
Section D: <i>Staffing</i>	5
Section E: <i>Reasons for Rejected Applications</i>	7
Section F: <i>Referral Source</i>	7
Section G: <i>Challenges/Recommendations/Comments</i>	9
Accomplishments	9

Summary

Union Gas Winter Warmth became a year round program in 2010-2011, in order to align with LEAP (Low-Income Energy Assistance Program), as mandated by the Ontario Energy Board (OEB), and to fulfill the increased needs of low-income energy users in these difficult economic times. The Union Gas Winter Warmth Program is coordinated by a network of social service agencies through United Ways in 28 Union Gas catchment areas.

Winter Warmth is designed for low-income households who are experiencing temporary setbacks and have exhausted all other appropriate means of financial support. The Winter Warmth program is an important part of the community and the participating social service agencies (Intake Agencies) serve as the place where families can go for assistance.

Winter Warmth is a blessing for many customers who face a crisis or life-changing event that, in turn, creates a backload of debts, including their heating bill. It is anticipated that households receiving the grants become more financially stable and are better prepared to manage ensuing utility bills. In addition to the monetary portion of assistance, the clients are provided with the necessary referrals and information about existing programs/services available in the community and energy conservation tools and techniques through Union Gas' Energy Savings Programs.

The Union Gas Winter Warmth program helps families who have already exhausted all of their available resources and have nowhere else to turn. More specifically, Winter Warmth is able to help families stay together under one roof, lessen the impact of financial strain and help clients maintain a good credit rating without going into arrears.

In 2010-2011 the maximum individual Winter Warmth grant was increased from \$450 to \$500, in attempt to keep pace with other utility relief programs, and to assist as many households as possible, as much as possible. These funds are not allocated for security deposits and connection fees. Care is taken to ensure that all clients are able to sustain payments post-grant and that the specific guidelines of the program are adhered to.

The following tables will show a year over year comparison (2013 vs. 2012), in order to demonstrate the impact that the Union Gas Winter Warmth Program has had on the 28 participating communities/municipalities.

Section A: Total Grants

The following table contains a comparison of grants disbursed in the Winter Warmth 2012 vs. 2013 heating seasons.

⇒ Please refer to the end of each Section for the Table of Definitions

Table 1: Total Grants

Year	Budget (\$)	Less Admin (\$)	Total WW (\$)	Pay-out (\$)	Remaining (\$)
Jan.01 – Dec. 31, 2013	\$1,009,079.01	\$137,266.83	\$871,812.18	\$788,309.16	\$83,503.02
Jan. 01 – Dec. 31, 2012	\$891,487.59	\$125,901.12	\$765,586.47	\$696,694.77	\$68,891.71

Approximately \$120,000 in additional funds were allocated to the Union Gas Winter Warmth Program in 2013. Over \$100,000 more in grants were allocated to people in need of assistance. We had an early and very cold winter in 2013 and people continued to struggle to make ends meet. One intake agency commented that they have never seen the request for services as high as they have been in 2013.

* Note - Haldimand Norfolk and Quinte reported in 2013 that their left over funds were more than what was reported in 2012. This is due to funds that were allocated in 2012, but not received by the Intake Agency until 2013.

Table of definitions

Budget	Total funds received from the funder for one heating season (current allocation plus funds left over from previous year)
Less Admin	Funds appropriated by each Intake Agency to cover admin costs; up to allowable 15% taken from total budget
Total WW	Funds available to assist clients - budget minus admin fee
Pay-out	Total funds spent on grants
Remaining	Funds that remain after the total Pay-out is deducted from the Total WW

Section B: Household Composition

The following tables describe the total number of households assisted along with the number of individuals (adults and children) within the households.

Table 2: Household Composition

	Total Number of Households Assisted	Total Number of Adults Assisted	Total Number of Children Assisted
2013	2,096	3,054	2,888
2012	1,928	2,883	2,697

Over 150 more households were assisted through the Union Gas Winter Warmth Program in 2013. 170 more adults with close to 200 more children came to local agencies to access the low-income energy assistance program.

Table of definitions

- Total Number of Households Assisted** Total number of individual households assisted with WW grants
- Total Number of Adults Assisted** Total number of adults within total assisted households
- Total Number of Children Assisted** Total number of children within total assisted households

Section C: Funding Impact

The following tables show the household size and net income in relationship to the amount of utility's arrears.

Table 3: Funding Impact

Year	Average # of Individuals per Household (Adults & Children)	Average Monthly Household Net Income (\$)	Average Arrears Amount (\$)	Average Grant Amount (\$)
2013	3	\$1,728.03	\$525.81	\$376.10
2012	3	\$1,731.63	\$489.75	\$361.36

The average size of the household has not changed dramatically year over year (the number is rounded off). The average income has also remained relatively flat. However, the average arrears have increased, as has the average grant amount. One can conclude that low-income families continue to be challenged to keep pace with increasing household costs.

Table of Definitions

Average # of Individuals per Household

Total number of assisted individuals (adults and children) divided by the total number of assisted households (rounded to the nearest digit)

Average Monthly Household Net Income

Total monthly *net income* of assisted households divided by the total number of assisted households

Average Arrears Amount

Total amount of arrears divided by the total number of assisted households

Average Grant Amount

Total grant amount paid to the assisted households divided by the number of assisted households

Section D: Staffing

The following table provides information on human resources required to carry out the WW program. It also contains information on total number of inquiries as well as applications that were not granted and the number of hours spent on the program.

Table 4: Staffing

Year	Total Number of Inquiries	Total Number of Staff	Total Number of Hours	Total Number of Rejected /Referred Applications
2013	4,415	58	5,911	2,319
2012	5,450	54	6,279	3,509

In 2013, our 28 participating communities' Intake Agencies received over 1,000 fewer inquiries. This is rather surprising, given the increased dollars requested and the apparent caseload of the agencies. Staffing was increased in some communities to manage the workload, although the hours spent seem to have decreased somewhat as well (368 less in 2013).

Despite the lower number of clients inquiring about the Winter Warmth Program, more families were assisted in 2013 than 2012 (see Section B), and fewer families were turned away or referred to other agencies. This may be due to a better understanding of the program, by prior internet searches or, as is noted below, word of mouth conversations were able to better inform about the program. And, if the first point of contact was an agency such as ODSP or Ontario Works, they may have been able to assist immediately (despite their more recent funding constraints) rather than refer to the Winter Warmth Program. Of course these are conjecture; one can only guess at this point, the actual reasons for the variance in the above data.

*Note – for 2012 the number of clients not assisted does not balance with the number of requests minus number of clients assisted. As reported in the 2012 Year-end Report, this is likely due to reporting error – initially a client may be approved for funding, this was reported in the statistics, and then perhaps they did not actually follow through; numbers may have been miscounted, etc. Many of these organizations are very small and are not well resourced. Report writing is not necessarily a strong suit. This discrepancy has been addressed for 2013, whereby a formula was inserted to do the calculations automatically for the Intake Agency.



Table of definitions

Total Number of Inquiries

Total number of inquiries that participating WW agency received from the public

Total Number of Staff

Total number of staff involved in work on WW (on part-time or full-time basis)

Total Number of Hours

Total number of staff hours spent on WW (answering inquiries, assessment and referral, application process, approval, follow-up)

Total Number of Rejected Applications

Total number of rejected applications through prescreening and application process

Section E: Reasons for Rejected/Referred Applications

The following are reasons, as identified by the 28 participating communities/municipalities, why client applications were turned down or referred to other agencies, for the 2013 program. These differ little from previous years:

- Applicant's household income exceeded income eligibility criteria
- Applicant failed to follow through on application process
- Applicant was unable to prove sustainability – housing costs too high to manage on an ongoing basis
- Documentation failed to verify information given by the applicant
- Bill was not in applicant's name/applicant owed from other addresses/applicant moved and did not pay debt
- Applicant was not an existing Union Gas customer
- Arrears was from another community
- Applicant was unable to make payment arrangements for the balance owing above the \$500 maximum grant
- Applicant resided outside the catchment area
- Could not assist because of the involvement of an energy retailer
- Applicant received assistance from OW (CHPI) or ODSP or other source of funds (family, friend)
- Applicant already qualified once this year
- Applicant had no income to continue to pay bills
- Applicant was not in arrears
- Amount owing was entirely deposit and reconnection fees
- Applicant requested deposit reversal to pay arrears

Section G: Referral Source

The following information captures the data on applicants' referral sources for the 2013 program. The sources differ very little from previous years. However, in 2013 Social Service agencies seem to provide the greatest number of referrals (although roughly the same number as in 2012). Utility referrals are significantly down (from 912 to 418) and word of mouth referrals are up (475 to 577) from 2012.

Of note as well, is that the "other" category has more than doubled over 2012, from 132 to 310. This category includes people having accessed the program in previous years. One might surmise, knowing that the provincial economy has not rebounded significantly, many people are still experiencing financial challenges and need to continue to access various supports. They may be barely sustainable for the year, thus qualifying for the program, but one small challenge in their lives can be sufficient to put them back into crisis mode.

Intake agencies and their partners need to be able to enhance supports to their clients, in order to be able to provide ongoing coping strategies, such as encouraging equal billing and energy conservation approaches, in order to ensure long term sustainability.

Seniors on a fixed income, as well as those on ODSP, have little flexibility in their monthly budget when costs increase or they experience unexpected bills. Some of our communities are seeing increased numbers within this demographic who require services.

Utility referral (25 communities) – 418 referrals
Word of mouth (23) – 577 referrals
Social service agency (25) - 601 referrals
Newspaper (4) – 27 referrals
Utility website (5) – 15 referrals
Poster (2) – 12 referrals
Billing inserts (4) – 42 referrals
Radio (5) – 37 referrals
TV (3) – 9 referral
Other (18) – 310 referrals - have accessed the program previously, internet search

Section F: Challenges/Recommendations/Comments

- Oakville reported that they had a lady come who was supporting her disabled son & mother and she did not qualify. They were able to help her with a benevolent fund that they have. They would like the decision makers to consider exempting government income that covers medical supplies from the income. This family receives money to pay for hospice support for the son and medical supplies for the mother and this amount put her over the allowable limit.

Funding

- In December 2012, 40 % of the total requested funding (\$1,031,375.00) was initially allocated to all communities for the 2013 Program, totaling \$412,550. Allocations were made at this level, rather than 50% that was allocated in 2012, in order to manage the timelines for investments coming due and funds available in the trust account at the time.
- There were many calls for additional funding – a total of eleven additional allocations were made, totaling \$524,100, over the course of the twelve months of the 2013 program.
- In September, 2013, when funds were running low, and the next investment did not mature until late October, a request was made of several agencies that appeared to have a surplus of funds to return a portion of their funds for re-allocation. Only one community – Thunder Bay – felt that they were in a position to do so. The communities that received the request were identified by “best guess” calculations/projections, based on the average of the previous nine months’ uptake. Thunder Bay was able to return \$5,000 and still had \$2,527.52 left over at the end of the year.
- Approximately \$420,000 was deposited into the trust account at the end of October; not only to provide funding to the end of 2013, but also to provide beginning funds for 2014. An additional \$70,000 was allocated for the 2013 program, from these funds, between October 28 and December 31.
- Once again, only one agency (Huron County) declined to avail themselves of the allowable 15% administrative funding in 2013.
- United Way Chatham-Kent has had several conversations with their Union Gas partners and, together, we have projected that Union Gas Winter Warmth settlement funds will be depleted in 2015.

Accomplishments

The Winter Warmth Program provides an extremely valuable form of assistance to many low-income households which face the prospect of living without heat. United Ways and social service agencies, in collaboration with Union Gas Ltd., help individuals and families maintain their housing and enhance their support network when many families are confronted with challenges such as job loss, family breakdown, illness, injuries or even death. Given an

ongoing difficult economic situation, this program continues to help to stabilize the life situations of low-income families who are confronted with short-term financial difficulties. Below are several “testimonials” and stories from agencies that are administering the Union Gas Winter Warmth Program and people who have lived-experience.

Burlington:

We were able to assist a single mom who is trying to start her own in home day-care. Without the help of Winter Warmth not only would she not have had heat for herself and her children but she also would have had to stop her day-care just as she was starting to build up clientele. Having just seen her recently outside of our office at a social event she is doing much better and the day-care is beginning to thrive!

Greater Simcoe County:

I have a client that has used the program for the past two years. She doesn't use the full grant, usually under \$200.00. This Union Gas client has a full time job and works very hard. She needs to take one day off a week due to her illness, which puts her behind in her gas bill. I have done her Winter Warmth application two years in a row; she is a very sweet woman, kind, hard working. She is trying to get on ODSP, but until then, she works hard and just needs a little help for her gas bill after the long winter.

Hamilton:

“I can't tell you how much this helps me...thank you. When my child got sick and I had to reduce my hours at work, I didn't know what I was going to do to pay my bills. I didn't even know this kind of help existed!”

“This is a real relief. I wasn't able to keep on top of things when I was going through chemotherapy. When I am able, I want to give back in some way. Thank you”

Oakville:

We had a family this year come in who were very embarrassed that they had to ask for help. The mum was on maternity leave and the dad was working two jobs to try and meet their financial commitments. We were able to assist them and they then asked us if we needed any help at our centre so they could return our kindness. The couple came back the following week and installed a shelf for us.

St. Thomas:

St. Thomas/Elgin County residents have been struggling with high unemployment rates and the Winter Warmth Program has alleviated some of the financial burden these families face.

In one particular circumstance, both parents had lost their jobs and were looking to downsize. "This grant has allowed our family to relocate without the worry of an outstanding debt. Thank you so much!"

Sudbury:

It is enlightening to see how the Winter Warmth program creates a positive impact in our clients' lives. Not only does this assistance prevent a disconnection but it offers our clients a temporary solution when faced with multiple financial demands. One client stated: "Either I get my teeth fixed (by a surgeon in Toronto) or I heat my home ... It's to the point where the pain is preventing me from eating." This program has allowed our clients to address numerous issues all at once. Finally, he added "Now I can focus on my well-being and I'm able to start fresh next month."

Thunder Bay:

The Lakehead Social Planning Council had a client who fell behind with her Union Gas account due to a recent cancer diagnosis. Between the weekly chemo and treatment costs, she just couldn't keep up with "real life", as she put it, but was worried because she is a single parent and couldn't risk having her gas disconnected with two young children at home. Because she was able to access the Winter Warmth Program and have her utility arrears taken care of, she could focus on (again, as she put it) "kicking cancer's butt and being around for her kids."

2013 Union Gas Winter Warmth Program MASTER

Agencies	Total 2013 Funding (left over + allocation)	Left Over from 2012	2013 Request	2013 First Allocation of 40% of Request 2012 DEC 10	Admin Fee Allowed on 2013 Allocation	Total (new) Grants for 2013 Season	Total Funds Available for WW Grants	Total Pay-out	Dollars Remaining
Quinte (Hastings Cty. - Belleville and Area)	\$ 51,040.07	\$ 13,040.07	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 4,633.06	\$ 38,000.00	\$ 46,407.01	\$ 36,398.82	\$ 10,008.19
Leeds and Grenville (Brockville and Area)	\$ 14,769.87	\$ 969.87	\$ 9,500.00	\$ 3,800.00	\$ 2,215.48	\$ 13,800.00	\$ 12,554.39	\$ 11,785.91	\$ 768.48
Brant	\$ 57,457.74	\$ 3,457.74	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 8,100.00	\$ 54,000.00	\$ 49,357.74	\$ 43,262.09	\$ 6,095.65
Bruce Grey	\$ 66,148.61	\$ 648.61	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 9,922.29	\$ 65,500.00	\$ 56,226.32	\$ 47,689.73	\$ 8,536.59
Burlington	\$ 17,980.01	\$ 2,280.01	\$ 17,500.00	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 1,177.50	\$ 15,700.00	\$ 16,802.51	\$ 15,163.81	\$ 1,638.70
Greater Hamilton	\$ 115,737.91	\$ 1,737.91	\$ 87,500.00	\$ 35,000.00	\$ 17,360.69	\$ 114,000.00	\$ 98,377.22	\$ 86,361.82	\$ 12,015.40
Waterloo Region (Cambridge & North Dumfries/Kitchener)	\$ 49,633.11	\$ 1,633.11	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 48,000.00	\$ 42,433.11	\$ 39,159.61	\$ 3,273.50
Chatham-Kent	\$ 49,061.72	\$ 61.72	\$ 60,000.00	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 7,350.00	\$ 49,000.00	\$ 41,711.72	\$ 39,351.98	\$ 2,359.74
Guelph and Wellington	\$ 10,839.28	\$ 5,439.28	\$ 13,500.00	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 1,625.89	\$ 5,400.00	\$ 9,213.39	\$ 6,216.56	\$ 2,996.83
Haldimand-Norfolk	\$ 21,142.21	\$ 5,142.21	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 3,150.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 17,992.21	\$ 17,316.42	\$ 675.79
Halton Hills	\$ 6,804.12	\$ 4.12	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 2,800.00	\$ 1,020.62	\$ 6,800.00	\$ 5,783.50	\$ 4,356.20	\$ 1,427.30
Huron County	\$ 16,000.00	\$ -	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ -	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 12,340.16	\$ 3,659.84
Perth County	\$ 8,292.77	\$ 2,292.77	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 900.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 7,392.77	\$ 7,392.77	\$ -
Kingston	\$ 11,643.58	\$ 4,643.58	\$ 15,000.00	\$ 6,000.00	\$ 1,746.54	\$ 7,000.00	\$ 9,897.04	\$ 8,405.26	\$ 1,491.78
London & Middlesex	\$ 80,000.00	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 80,000.00	\$ 68,000.00	\$ 68,273.39	\$ (273.39)
Milton	\$ 15,466.46	\$ 1,966.46	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 3,200.00	\$ 2,025.00	\$ 13,500.00	\$ 13,441.46	\$ 12,094.62	\$ 1,346.84
Northumberland	\$ 17,483.93	\$ 7,483.93	\$ 25,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,622.59	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 14,861.34	\$ 14,342.56	\$ 518.78
Greater Simcoe County	\$ 20,039.90	\$ 6,039.90	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 2,100.00	\$ 14,000.00	\$ 17,939.90	\$ 15,561.03	\$ 2,378.87
Oakville	\$ 21,491.52	\$ 991.52	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 6,400.00	\$ 3,223.73	\$ 20,500.00	\$ 18,267.79	\$ 15,710.01	\$ 2,557.78
Oxford	\$ 33,136.13	\$ 1,136.13	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 4,800.00	\$ 32,000.00	\$ 28,336.13	\$ 25,266.76	\$ 3,069.37
Sarnia-Lambton	\$ 48,107.90	\$ 1,107.90	\$ 50,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 2,970.24	\$ 47,000.00	\$ 45,137.66	\$ 43,539.80	\$ 1,597.86
Sault Ste. Marie	\$ 20,000.00	\$ -	\$ 30,000.00	\$ 12,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 17,000.00	\$ 16,993.89	\$ 6.11
Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry (Cornwall & St. Thomas)	\$ 12,647.44	\$ 2,647.44	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 11,147.44	\$ 6,336.73	\$ 4,810.71
St. Thomas	\$ 16,896.71	\$ 896.71	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 2,534.51	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 14,362.20	\$ 10,410.83	\$ 3,951.37
Sudbury & District	\$ 22,861.12	\$ 2,361.12	\$ 18,000.00	\$ 7,200.00	\$ 3,429.17	\$ 20,500.00	\$ 19,431.95	\$ 16,225.26	\$ 3,206.69
Thunder Bay	\$ 31,212.61	\$ 5,212.61	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 16,000.00	\$ 4,681.89	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 26,530.72	\$ 24,003.20	\$ 2,527.52
Cochrane-Timiskaming (Timmins)	\$ 24,434.29	\$ 6,234.29	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 8,000.00	\$ 3,665.14	\$ 18,200.00	\$ 20,769.15	\$ 17,912.44	\$ 2,856.71
Windsor-Essex County	\$ 148,750.00	\$ -	\$ 134,375.00	\$ 53,750.00	\$ 22,312.50	\$ 148,750.00	\$ 126,437.50	\$ 126,437.50	\$ -
Total	\$ 1,009,079.01	\$ 77,429.01	\$ 1,031,375.00	\$ 412,550.00	\$ 137,266.83	\$ 931,650.00	\$ 871,812.18	\$ 788,309.16	\$ 83,503.02

2013 Union Gas MASTER

Agencies	Total # of Households Assisted	Average Pay-out per Client	Number of Adults	Number of Children	Average Net Income	Average Arrears Amount	Number of Inquiries	Total # of Households Not Assisted or Referred	Total Number of Staff	Total Number of Hours	Notes
Quinte (Hastings Cty. - Belleville and Area)	82	\$ 443.89	128	123	\$ 1,698.09	\$ 650.45	83	1	6	83	
Leeds and Grenville (Brockville and Area)	27	\$ 436.52	39	30	\$ 2,042.36	\$ 706.00	38	11	2	38	
Brant	111	\$ 389.75	160	152	\$ 1,895.92	\$ 485.75	122	11	3	119	
Bruce Grey	118	\$ 404.15	169	137	\$ 1,336.50	\$ 537.50	130	12	1	236	
Burlington	39	\$ 388.82	55	65	\$ 1,852.75	\$ 386.25	57	18	1	56	
Greater Hamilton	234	\$ 369.07	333	348	\$ 1,842.00	\$ 467.58	417	183	7	370	
Waterloo Region (Cambridge & North Dumfries/Kitch	93	\$ 421.07	119	126	\$ 1,426.92	\$ 541.17	98	5	2	93	
Chatham-Kent	118	\$ 333.49	163	150	\$ 1,162.92	\$ 406.00	206	88	1	230	
Guelph and Wellington	14	\$ 444.04	20	30	\$ 1,600.29	\$ 526.14	14	0	1	21	
Haldimand-Norfolk	46	\$ 376.44	68	51	\$ 1,453.73	\$ 645.64	67	21	1	67	
Halton Hills	9	\$ 484.02	11	13	\$ 1,674.00	\$ 629.00	9	0	1	13	
Huron County	33	\$ 373.94	42	47	\$ 1,327.80	\$ 435.00	33	0	2	33	
Perth County	22	\$ 336.04	31	24	\$ 1,619.09	\$ 499.73	52	30	1	60	
Kingston	26	\$ 323.28	44	23	\$ 1,853.60	\$ 423.10	31	5	3	33	
London & Middlesex	223	\$ 306.16	327	407	\$ 1,693.00	\$ 372.17	1,720	1,497	3	2,880	number of hours has been tracked for total in energy relief programs, not just Winter Warmth.
Milton	26	\$ 465.18	42	44	\$ 1,739.50	\$ 558.25	31	5	2	14	
Northumberland	36	\$ 398.40	48	46	\$ 1,633.91	\$ 569.73	48	12	2	86	
Greater Simcoe County	37	\$ 420.57	67	61	\$ 2,077.36	\$ 574.27	40	3	4	24	
Oakville	50	\$ 314.20	71	69	\$ 1,965.00	\$ 408.92	148	98	1	192	
Oxford	70	\$ 360.95	91	72	\$ 1,546.00	\$ 359.73	77	7	1	240	
Sarnia-Lambton	107	\$ 406.91	150	133	\$ 1,453.25	\$ 501.58	199	92	2	205	
Sault Ste. Marie	40	\$ 424.85	60	40	\$ 1,875.18	\$ 561.91	66	26	2	40	
Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry (Cornwall &	16	\$ 396.05	25	21	\$ 2,272.20	\$ 539.80	27	11	1	25	
St. Thomas	26	\$ 400.42	41	25	\$ 1,902.78	\$ 540.56	59	33	1	137	
Sudbury & District	35	\$ 463.58	49	43	\$ 1,873.40	\$ 812.20	56	21	2	115	
Thunder Bay	62	\$ 387.15	85	83	\$ 1,889.75	\$ 472.67	147	85	1	48	
Cochrane-Timiskaming (Timmins)	39	\$ 459.29	59	53	\$ 1,751.64	\$ 666.27	62	23	1	36	
Windsor-Essex County	357	\$ 354.17	557	472	\$ 1,926.00	\$ 445.38	378	21	12	417	
Total	2,096	\$ 376.10	3,054	2,888	\$ 1,728.03	\$ 525.81	4,415	2,319	58	5,911	