

The Crux of the Rate Case Matter:

Ratepayer & Community Intervenor

Finger Lakes, NY

**Ratepayer and Community Intervenor, Joint Senate Panel on PSC,
Written Testimony prepared for 9-30-2025 Joint Hearing of the
NYS Senate Standing Committee on Corporations, Authorities and
Commissions and the
NYS Senate Standing Committee on Energy and
Telecommunications**

**Carol Chock, President
Ratepayer and Community Intervenor
Finger Lakes, NY**

My expertise:

I have been a registered participant in four rate cases and several additional matters in front of the Public Service Commission since 2012, at first while I was an elected official on the Tompkins County Legislature. I retired after ten years there. I am president of a regional membership organization formed 12 years ago specifically to impact electric and gas utility matters. Ratepayer and Community Intervenor (RCI)'. RCI is a coalition formed specifically to represent local elected and appointed officials, local and regional organizations, small businesses, scientists, farmers and residents affected by energy decisions in the geographically spread-out, upstate NYSEG and RG&E service areas.

The current NYSEG-RGE rate case, being conducted right now, is RCI's fourth, plus we've been stakeholders in other related energy matters in the administrative and policy-setting arenas.

My experience in front of this joint panel is as a member and representative of one of the smaller, low-budget stakeholders that has, nevertheless, been able to make an impact in a rate case. (See, in particular, Appendix M: Gas Matters, of the NYSEG Joint Proposal in Case 19-G-0379 *et al.* Of 2019 establishing a ten-ground breaking program

including the Lansing NPA and a variety of incentives for businesses, economic development and residents to install heat pumps..)

The “Cool Kids” Slur: In the immediate prior NYSEG-RGE Rate Case of 2022, I personally and RCI as an organization found ourselves numbered among the stakeholders whose participation and testimony were not taken seriously by either the companies or the DPS staff. Others will testify on another of this joint hearing’s panels with further detail about the many ways the companies and state failed quite a few stakeholders in the prior two NYSEG-RGE rate case process. It culminated with the DPS staff making blatantly apparent exactly what its attitude was towards those organizations trying to represent everyday and low income ratepayers and also those working to achieve the transition to the more renewable future that is now NYS Law. Their public, official case response literally disparaged our advocacy and participation on behalf of RCI’s NYS municipal government representatives, residents and small businesses as merely being just the work of some “Cool Kids.” I don’t know exactly what that means and the DPS afterwards replaced that Response in the NYSEG-RGE Rate Case 22-E-0317 et al. with another version, explaining they had mistakenly posted an earlier “draft.” However, I have tried to dress the part for this hearing today in snazzy clothes as I proudly claim my role as a “Cool Kid”.

The issue isn’t the cultural slur. I’m a big girl. Call me anything you want, but negotiate with me in good faith and start paying more than lip service to concerns of stakeholders who take your needs for safety, reliability, and a gradual enough transition for your business to continue making a fair profit and OUR state staff to train and develop their capacity to handle the newer technologies, laws and energy goals.

There have been some players along the way asking the companies to shut off the gas switch tomorrow. That isn’t the position of any of us who’ve stuck with this cumbersome process through several cases, looking to start

transitioning off fossil fuel with years to achieve it, on a time frame to address the accelerating costs due to storm damage and public health expenses and that doesn't further jeopardize public health by leaving old lines to leak or worse, corrode and explode near the homes and workplaces of ratepayers who reside in the service area. .

(HEAT PUMP TECHNOLOGY: I have added this note early in my testimony to correct an error introduced into the hearing record just a few hours ago regarding the ability of current heat pump technology to continue providing heat at New York State's extremely cold temperatures: Tompkins County, where I live, experiences winter temperatures regularly going down below Zero degrees F. **It is a FACT that homes and small businesses in Tompkins County, with winter temperatures (and that I think might even have an average winter temperature that is routinely colder than the further western region around Buffalo, Erie and nearby counties,) have been successfully heating their homes, small businesses, commercial entities, and large housing developments, at temperatures that have been tested in recent years in real life down to negative 9 and negative 13 degree F.**

Ithaca Neighborhood Housing Services—a national model small-city affordable housing development corporation -- has heated its 50 unit affordable housing project since 2014 with an earlier iteration of a large building heat pump. The Village Solars market-rate housing project in Lansing is the largest of the many housing complexes in that area. Upwards of 500 units are heated with heat pumps in an exposed location above Cayuga Lake. Current heat pump technology is now so successful that the development company, Lifestyle Properties, will construct over 700 market rate housing units in the Town of Dryden, NY, a town in Tompkins County where there has never been a gas moratorium, choosing to use heat pumps instead of gas.

<https://www.lifestylepropertiesithaca.com/amenities/>

Energy Burden of New Yorkers is no longer the same average 6%. 1/3 of NYers now have energy burdens in the category “above 6.0 – 15%.

Affordable housing, tax credits, mortgage banking and the 6% maximum utility bill:

Please see the section further into this testimony that includes the statistics regarding the Energy Burden of New Yorkers.

(Commission Chair Rory Christian opened the Joint Public Hearing on the PSC with a specific statistic to back up his claim that the process may need tweaking, but the underlying health of the Utility Rate Case method and outcome were still sound. The primary statistic he cited was the **Energy Burden: the percentage of your budget – your monthly or annual spending on everything – remains constant at an average maximum of 6%. This figure is no longer true.**

It is true that we relied upon that 6% maximum energy burden for many decades. Six percent was the maximum proportion your utility bills would be of your total household budget for all except the very poorest of New Yorkers. It was both a guideline for families and an actual fact.

Mortgage banks expected that when you applied for a residential mortgage to buy a house, your budget outside of your required mortgage payments, insurance and taxes (PITI) would still allow you to make your PITI payments. The guideline has been the reality and the common wisdom for many decades. I recall the figure from when my husband and I bought our own first home in the 1970s. It was an uninsulated, very leaky farmhouse and stagecoach stop along the old Ithaca-Owego road that is now Route 96 South, built in the 1890s with a wood floor that had planks as wide as two feet. and we were in our first real jobs, but that figure still held- we checked each month that our utilities didn't use up more than 6% of our much pored-over budget.

Affordable housing providers advise their first time homebuyers to calculate their budgets and plan to be able to make their PITI payments and it is a guideline for renters, too. **However, PLEASE NOTE THE AVERAGE ENERGY BURDEN OF NEW YORKERS HAS UNDERGONE A LARGE SHIFT IN THE PAST DECADE.** RCI is working with our regional affordable housing organizations and our Tompkins County Planning Department to confirm some of the sources, but please see the section in this testimony below on Energy Burden.

The U.S. Department of Energy figures from 2018-2022 show that fully one third of New Yorkers have an energy burden ranging from 6% to 15%. Even if further research shows that the extreme incomes of a very small number of billionaires who maintain their fifth homes in the New York Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) manages to keep the overall average energy burden from squeaking above 6%, —the figure cited by Mr. Christian and by the utility companies alike as still the maximum-- the real figures paint a very different picture regarding the energy burden of the majority of New York State voters and residents.

If you take no other advice from the testimony you hear today, please investigate the assertion that the energy burden of New Yorkers remains constant from a decade ago (although I believe you also should take the advice you heard from the CLCPA panel just as seriously). Compare not only the “average,” (by which I’m assuming he is referring to the mean, because the median and the mode have certainly shifted), but the distribution of that energy burden related to area median income levels.

The Energy Burden statistics will show the same picture you are hearing from NYS residents in Rate Case Hearings in the various utility service areas across the state. We just heard about the phenomenon from multiple, very eloquent individual speakers at the round of Public Hearings in the NYSEG-RGE Rate Case. Please see the transcripts, listen to the tapes from the Ithaca, NY hearings, Binghamton, and Rochester, and/or invite testimony from the NYSEG-RGE Rate Case Administrative Law Judges who kindly spent meant hours listening to all the ratepayers speak.

If the energy burden has shifted so definitively over the past 5-10 years, there could be significant impact on New York State's whole affordable housing lending model, and it could have significant implications for New York State's tax credit program. The right Senate staffer and the relevant deputy secretary within the governor's office purview should look into Mr. Christian's assumption to see if it needs revision.

See the Energy Burden Statistics section, appended below.

Rate case history: Over a century ago, when New York State established the rules by which we would grant Monopoly contracts to private companies, the legislators were careful to ensure that no company could obtain or administer utility services to the good people of the state of New York without a guarantee that they would serve all customers. New York State established a mandate that electric equipment and gas pipelines could not just serve the densest or the richest among us. Our legislators had the foresight to say to companies, if you want to be the recipient of a monopoly contract in any region of our state, you need to lay those gas pipelines and make them available at a group discount cost for the first hundred feet. You need to make the new technology available, not only in the dense cities, but to the poor people at the end of the lane and the rural farmers and the loggers and hunters up in the Adirondacks.

Further, a century ago you had to agree to subject your proposed contract to a public process open to all serious stakeholders willing to put in the hours it would take to read those case documents (today over 900 pages), think through the procedures you'd like, and bring them to the attention of the company, staff and other stakeholders. We should still be able to do so with the reasonable expectation that the suggestions and observations we bring to the attention of DPS staff acted upon, especially the ones staff and Commission might not have already identified.

For example, our community alerted staff and commission that trees weren't getting trimmed and that they should be looking into management practices of our utility companies. Those of us on the ground, in the local municipalities noticed that instead of the using in-house staff, there were instead some extra costs added to the budget for administration of outside entities and that those additional companies would also require indirect expenses. Three years after the 2022 rate case and six years after the 2019 rate case you can read the 128 point audit of those same companies.

NPA implementation happens best with municipal Partnership. Our community stakeholders were the ones who suggested one of the first, if THE first, NPA, or non pipe alternative, and a way to test it as a PILOT within a rate case. It saved ratepayers millions of dollars eliminating a proposed pipe from Oneonta and Cooperstown to Lansing. We knew the location of the elementary school that wasn't getting enough pressure to run their gas heat, we knew the real estate developers and their level of knowledge to be convinced to install heat pumps instead of gas in their new 50 unit and 100 unit housing developments, we knew the commercial spin off Cornell businesses and which ones could switch to heat pumps and which ones didn't have anything but gas equipment available for their commercial and light industrial processes, so we'd need to ensure there would still be enough capacity for them to continue on gas.

Today, in some ways the Lansing NPA area has had great success. Village Solars has expanded from its first proposed market-rate housing development whose developer was not happy when he was instructed to change his proposed project to use the newer heat pump technology instead of the gas heat called for in his original design. The project now contains over 500 units of new market-rate housing, all heated and cooled with heat pumps. The same development company is now building the first phases of a similar project in the Tompkins County Town of Dryden, where there is no gas moratorium. When complete, the project will contain over 800 units of market rate housing - and all will be built by choice of the developer with heat pumps, not gas. The company is now requesting funds

to install a very dirty LNG injection point, although the far points on the gas grid are meeting their heating needs within the parameters set.)

Examples:

- One flaw today is that even those overseeing the process have let it get so cumbersome and weighed down with insider formulas and detailed rules of minutia that require a full-time staff to administer.
- Arcane formulas, and decades of participation only by those large enough and well enough funded to push for quarter of a percent changes in their own benefit have multiplied and compounded year after year. This has resulted in a highly inequitable **Rate Design Structure**. Newcomers, whether they be the increasing number of municipal government representatives from County, City, Town or Village levels, or whether they be representing the poorest among us, those seeking racial justice in the placement of dirty equipment in their communities, trade associations of new EV charger technologies, or those presenting truly exciting other new technologies that can pull warm heat from even frigid outdoor air to send indoors in the winter time and cooling ability from even the hottest outdoor air to send indoors during ever hotter, sun or summers don't enjoy the same access to make their case, consideration, or dollars as those who have been helping to write the rules and the formulas for many decades. Old mandates, for example, that gas be delivered to all who request it even though we know there are new, cleaner and less expensive technologies don't have the ability to change.

Design Justice: "Nothing about us without us. "

Theoretically, all interested stakeholders are invited to participate in rate cases. However, to have a true seat at the table you need to be in a position to either add staff or allocate staff time every three years for a few months while also covering the day job if you are a staff member or your regular work if you are a municipal participant. Local representatives do

not have the inclination or the ability to cycle on to the next rate case in a different region, addressing the proposal of the next utility company on the list.

Ratepayer and Community Intervenors submitted testimony in one rate case documenting public comments from the DPS Matter Master that we documented, categorized, annotated, dissected, memorialized in testimony analysis. Along with partners from the Binghamton Regional Sustainability Network (now NeST), we hired a team of interns to help DPS staff answer the question that was actually asked every year by the Commission.

Spoiler alert - public comments from the record are regularly dispatched in half a sentence In NYSEG RGE Case 22-E-0788 et .

Specific Experiences I have had in NYSEG/RGE rate cases:

- My tally of rate case comments and rate case testimony: thousands of comment were ignored in the 2015 NYSEG/RG&E rate case. They were not discussed in the commentary or on the floor of the PSC meeting to vote on the order. During the 2019 case, I convened a team of interns to read and tally 6,000 comments by category, comment, and stance, pro or con. I could tell you about documenting, detailing and testifying to some overwhelmingly high percentages (85% negative comments, positives being about the bit of grid upgrades NYSEG/RGE were willing to add. The overall rejection rate was between 90%- 95% to NYSEG's request. The exact number can be found in my testimony within the case record.
 - It includes testimony about the difficulties people were having as ratepayers, evidence that tree trimming hadn't really happened, desire to decrease the gas budget and increase electric capacity.
 - The meticulous, documented, tallied and analyzed presentation regarding the public comments did not serve to further a more careful look at local, ratepayer, municipal and small business concerns. Presentation of the case details to the Commission did not include more than a half of a sentence. Rather, comments were mentioned as having had "some comments in

favor, some were against” and then they changed the subject in the same sentence

Ratepayers inquiring about participation being shunted off to a side case: A group of Pawling, NY ratepayers wrote to the PSC and the governor wanting to impact the 2022 case, only to be shunted aside to a new case number that didn't have any other parties or follow up activity. RCI noticed a small reference to an unfamiliar case number and looked it up. All it took was the motivation to look for interested stakeholders. It was so easy to let them know about their eligibility to join the actual rate case, but it was in the final few days and they had effectively missed the opportunity to weigh in.

- In the same case in which we were denigrated, the final decision regarding the case, recommended by DPS staff and ordered by the PSC allowed the company to increase their investment return from 8.8% to 9.2%. Those are public numbers. That was over \$63 million dollars in additional money going to shareholder profit. (Please refer back to the overarching questions, “Who benefits? Who Pays?”)
- I was a sitting County Legislator during the first case I joined. As you yourselves probably regularly experience, elected officials enjoy a very strong culture of respect on the part of staff, at least in listening to our input. Ten years of elected life also gave me experience in commanding the floor, in a room full of practiced talkers. However, getting to weigh in during a phone call to staff or even during case meetings does not mean your positions are taken seriously when the deal is cut...

Local officials and ratepayers notice details one can only obtain day-to-day on the ground. Local government stakeholders examined the proposed budget and told staff that the trees hadn't been trimmed even though ratepayers had paid for them. Local advocacy group stakeholders and many local government officials at county, town and city levels commented the year that the company proposed

a reduction in the new pipe budget but somehow showed a large jump in the part of the capitol budget devoted to fixing – i. e. replacing – “leak-prone” pipe. (as opposed to actually leaking pipe.)

- **Lack of local municipal representation** Please hold a hearing in which you hear from municipal and organizational representatives as well as some ratepayers from the designated disadvantaged communities (DACs).
- Include a panel about the rate of **local government and state highway and bridge costs due to storm damage**. Weigh those and other climate-related taxpayer expenses against the permitted ROE and the ratepayer bills. A complete cost-benefit analysis might challenge the assumption that keeping gas as an energy source is less expensive, much as the socio-economic study conducted by the NYS DEC during NYS’s decision making process about hydrofracking uncovered the economic realities that would be faced by NYS re

●

“Nothing about us without us:”

I am a Cornell University-educated professional planner with an MRP; I spent years learning multiple analytical techniques and methods. I am able to apply that expertise in the Rate Cases. But I also learned in planning school that, in the end, all that technical analysis comes down to two simple questions:

Who benefits? Who pays?

Four words. Really, it is all you need to get to the crux. The current treatment of all except the largest stakeholders and the outcomes in recent utility rate cases show very clearly that the voters/ratepayers of upstate NY are not being served well-enough.

In closing, I’d like to add one point, in a spirit of great respect and desire to inform and encourage alternative methodologies, not to chide. The Joint Committee’s hearing process aims to “.... explore ways to improve

transparency, broaden public participation, and ensure that decisions reflect the needs of all New Yorkers...” and to ” identify practical reforms to strengthen oversight and support affordability and equity.”

As a decade-long elected government official I have great appreciation of the tension between letting the public know you have heard them and letting them know there are specific parameters and physical realities that impact your decision-making as well. There is a tension between our sincere desire to hear from all members of the public, especially on hot button issues and the realities of the meticulous administrative required details we hear from our staff members. Some examples.

- As chair of Tompkins County’s Facilities and Infrastructure Committee I learned more than I ever knew to question regarding road wear miles per vehicle (heavy trucks wear down roads in one trip equal to the passage of 5,000 cars. In 2017 it cost over \$1 million per mile to rebuild one mile of average county roadway).
- We regularly heard about the fine points of staff, project, and program realities, their systems and the time and effort it takes to put new policies into practice where the rubber meets the road

So, I understand that a casual participant who has never been exposed to that level of detail might have less expertise to expound on certain details as you develop a new program or price potential purchases. However, it is possible to give equitable attention to the needs, reactions, and ideas about potential solutions to what, after all, are the consequences with which your residents and small business ratepayers must live in our day-day-day realities. That is experience you and your staff might not have. Allowing a true seat at the table as you not only find solutions to problems Company and Staff have defined, but that resident, local, municipal and organizational stakeholders can identify, is the only way to truly achieve equity and “ensure that decisions reflect the needs of all New Yorkers...”

You asked good questions at today's hearing about recommendations for tweaking the rate case process. Please also ask representatives from upstate NY governments in elected and appointed positions.

Learn about the field of Design Justice. Find consultants in that field from the Design Justice Network. More information can be found in this book:

Design Justice

Sasha Costanza-Chock

MIT Press, 2020, available at commercial and independent bookstores.

I had the capacity to carry one copy of this book, which I include for your review. If I'm informed that all of you will read it, I will be happy to investigate whether I can get a volume discount to deliver nine more copies. On page 69, tabbed in red, there's a cartoon cited and a caption that reads, "Nothing about us without us".

To understand the intense reaction you've been hearing from a Facebook group with 22,000 members and from many of us non-corporate, and from smaller, institutional parties who are telling you our concerns and proposed solutions sometimes get heard but rarely actually get implemented in the final orders and that sometimes the commission itself isn't getting the full reports.

I applaud you for holding a hearing to explore the ways in which the current PSC /DPS process might not be serving all of the state's residents and I applaud you for opening it up for public attendance. I urge you to seek a process that truly leaves open the possibility that there are perspectives in addition to those of which you were already aware in order to "ensure that decisions reflect the needs of all New Yorkers."

You are the ones who set the tone for rate cases and other matters before the PSC related to monopoly utilities.. Just like those senators a century ago, set the tone to insist on making the newest energy related technologies available to the least among us. Set the tone to include locals in the most distant reaches of each service area. Set a tone

open to and inclusive of the ability of locals to know our problems and solutions. **Set the tone to respect the advocacy groups** who know what works to educate and truly empower ratepayers, and scientists who know their fields, as part of the group that defines the problem and works together to come up with solutions. **Then, be like those legislators a century ago who insisted that those who profit from monopoly contracts deliver solutions that are best for the future of New York.**

Thank you for the opportunity to speak

Appendix: Energy Burden of New Yorkers: An initial dive into the statistics

Energy Burden:

The chair of the Public Service Commission (PSC), Rory Christian, spoke first at a public hearing held on September 30, 2025 by the NYS Senate Standing Committee on Corporations, Commissions and Authorities jointly with the NYS Senate Standing Committee on Energy and Telecommunications. While it was called a "Public Hearing," (it was public only in the sense that the public was invited to watch. The announcement sub-header to the Notice of Joint Public Hearing was: Oral Testimony By Invitation Only.)

The hearing panel was convened jointly by the two committees to conduct oversight of the PSC regarding process issues and to investigate the PSC's progress (or lack thereof) in implementing NYS's climate law - the CLCPA.

PSC Chair Rory Christian defended the performance of the PSC in front of the two NYS Senate standing committees by citing the long-standing statistic that NYers continue to have an average energy burden of 6%. He acknowledged that there might be some tweaks needed to the rate case process and utility company oversight, but that the steady 6% rate meant the

Commission and DPS staff's current approach--and the basic premises of PSC rate case processes --are actually just fine.

The head of the utility company on their panel at the end of the hearing said the same thing - in almost the exact same words. (Sitting behind the table, it was not clear whether it was the panelist from National Guel Gas Distribution Corp or the one from Central Hudson Gas and Electric. Additional panel speakers included Kimberly Harrison, Deputy CEO of Avangrid, on behalf of NYSEG.(She also reported to the NYS Senate committee members that they are doing just fine, and that the items identified by the audit are "routine" management audit items that were identified by the April 2025 independent audit.)

In the week or so preceeding the hearing, there was a news story that included information about a group of New Yorkers of whom 24% now carried energy burdens as high as a quarter of their incomes.

That is a large discrepancy, So I spent the past week trying to find the source of that info - that I didn't catch at the time, and I've found some other reports on energy burden.

I'm 3/4 blind and haven't had much extra time beyond getting people out to attend the public hearing two days ago, so maybe a simple search by a planner could easily find more. But here's what I've found.

The report about 24% of NYers having up to 25% energy burden might have been from an ACEEE report only about major metropolitan areas. [link](#) is below.

US DOE Data Tool:

More relevant to the claim about "all NY still has a 6% energy burden" was that the US Department of Energy tracks that item, broken down by area median income, and broken into six distinct levels.

Here is the data for NYS, energy burden by area median income. The data are not just the most recent figures and they partly predate COVID. They come from the American Community Survey 5-year Estimates for 2018-2022.

(six segments: sextiles? one never hears it put that way, but you'll see how they broke it down so one third of NYers are in the bottom two sections, all of them that go up above 6.0 from 6-15% energy burden.) Even if some billionaires who maintain one of their many homes in NYC skew the "average" so that the PSC can claim the overall number still stands at 6% - Rory Christian didn't define whether they use the median, the mean, or the mode - it is still way too many NYers now who spend 6% OR MORE of their incomes on utilities. I don't think the reality has stayed level for most NY ratepayers over the past decade.

INHS doesn't ask energy burden specifically for homebuyers or for rentals, but they do expect people to be meeting their monthly budgets in order to qualify. Banks do the same when homebuyers at all levels apply for mortgages. What does an increasing energy burden - well over 6 % -11% for one sixth of NYers and as high as 12 - 15% for the bottom sixth of NYers - do to affordable housing rental programs? what does it do to first-time homebuyer programs? At that scale, does it do anything even to market-rate mortgage bankers?

Here is the U.S. DOE LEAD Tool, it has much other useful data and a user friendly interface if you click and explore the various categories to cut through the data on the left. A search returns a neat graph of the data on the right.

Selected within the DOE Tool for "Energy Burden by Area Media Income." And select for New York State

<https://www.energy.gov/scep/slsc/lead-tool>

2024 UPDATE to The 2020 ACEEE Energy Burden Report:
https://www.aceee.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/data_update_-_city_energy_burdens_0.pdf [2024 ACEEE Report MSA Energy Burdens Major Cities](#)

ACEEE analyzed data for major metropolitan areas.
 Here is Rochester, NY Metro Area Summary Statistics from the 2020 ACEEE Energy Burden Report:

See ACEEE's 2020 report, *How High Are America's Residential Energy Burdens*, for a breakdown of median energy burdens for other groups

nationally, regionally, and in 25 select metro areas: www.aceee.org/energy-burden.

ENERGY BURDENS IN ROCHESTER

https://www.aceee.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/aceee-01_energy_burden_-_rochester.pdf

- **n Median energy burden is 3.8%**, and the **median low-income energy burden is 9.5%** in the Rochester metropolitan area.
- **n A quarter of low-income households** have an energy burden above 16% in the Rochester metropolitan area, which is more
- than four times higher than the median energy burden.
- **n 29% of Rochester households** (127,262) have a high energy burden (above 6%).
- **n 15% of Rochester households** (64,726) have a severe energy burden (above 10%).
- **n 44% of Black households** (21,120) and **44% of Hispanic households** (11,220) in the Rochester metropolitan area experience a high energy burden (above 6%).
- **n Based on the groups in the study, low-income** (9.5%), **low-income multifamily households** (6.0%), and **Hispanic households** (5.4%) experienced the highest median energy burdens in Rochester.
-
- **3.2 X:** The median energy burden of low-income households in Rochester is 3.2 times higher than non-low-income households
- **88%:** The median energy burden of low-income multifamily households in Rochester is 88% higher than multifamily households
- **43 % :** The median energy burden of Black households in Rochester is 43% higher than that of non-Hispanic white households

The median energy burden of Black households in Rochester is 43% higher than that of non-Hispanic white households

of Rochester households (127,262) have a high energy burden (above 6%).multifamily households

NYC Metro Area Summary Statistics from the 2020 ACEEE Energy Burden Report:

ENERGY BURDENS IN NEW YORK CITY

- **n Median energy burden is 2.9%**, and the **median low-income energy burden is 9.3%** in the New York City metropolitan area. **n A quarter of low-income households** have an energy **burden above 17%** in the New York City metropolitan area, which is
 - almost six times higher than the median energy burden.
- **n 25% of New York City households** (1,859,460) have a high energy burden (above 6%).
- **n 15% of New York City households** (1,111,740) have a severe energy burden (above 10%).
- **n 32% of Black households** (467,072) and **33% of Hispanic households** (509,685) in the New York City metropolitan area experience a high energy burden (above 6%).
- **n Based on the groups in the study, low-income (9.3%), low-income multifamily households (8.0%), and older adults (4.2%)** experienced the highest median energy burdens in New York City.
- **3.3X:** The median energy burden of low-income households in New York City is 3.3 times higher than non-low-income households
- **3.3X:** The median energy burden of low-income multifamily households in New York City is 3.3 times higher than multifamily households
- **46%.** The median energy burden of Hispanic households in New York City is 46% higher than that of non-Hispanic white households

2024 Data update:

Metro Area MSA	All Households			Low Income Households			Black Households			Hispanic Households		
	All	Owner	Renter	All	Owner	Renter	All	Owner	Renter	All	Owner	Renter
New York City	5.4 %	5.6 %	5.1 %	20.0 %	25.1 %	16.0 %	5.1 %	6.3 %	4.9 %	5.6 %	4.5 %	7.7 %
Rochester	7.3 %	6.9 %	8.4 %	21.0 %	23.3 %	17.6 %	10.4 %	6.4 %	14.8 %	8.5 %	9.9 %	8.0 %