

Exhibit No.: \_\_\_\_\_  
Issue(s): Low-Income Programs  
Witness: Nathaniel W. Hackney  
Type of Exhibit: Direct Testimony  
Sponsoring Party: The Empire District  
Electric Company d/b/a Liberty  
Case No.: ER-2024-0261  
Date Testimony Prepared: November 2024

**Before the Public Service Commission  
of the State of Missouri**

**Direct Testimony**

**of**

**Nathaniel W. Hackney**

**on behalf of**

**The Empire District Electric Company d/b/a Liberty**

**November 6, 2024**



TABLE OF CONTENTS  
FOR THE DIRECT TESTIMONY OF NATHANIEL W. HACKNEY  
THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY D/B/A LIBERTY  
BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
CASE NO. ER-2024-0261

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. STIPULATED ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS CASES .....	2
III. ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES TO LIWAP .....	9
IV. CONTINUATION OF CRITICAL MEDICAL NEEDS PROGRAM .....	11
V. CONTINUATION OF ANNUAL LOW-INCOME STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS .....	12
VI. LOW-INCOME PILOT PROGRAM.....	13

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF NATHANIEL W. HACKNEY  
THE EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC COMPANY D/B/A LIBERTY  
BEFORE THE MISSOURI PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
CASE NO. ER-2024-0261

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Nathaniel W. Hackney and my business address is 602 S. Joplin Avenue,  
4 Joplin, Missouri 64801.

5 **Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?**

6 A. I am employed by Liberty Utilities Service Corp. (“LUSC”) as the Manager of  
7 Customer Assistance Programs for the Customer Care Department in Liberty’s Central  
8 Region, which includes The Empire District Electric Company (“Liberty” or  
9 “Company”).

10 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?**

11 A. I am testifying on behalf of Liberty.

12 **Q. Please describe your educational and professional background.**

13 A. In 2009, I received a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Minnesota’s Hubbard  
14 School of Journalism and Mass Communication. I began my employment with Liberty  
15 in 2010, and I accepted the promotion to Associate Energy Efficiency Coordinator in  
16 2012. In 2014, I was promoted to Energy Efficiency Coordinator. In 2018, I was  
17 promoted to Senior Energy Efficiency Coordinator. In 2019, I was promoted to Central  
18 Region Senior Reporting and Systems Analyst. In 2022, I accepted my current position  
19 of Manager, Customer Assistance Programs. In this position, I manage the low-income  
20 programs for the Central Region, which encompasses electric, gas, wastewater, and

1 water customers in Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Illinois, and Iowa. These  
2 include, but are not limited to, the Low-Income Weatherization Assistance Program  
3 (“LIWAP”) and various other programs for the other utilities operating within the  
4 Central Region that offer billing credits and/or discounts.

5 **Q. Have you previously testified before the Missouri Public Service Commission**  
6 **(“MPSC” or “Commission”) or any other regulatory agency?**

7 A. Yes. I have filed testimony with this Commission and also with the Arkansas Public  
8 Service Commission and the Kansas Corporation Commission.

9 **Q. What is the purpose of your direct testimony in this proceeding?**

10 A. In this testimony, I discuss several items related to Liberty’s low-income programs.  
11 First, I address previous stipulated agreements. Second, I address suggested changes to  
12 the LIWAP. Third, I address performance of the Critical Medical Needs Program  
13 (“CMNP”), which Liberty offers in partnership with the United Way of Southwest  
14 Missouri and Southeast Kansas (“United Way” or “UW”). Fourth, I address the  
15 continuation of the annual low-income stakeholder meetings. And finally, I address the  
16 performance of Liberty’s Low-Income Pilot Program (“LIPP”) and posit a suitable  
17 replacement.

18 **II. STIPULATED ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS CASES**

19 **Q. Please re-state the stipulated items from MPSC Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to**  
20 **the LIPP.**

21 A. Item 11a(i) in the *Fourth Partial Stipulation and Agreement* (“S&A”), filed February  
22 5, 2022, stated “Empire’s LIPP will continue, with shareholders matching the \$250,000  
23 customer funding.” Item 11a(ii) stated, “The requirement for payments to stay current  
24 within 60 days of bill date will be waived.” Item 11a(iii) stated, “The LIPP discount

1 will increase to two times the customer charge during the peak heating months of  
2 December through February and peak cooling months of June through August.” Item  
3 11a(iv) stated, “there will be a 2,000 customer cap.” Item 11a(v) stated, “Unspent funds  
4 will rollover annually to Empire’s low-income weatherization program.” Item 11a(vi)  
5 stated, “Updates will be provided twice a year to [MPSC] Staff and to [Office of Public  
6 Counsel].”

7 **Q. Has Liberty continued offering the LIPP to its customers since the conclusion of**  
8 **Case No. ER-2021-0312 and performed in compliance with these items?**

9 A. Yes.

10 **Q. Did the program expend its full budget between June 2022 and May 2023?**

11 A. No, it did not.

12 **Q. Were the unspent funds reallocated to LIWAP, per 11a(v)?**

13 A. Yes, in early 2024, Liberty issued the balance of this account at May 31, 2023. The  
14 unspent balance of \$382,729.82 was reallocated amongst Liberty’s three Community  
15 Action Agencies (“CAAs”) as follows:

- 16 • Economic Security Corporation of SWMO (“ESC”) - \$166,364.91;  
17 • Ozarks Area Community Action Corporation (“OACAC”) - \$166,364.91; and  
18 • West Central Missouri Community Action Agency (“WCMCAA”) -  
19 \$50,000.00

20 **Q. Did the program expend its full budget between June 2023 and May 2024?**

21 A. No, it did not.

22 **Q. Were the unspent funds reallocated to LIWAP, per 11a(v)?**

23 A. Yes, in August 2024, Liberty issued the balance of this account at May 31, 2024. The  
24 unspent balance of \$352,502.44 was reallocated amongst Liberty’s CAAs as follows:

- 1           • ESC - \$252,502.44; and
- 2           • WCMCAA - \$100,000

3   **Q.    Are the CAAs reporting to Liberty the homes that have been weatherized using**  
4   **these funds?**

5   A.    Yes, the CAAs are sending periodic reconciliations to the Company which feature,  
6         among other data, weatherization expenditures, and homes completed.

7   **Q.    How does the Company update the regulators regarding the reports?**

8   A.    These projects are clearly outlined and reported separated from traditionally-funded  
9         (i.e., through the Missouri Division of Energy (“DE”)) expenditures and home counts,  
10        and compiled within the Low-Income Weatherization Report. This report is filed  
11        electronically in May of each year for reconciliation of the prior year.

12 **Q.    Does the Company believe the LIPP should continue?**

13 A.    The Company believes it is important to continue to support a program which provides  
14        assistance to some of our most vulnerable customers. However, the Company believes,  
15        for a variety of reasons, that the funds can better serve Liberty’s income-eligible  
16        customers via a new program, which I will discuss at length in Section VI of this  
17        testimony.

18 **Q.    Please re-state the stipulated item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to customers**  
19 **who call in for bill assistance.**

20 A.    Item 11f in the S&A stated, “Customers who call in for bill assistance will be given the  
21        option to be referred to one of the three community action agencies (“CAAs”) if they  
22        are interested in free weatherization.”

1 **Q. For customers calling Liberty and expressing difficulty paying their bill to a**  
2 **Customer Service Representative (“CSR”) are they now referred to one of the**  
3 **three CAAs?**

4 A. Yes.

5 **Q. What is the stipulated item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to staffing for low-**  
6 **income programs at Liberty?**

7 A. Item 11e in the S&A stated, “Liberty Utilities Service Corp. will establish an employee  
8 position devoted to low-income programs in the Central Region (which includes  
9 Empire).”

10 **Q. Has the Company complied?**

11 A. Yes, I accepted the newly created position of Manager, Customer Assistance Programs  
12 in September of 2022. As noted above, I oversee items of compliance and program  
13 management for low-income programs in the Central Region.

14 **Q. What is the stipulated item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to the development**  
15 **of the Critical Medical Needs Program (“CMNP”)?**

16 A. Item 11c(i) in the S&A stated Liberty, “will establish a critical needs program  
17 consistent with the direct testimony of Geoff Marke in this docket funded annually with  
18 \$50,000 by customers and \$50,000 by shareholders.”

19 **Q. Please describe the development of this program.**

20 A. Liberty’s CMNP—which is offered in similar form by multiple investor-owned utilities  
21 in Missouri—evolved from the aforementioned item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 into a  
22 partnership with the United Way. The specifics of this program were ironed out over  
23 the fourth quarter of 2022 and the first quarter of 2023, in coordination with Spire Gas,  
24 Ameren Missouri, and the United Way of St. Louis. This pilot utilized the United

1 Way's Care Partner Network and the Unite Us Platform, which manages referrals from  
2 local Community Benefit Organizations ("CBOs", e.g., health care providers, low-  
3 income advocates, and social service providers) to bolster and establish a two-way  
4 referral system. Customers with arrearages who have a professionally-attested medical  
5 need for electricity receive a thirty-day delay of disconnect for non-pay. This delay  
6 allows them to seek assistance from various sources. The budget approved in the S&A  
7 also includes a hardship fund, which can help with arrearages as a payer-of-last-resort,  
8 at the discretion of Liberty and the United Way.

9 **Q. Has the Company complied with this item, establishing the CMNP?**

10 A. Yes.

11 **Q. Has this program proved beneficial?**

12 A. Yes. The program has allowed 63 customers-in-need the thirty-day extension. It has  
13 also provided nearly \$19,000 to avoid the imminent disconnections of 23 customers  
14 experiencing extraordinary hardship.<sup>1</sup> The program has also connected more than 33  
15 additional customers with pledges from other CBOs.

16 **Q. Does the Company believe this program should continue following the conclusion**  
17 **of this case?**

18 A. Absolutely. I will detail the reasons why the Company believes so in Section IV of this  
19 testimony.

20 **Q. Please re-state the stipulated item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to the**  
21 **parameters of funding for the LIWAP.**

---

<sup>1</sup> As of September 2024.



1 A. Item 11d(ii) in the S&A states, “Funding under [LIWAP] will be momentarily freed up  
2 to include the option for pass-over, marketing, hiring, training, health and safety;  
3 relaxation of funding restrictions to be revisited in the next rate case.”

4 **Q. Has Liberty complied with Item 11d(ii) in the S&A by allowing greater freedoms  
5 to CAAs and the way they administer funding for the LIWAP?**

6 A. Yes. On a case-by-case basis, Liberty has broadened the parameters of LIWAP funding,  
7 approving things outside the scope of conventional LIWAP and its Readiness Funds.  
8 Liberty has maintained the right to approve these expenditures on a case-by-case basis  
9 as a means to responsibly steward the funds for this program, but has not denied any  
10 requests to date, as they have all been reasonable and justifiable in scope and spirit.

11 **Q. What is the stipulated item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to the annual low-  
12 income stakeholder meeting?**

13 A. Item 11g in the S&A states Liberty, “will continue to meet annually with stakeholders  
14 and the CAAs.”

15 **Q. Has the Company complied with this item since the resolution of Case No. ER-  
16 2021-0312.**

17 A. Yes. Liberty has hosted regulatory stakeholders and CAAs in Joplin for annual  
18 meetings on November 30, 2022, and November 15, 2023.

19 **Q. Please re-state the stipulated item in Case No. ER-2021-0312 related to the Energy  
20 Burden Study.**

21 A. Item 11b(i) stated Liberty “will perform a one-time study at a cost not to exceed  
22 \$100,000,” and Item 11b(ii) stated Liberty “will work with stakeholders to discuss the  
23 study design and RFP.”

1 **Q. Please detail the Company’s subsequent actions toward compliance with this**  
2 **settlement term.**

3 A. Liberty kicked off the study process on October 11, 2022, hosting stakeholders with  
4 the intent to narrow down RFP candidates and establish a scope of work. A consensus  
5 was reached in this meeting to develop an RFP that would accomplish two things:

- 6 • analyze Liberty customer billing data and census block data to quantify Liberty’s  
7 energy burden; and
- 8 • analyze successful income-eligible programs in the state, region, and country to  
9 identify candidates for programs Liberty could potentially adopt to help its  
10 customers.

11 The stakeholders also agreed that Empower DataWorks (“Empower” or “EDW”) and  
12 Applied Public Policy Research Institute for Study and Evaluation (“APPRISE”) would  
13 be the candidates the Company would receive bids from, as these companies conducted  
14 similar studies for Spire and Ameren, respectively. The RFP was issued on March 15,  
15 2023, with bids received in early April. These bids were evaluated and scored in April  
16 2023. In May 2023, the bid was awarded to EDW. On May 16, 2023, the award  
17 recipient and bid scoring methodology was shared with stakeholders. The study was  
18 conducted over the coming months, and the finished product was presented to  
19 stakeholders on February 20, 2024. The Energy Burden Study is attached to this  
20 testimony as **Direct Schedule NWH-1**.

21 **Q. Has the Company complied with its directive in Item 11b(i) regarding the cost of**  
22 **the study?**

23 A. Yes, the study was completed for well under the targeted budget of \$100,000. The final  
24 cost of the study was \$73,600.

1 **Q. Has the Company complied with its directive in Item 11b(ii) regarding**  
2 **stakeholder involvement?**

3 A. Yes, the stakeholders were involved at each step of the process.

4 **Q. Did the study achieve its two-part objective as previously described?**

5 A. Yes, the Energy Burden Study quantified Liberty’s energy burden and the needs of its  
6 income-eligible customers and laid out a list of program options for Liberty to consider.

7 **Q. Did the results of the study inform any of the recommendations you will be making**  
8 **in this testimony?**

9 A. Yes, the study informed my recommendations for how Liberty can better utilize the  
10 funding currently reserved for LIPP, which I will detail later in Section VI in this  
11 testimony.

12 **III. ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES TO LIWAP**

13 **Q. Please describe the current administration of LIWAP.**

14 A. Currently, as stipulated in the Stipulation and Agreement in MPSC Case No. EM-2016-  
15 0213 (“Merger S&A”), filed August 23, 2016, Liberty’s LIWAP is administered in  
16 partnership with DE. Liberty sends its annual budget for weatherization for LIWAP as  
17 set in the S&A in MPSC Case No. ER-2021-0312—\$550,000 comprised of \$250,000  
18 from customers and \$300,000 from shareholders—to the Division of Energy, along  
19 with \$12,500 (five percent), funded by shareholders, for administration. DE, through  
20 the Environmental Improvement and Energy Resources Authority (“EIERA”),  
21 allocates and distributes these funds to the CAAs served by Liberty. DE then receives  
22 information regarding the qualitative and quantitative specifics of each weatherization  
23 job performed, compiles them, and supplies Liberty with a quarterly report.

1 **Q. Since the resolution of Case No. EM-2016-0213, has the Company substantially**  
2 **complied with this item from the Merger S&A related to administrative budgets?**

3 A. Yes, it has. The Company has made the \$12,500 (administrative, shareholder-funded)  
4 payments annually to EIERA in 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024. A  
5 payment for 2025 will be delivered to EIERA before the resolution of this case.

6 **Q. Since the resolution of Case No. ER-2021-0312, has the Company substantially**  
7 **complied with this item from the S&A related to program budgets?**

8 A. Yes, it has. The Company has made the \$250,000 (customer-funded) and \$300,000  
9 (shareholder-funded) payments annually to EIERA in 2017 (prorated for November-  
10 December), 2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024. A payment for 2025 will  
11 be delivered to EIERA before the resolution of this case.

12 **Q. Do any other investor-owned utilities in Missouri still utilize DE for**  
13 **administration of their LIWAP?**

14 A. Not to my knowledge.

15 **Q. Does the Company wish to continue its current arrangement following the**  
16 **resolution of this case?**

17 A. While the current arrangement has served Liberty and its customers adequately, the  
18 Company does not wish to continue this arrangement. Over many conversations with  
19 MPSC Staff (“Staff”), Office of Public Counsel (“OPC”), DE, and its CAAs, Liberty  
20 perceives there to be consensus among these parties in favor of Liberty resuming  
21 administrative control of these programs as part of the resolution of this case.

22 **Q. Is Liberty willing to work with these stakeholders to establish a process and**  
23 **protocol for periodic reporting on its LIWAP after resuming administrative**  
24 **control with the resolution of this case?**

1 A. Absolutely.

2 **Q. Will Liberty endeavor to keep stakeholders informed of a payment and reporting**  
3 **structure as it is established with CAAs following the resolution of this case?**

4 A. Yes, and, in addition, a reporting process is already being established with CAAs for  
5 reconciliation of the aforementioned unspent LIPP budgets, which have been  
6 reallocated to LIWAP and distributed to the CAAs. This will position the Company  
7 even better for success as it resumes administrative control of this program.

8 **IV. CONTINUATION OF CRITICAL MEDICAL NEEDS PROGRAM**

9 **Q. In Section II, the Company detailed the genesis and development of the CMNP in**  
10 **its current state, as well as the ongoing performance of the program. Is the**  
11 **Company pleased with the performance of this program to date?**

12 A. The Company is quite pleased with the early success of the CMNP and is optimistic  
13 for even greater success in the future. As awareness of the programs has grown among  
14 the United Way's Care Partner Network, and both the Company and the United Way  
15 have increased their respective comfort levels with the processes that contribute to the  
16 day-to-day success of the program, the program has steadily increased in the number  
17 of customers it serves. The Company and United Way have also established a  
18 partnership of two-way referrals to the program, as has United Way with its CBOs.  
19 This has allowed customers who express difficulty paying to Liberty to be referred to  
20 United Way to enroll in the program, and customers who contact the United Way, or  
21 are referred to the United Way from other CBOs, can also be referred to Liberty for  
22 consideration in other programs in addition to the CMNP. Additionally, the program  
23 has recently expanded to include two new counties (Barton and McDonald) in addition

1 to Jasper and Newton Counties. McDonald County, in particular, stands to be well-  
2 served from this program, as it is statistically one of the poorest counties in Missouri.

3 **Q. Does the Company see value in continuing the CMNP following the resolution of**  
4 **this case?**

5 A. Yes -- immense value. This program serves a subset of Liberty's customers in the most  
6 dire of situations and digs in to help them comprehensively in partnership with United  
7 Way CBOs. There are numerous testimonials of customers who have utilized the thirty-  
8 day extension to re-establish disconnected service, enter into long-term payment  
9 agreements, receive emergency and long-term financial aid, handle years-old  
10 arrearages, receive referrals to other programs (e.g., LIWAP) and most importantly,  
11 maintain a life-sustaining connection to power during trying times with serious and  
12 chronic illnesses. Now with the expansion into two new counties, Liberty expects even  
13 greater impacts and testimonials from this program.

14 **V. CONTINUATION OF ANNUAL LOW-INCOME STAKEHOLDER**  
15 **MEETINGS**

16 **Q. As detailed in Section II, the Company has continued to host the CAAs and**  
17 **regulatory stakeholders annually in Joplin in 2022 and 2023. Does the Company**  
18 **still believe hosting these meetings has value?**

19 A. Without a doubt, the dialogues and discourses are invaluable, and many of the ideas  
20 that begin or expand within these meetings lead to tangible and actionable  
21 improvements for the programs and processes of Liberty's low-income programs.

22 **Q. Does the Company believe it should continue hosting these meetings after the**  
23 **resolution of this case?**

24 A. Absolutely.

1 **VI. LOW-INCOME PILOT PROGRAM**

2 **Q. As noted in Section II of my testimony, the LIPP did not expend its full budget in**  
3 **either the 2022-23 or 2023-24 program years. Please share the specific**  
4 **performance figures.**

5 A. As of October 2024, there were 551 customers enrolled in the program, as compared  
6 to the cap of 2,000.

7 **Q. Is this indicative of enrollment trends since inception of the program?**

8 A. Yes, the program has had enrollment of roughly 600-700 for quite some time.

9 **Q. What is the budget for this program?**

10 A. The budget of this program is \$500,000, split evenly between shareholders and  
11 customers.

12 **Q. What has the Company observed to be hindering the success of this program?**

13 A. Being enrolled in the Company's Budget Billing Plan – formerly known as the Average  
14 Payment Plan, is a requirement of the Low-Income Pilot Program. The logic behind  
15 this is sound: that a predictable monthly bill should allow customers a better chance to  
16 stay current on their bills. However, when a customer is on the Budget Billing Plan,  
17 their monthly bills during peak seasons *appear* to be lower than they actually are, due  
18 to the nature of the program. This means that when the Budget Billing Plan customers  
19 apply for and receive financial assistance, such as the federal Low-Income Heating  
20 Energy Assistance Program (“LIHEAP”), they often have a misleading credit balance  
21 on their account. This is because the net of their monthly Budget Billing Plan  
22 installment is significantly less than the payment they receive from LIHEAP, but *not*  
23 *lower* than the amount they actually owe to the Company. This issue can often preclude  
24 customers who *do carry a balance owed to the Company* to miss out on the LIPP

1 payment, because their Budget Billing Plan makes it appear as though they owe nothing  
2 after receiving energy assistance. This complicated “Catch-22” has caused some  
3 customers to unenroll from the program.

4 **Q. Has the Company found that some low-income customers are averse to the**  
5 **principle of the Budget Billing Plan on its own merits?**

6 A. While the Company cannot speak specifically regarding customer perception of the  
7 Budget Billing Plan, the Company has observed a significant sample of customers, both  
8 income-challenged and not, who chose to unenroll from the Budget Billing Plan during  
9 shoulder months (i.e., spring and fall). When the customer’s *actual balance* is less than  
10 their Budget Billing Plan installment, the customer will often take the lower of the two  
11 balances for the present month, notwithstanding the net-positive effect of future peak  
12 months when their Budget Billing Plan installment will be less than their actual balance  
13 owed. This behavior is not exclusive to low- and moderate-income customers, but it  
14 stands to reason that customers in crisis may be more likely to make such a short-term  
15 decision.

16 **Q. Does the Company believe a new program that does not require the Budget Billing**  
17 **Plan will have a greater chance of success than LIPP?**

18 A. Yes.

19 **Q. Does the Company believe that a program with a higher stipend may further**  
20 **entice customers into enrollment for LIPP?**

21 A. Yes, it does.

22 **Q. What does the Company propose be done with LIPP?**

23 A. First, I would like to establish that Liberty values input and dialog with stakeholders  
24 regarding design of programs like this. With that established, the Company would like



1 to begin that dialog by proposing a new program. The Company would like to replace  
2 the LIPP program with the “Fresh Start Plan”. The Company would propose the Fresh  
3 Start Plan have an annual budget of \$300,000 that will continue to be split 50/50  
4 between customers and shareholders. Additionally, the Company would propose any  
5 unspent funds remain and rollover to the following year.

6 **Q. Please describe the proposed Fresh Start Plan.**

7 A. The Fresh Start Plan will offer a larger stipend to a smaller sample of customers, and  
8 evaluate on a pilot scale how their long-term arrearages are affected in spite of the  
9 absence of the Budget Billing Plan. The Fresh Start Plan will solicit CAAs in Liberty’s  
10 service territory to recommend a list of customers who could benefit from this program.  
11 The program leverages design elements of Ameren Missouri’s *Keeping Current*  
12 program. *Keeping Current*, and programs like it, were identified as one of several  
13 potentially beneficial program designs in the Energy Burden Study, as shown in **Direct**  
14 **Schedule NWH-1** to my testimony. Like *Keeping Current*, the Fresh Start Plan will  
15 offer a tiered credit to eligible customers based on income, as verified by the CAA  
16 providing the referral. The program will offer a \$50 bill credit to customers between  
17 41 and 60 percent of the State Median Income (“SMI”), and \$75 to customers with an  
18 income less than or equal to 40 percent of the SMI. The program will also have an  
19 Arrearage Match component, wherein customers who enter into and maintain a twelve-  
20 month payment agreement for half of their arrearage amount will receive a monthly  
21 credit on their bills equal to the other half of their arrearage amount.

22 **Q. Why does the Company propose SMI as the metric of choice over Federal Poverty**  
23 **Level (“FPL”)?**

1 A. Sixty percent of SMI is the current threshold for qualifying for LIHEAP in the state of  
2 Missouri, and thus, makes the most sense as a determinant for eligibility in an income-  
3 eligible assistance program. Liberty's Energy Burden Study found that nearly 40  
4 percent of Liberty's Missouri electric customers live at or below 60 percent of the SMI,  
5 as shown in Direct Schedule NWH-1.

6 **Q. Does the Company propose enrollment in the Budget Billing Plan as a**  
7 **requirement to the new pilot program?**

8 A. After citing the Budget Billing Plan as a barrier to the success of the LIPP, the Company  
9 is not inclined to require it as a component of this program. Although the Company  
10 would likely offer it as a viable option for having predictable bills while maintaining a  
11 long-term payment agreement, the Company would prefer to leave the ultimate  
12 decision to the customer.

13 **Q. Does Ameren's *Keeping Current* require a Budget Billing Plan?**

14 A. It appears to.

15 **Q. Does Liberty have reservations about not requiring enrollment in the Budget**  
16 **Billing Plan as a component of the Fresh Start Plan?**

17 A. The Company is eager to evaluate within this pilot how leaving this decision in the  
18 hands of the customer affects their ability to successfully stay enrolled in the program.  
19 The Company is also eager to see how customer outreach and communications to  
20 educate the customers on the seasonality of their bills can help customers who decline  
21 the Budget Billing Plan to stay current.

22 **Q. Will the Company track the success rates and enrollment of customers who enroll**  
23 **with the Budget Billing Plan versus those who do not enroll in the Budget Billing**  
24 **Plan as a metric for this pilot program?**

1 A. Absolutely.

2 **Q. How many customers does the Company anticipate this program can serve with**  
3 **its \$300,000 budget?**

4 A. The first iteration of this program has the capability to serve 250 customers at Tier 1  
5 (41-60% of SMI), 75 customers at Tier 2 (40% of SMI or less), and 49 customers to  
6 qualify for an arrearage match. This is based on an average arrearage estimate of \$279,  
7 as calculated based on actual outstanding arrearage balances at the end of February  
8 2024.

9 **Q. In addition to its ongoing analysis, would the Company be willing to conduct a**  
10 **third-party evaluation of the program as part of this pilot?**

11 A. Yes, if the Company believes the sample size is valid. If the Company hits a minimum  
12 threshold of 60 percent of budget expenditures in Year 1 of the Plan, and 75 percent in  
13 Year 2 of the Plan, an evaluation not to exceed \$25,000 will be conducted upon  
14 conclusion of Year 2. This study will include a process evaluation, economic  
15 evaluation, and—budget permitting—customer interviews. The Company proposes  
16 the third-party evaluation of the program be paid out of the program costs.

17 **Q. Will the Fresh Start Plan require modifications of the current LIPP tariff sheets?**

18 A. Yes. The tariff modifying the LIPP into the Fresh Start Plan is attached to this testimony  
19 as **Direct Schedule NWH-2**.

20 **Q. Does this conclude your direct testimony at this time?**

21 A. Yes.

**VERIFICATION**

I, Nathaniel W. Hackney, under penalty of perjury, on this 6th day of November, 2024,  
declare that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Nathaniel W. Hackney