

Organization: East Missouri Action Agency
Name: Steven Brewen
Title: Community Services/LIHEAP Manager
Date of Submission: 4/24/2026
Provider? <input type="checkbox"/> Please complete both Part A and Part B
Stakeholder only? <input type="checkbox"/> Please complete only Part B
Programs Administered/Managed by your Organization (ALL utility related programs, including government funded programs such as LIHEAP and weatherization)
1.
2.
3.

Part A: Provider Information Request

If you or your organization helps or has previously helped administer a utility assistance program (weatherization, LIHEAP, PAYS, Keeping Current, Dollar Help, Dollar More, ERPP, Critical Needs, Low-Income Assistance Programs, Payment Partner Program, etc.) please provide your name and the name of your organization and complete Part A. **If you don't manage or administer programs, skip to Part B on page 2.**

Please complete a table for each program that your organization manages

Copy and paste the tables as needed for the number of programs your organization manages

Cells will expand as needed to accommodate text

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION						
Utility Company		Program Name			State Agency Partner	
Ameren		Clean Slate				
Program Start Date	1/2022	Program End Date	Ongoing	Total # Employ	11	
Job Title 1	LIHEAP Coord.	Duties	Processing Apps., Payment Runs, Compliance, Communicate with Vendors and State Partners, Communicate with All Staff, General Program Management		# Employ	1
Job Title 2	CS/LIHEAP Manager	Duties	Approval of Payment Runs, Communicate with Vendors and State Partners, General Program Management, Compliance		# Employ	1
Job Title 3	EA Processors	Duties	Directly work with customers, Works and/or processes applications, Enter Pledges, Clerical Work, Interacts with Community Partners, Works to Program Coord. And Department Manager to Ensure Compliance		# Employ	2
Job Title 4	Community Services Representatives	Duties	Initial Intake of Applications from Customers for Enrollment into this Program		# Employ	7
Annual Average Enrollment #	15	Monthly Average Enrollment #	1			
Comments						

Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
...with state agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.</p> <p>While we do not administer surveys to individuals or families regarding Clean Slate, we do often speak with the vendor, Ameren, which offers this funding. We inform them of how impactful this extra funding is for families struggling to pay energy bills.</p>		

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the STRENGTHS of this program?
Clean Slate gives families a chance to pay past due bills and rectify accounts with Ameren. Customers can start fresh and work to stay out of disconnect threat.
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the WEAKNESSES of this program?
This program has somewhat stringent rules.
If you have it, please provide empirical and/or anecdotal data that support your comments.

Part B: Stakeholder Information Request

All interested stakeholders are invited to submit responses to **any or all of the following questions**. To ensure submissions are as helpful as possible, respondents are encouraged to provide specific information and data relevant to circumstances experienced in Missouri, "lessons learned" from other jurisdictions, and citations.

Stakeholder Question 1: EFFECTIVENESS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS AT REDUCING ARREARAGES AND DISCONNECTIONS FOR HIGH-BURDEN HOUSEHOLDS
a. How much do existing programs help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?
b. Which specific features are most effective at stabilizing households and preventing repeated cycles of arrearage (e.g., predictable monthly payments, income-based caps, arrearage forgiveness, and hardship protections, etc.)?
c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?
d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?

Stakeholder Question 2: CRITERIA AND MECHANISMS FOR PROGRAM ENROLLMENT
a. What principles should be used to establish eligibility criteria (e.g., need, administrative feasibility, accuracy, and alignment with household need) and how should programs prioritize access to assistance when resources are limited?
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?
d. What risk-management practices (e.g., random audits, post-enrollment verification, data-matching) should be used that are effective without creating undue burdens for applicants?
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?

Stakeholder Question 3: CHALLENGES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN
a. What administrative practices would reduce customer burden and streamline application, verification, and recertification processes (e.g., short-form applications, online portals, single-point-of-entry systems)?
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?
c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?

Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION

a. What metrics should be used to evaluate program performance, measure impacts, and assess cost-effectiveness?

b. What metrics should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of marketing, education, and outreach efforts?

c. What customer-experience metrics should be used to evaluate program accessibility, clarity, and ease of navigation, including the application, verification, and enrollment processes?

d. What metrics should be used to evaluate whether verification requirements are appropriately calibrated to risk?
--

e. What metrics should be used to assess whether programs improve long-term household stability, reduce arrearages, prevent disconnections, and support energy-efficiency or weatherization investments?
--

Stakeholder Question 5: RATE STRUCTURES AND ASSISTANCE SUCCESS

a. Is there a relationship between utility rate structures and the success of assistance programs? If so, what is that relationship?
--

B31. How does the rate design element of fixed charges affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
--

b2. How does the rate design element of seasonal usage and rates affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
--

b3. How does the rate design element of time-variant pricing affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
--

Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS ARE REDUCING RELIANCE ON CRSIS ASSISTANCE
--

Identify specific program elements that have demonstrated the greatest success in reducing reliance on "in crisis" assistance. (e.g., offering 1/12th debt forgiveness in exchange for on-time payments, offering levelized billing)
--

Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES
--

Describe the implementation challenges that should be anticipated when launching new assistance programs.
