

**In the Matter of a Working Case for  
Commission Review and Consideration of  
Utility Assistance Programs and Special  
Alternative Residential Customer Rates.**

File No. OW-2026-0085

**Content:** Response to Order Requesting  
Comments and Scheduling Workshop

**Date of Submission:** 4/24/2026



**Name of Agency:** Central Missouri Community Action

**Mission Statement of agency:** Our mission is to build relationships to empower people, strengthen resilience, and improve quality of life for all members of the community.

**Vision Statement of Agency:** We envision communities without poverty

<b>Organization:</b> Central Missouri Community Action
<b>Name:</b> Emily Young
<b>Title:</b> Assistant Family and Community Services Director
<b>Date of Submission:</b> 4/24/2026
<b>Provider?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please complete both Part A and Part B
<b>Stakeholder only?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Please complete only Part B
<b>Programs Administered/Managed by your Organization (ALL utility related programs, including government funded programs such as LIHEAP and weatherization)</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dollar More, Keeping Current, Keeping Cool</li> <li>2. LIHEAP</li> <li>3. Weatherization</li> </ol>

**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*

*Provide information on the time and duration of administering program (for example: Weatherization – February 1976)*

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
Ameren		Dollar More			
Program Start Date	2000	Program End Date	Current	Total # Employ	0
Job Title 1		Duties		# Employ	
Job Title 2		Duties		# Employ	
Job Title 3		Duties		# Employ	
Annual Average Enrollment #	136	Monthly Average Enrollment #	23		
Comments	No administrative dollars are included in this funding				

Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
Program effectiveness surveys throughout year, Community needs Assessment surveys every 3 years	

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>STRENGTHS</b> of this program?
The assistance helps members avoid disconnection or with reconnection beyond what LIHEAP can cover.
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>WEAKNESSES</b> of this program?
Cap on the amount of grant per year. Households could use more than allowed with the higher utility bills. Lack of funding, we consistently run out of funds.
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 <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?
They do what they can. Some members only need one time. Others would be without power without it.

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.)?
Does not require a disconnect so it helps bridge gap of higher bills without waiting for crisis.
c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?
Non Ameren customers are not eligible for this program.
d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?
Funding caps and no administrative dollars included which results in not enough staff for demand
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?
Income-based caps and automatic enrollments

<b>Stakeholder Question 2: CRITERIA AND MECHANISMS FOR PROGRAM ENROLLMENT</b>	
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?	Energy burden households needs – vulnerable households (seniors, disabled, medically needy and households with children, low- income households, general energy burden households).
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?	200% FPL is consistent with other programs. Energy burden metric would allow more households in need to be served.
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?	Yes, that would cut down waiting times for consumers and administrative burden
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?	Random audits, data matching
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?	Program matches social security numbers which reduces chances of duplicating benefits per members household. Benefits are available to members on an annual basis. Data shows history of years of service. This prevents members from getting more benefits than they are eligible. There is oversight of supervisors of staff in the agency reviewing benefits and approval. Ameren then balances with agency’s pledges. System works well to prevent fraud and abuse.

<b>Stakeholder Question 3: CHALLENGES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN</b>	
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)?	Updated LIHEAP forms, short-form applications, online portals, single-point-of-entry systems.
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?	Statewide systems share eligibility and program utilization.
c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?	Use of LIHEAP applications for eligibility determination.

<b>Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION</b>
---

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?

<b>Stakeholder Question 5: RATE STRUCTURES AND ASSISTANCE SUCCESS</b>
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 <b>fixed charges</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
Fixed charges impact households of low income more than others. Even when they work to lower their usage, they are still charged certain fixed charges that they have no control over.
b2. How does the rate design element of <b>seasonal usage and rates</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
The seasonal usage and rates cause members to need assistance programs to prevent the disconnection of services. It is hard for members to be surprised by higher than budgeted utility bills. These higher seasonal rates cause budget billing members to end up owing at the end of the year when they reconcile usage.
b3. How does the rate design element of <b>time-variant pricing</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
It is difficult for members to do their laundry and dishes during certain times. With work schedules, they may have to use energy during peak times. They don't have as much flexibility as others.

<b>Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS AND REDUCING RELIANCE ON CRISIS ASSISTANCE</b>
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 leveled billing)
Debt forgiveness in exchange for on-time payments, monthly bill credits for energy cost burdened households, and budget billing.

<b>Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES</b>
Describe the implementation challenges that should be anticipated when launching new assistance programs.
Training in systems and program implementation with staff, additional administrative tasks, adequate staff for demand

**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

Provide information on the time and duration of administering program (for example: Weatherization – February 1976)

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
Ameren		Keeping Current/Keeping Cool			
Program Start Date	2010	Program End Date	Current	Total # Employ	0
Job Title 1		Duties		# Employ	
Job Title 2		Duties		# Employ	
Job Title 3		Duties		# Employ	
Annual Average Enrollment #	36	Monthly Average Enrollment #		5	
Comments	No administrative dollars are included in this funding				

Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
Program effectiveness surveys throughout year, Community needs Assessment surveys every 3 years	

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>STRENGTHS</b> of this program?
The assistance helps members avoid disconnection or with reconnection beyond what LIHEAP can cover.
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>WEAKNESSES</b> of this program?
Cap on the amount of grant per year. Households could use more than allowed with the higher utility bills. Lack of funding, we consistently run out of funds.
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 <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?
They do what they can. Some members only need one time. Others would be without power without it.
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.)?
Does not require a disconnect so it helps bridge gap of higher bills without waiting for crisis.
c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?

Non Ameren customers are not eligible for this program.
d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?
Funding caps and no administrative dollars included which results in not enough staff for demand
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?
Income-based caps and automatic enrollments

<b>Stakeholder Question 2: CRITERIA AND MECHANISMS FOR PROGRAM ENROLLMENT</b>	
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?	Energy burden households needs – vulnerable households (seniors, disabled, medically needy and households with children, low- income households, general energy burden households).
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?	200% FPL is consistent with other programs. Energy burden metric would allow more households in need to be served.
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?	Yes, that would cut down waiting times for consumers and administrative burden
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?	Random audits, data matching
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?	Program matches social security numbers which reduces chances of duplicating benefits per members household. Benefits are available to members on an annual basis. Data shows history of years of service. This prevents members from getting more benefits than they are eligible. There is oversight of supervisors of staff in the agency reviewing benefits and approval. Ameren then balances with agency’s pledges. System works well to prevent fraud and abuse.

<b>Stakeholder Question 3: CHALLENGES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN</b>	
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)?	Updated LIHEAP forms, short-form applications, online portals, single-point-of-entry systems.
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?	Statewide systems share eligibility and program utilization.
c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?	Use of LIHEAP applications for eligibility determination.

<b>Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION</b>	
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?

<b>Stakeholder Question 5: RATE STRUCTURES AND ASSISTANCE SUCCESS</b>
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 <b>fixed charges</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
Fixed charges impact households of low income more than others. Even when they work to lower their usage, they are still charged certain fixed charges that they have no control over.
b2. How does the rate design element of <b>seasonal usage and rates</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
The seasonal usage and rates cause members to need assistance programs to prevent the disconnection of services. It is hard for members to be surprised by higher than budgeted utility bills. These higher seasonal rates cause budget billing members to end up owing at the end of the year when they reconcile usage.
b3. How does the rate design element of <b>time-variant pricing</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
It is difficult for members to do their laundry and dishes during certain times. With work schedules, they may have to use energy during peak times. They don't have as much flexibility as others.

<b>Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS AND REDUCING RELIANCE ON CRISIS ASSISTANCE</b>
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 leveled billing)
Debt forgiveness in exchange for on-time payments, monthly bill credits for energy cost burdened households, and budget billing.

<b>Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES</b>
Describe the implementation challenges that should be anticipated when launching new assistance programs.
Training in systems and program implementation with staff, additional administrative tasks, adequate staff for demand

**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*

Provide information on the time and duration of administering program (for example: Weatherization – February 1976)

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
Ameren		Clean State			
Program Start Date	2020	Program End Date	Current	Total # Employ	0
Job Title 1		Duties		# Employ	
Job Title 2		Duties		# Employ	
Job Title 3		Duties		# Employ	
Annual Average Enrollment #	135	Monthly Average Enrollment #	21		
Comments	No administrative dollars are included in this funding				

Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
Program effectiveness surveys throughout year, Community needs Assessment surveys every 3 years	

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>STRENGTHS</b> of this program?
The assistance helps members avoid disconnection or with reconnection beyond what LIHEAP can cover.
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>WEAKNESSES</b> of this program?
Cap on the amount of grant per year. Households could use more than allowed with the higher utility bills. Lack of funding, we consistently run out of funds.
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 <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?
They do what they can. Some members only need one time. Others would be without power without it.
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.)?
Does not require a disconnect so it helps bridge gap of higher bills without waiting for crisis.
c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?
Non Ameren customers are not eligible for this program.
d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?
Funding caps and no administrative dollars included which results in not enough staff for demand
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?

Income-based caps and automatic enrollments

<b>Stakeholder Question 2: CRITERIA AND MECHANISMS FOR PROGRAM ENROLLMENT</b>	
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?	Energy burden households needs – vulnerable households (seniors, disabled, medically needy and households with children, low- income households, general energy burden households).
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?	200% FPL is consistent with other programs. Energy burden metric would allow more households in need to be served.
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?	Yes, that would cut down waiting times for consumers and administrative burden
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?	Random audits, data matching
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?	Program matches social security numbers which reduces chances of duplicating benefits per members household. Benefits are available to members on an annual basis. Data shows history of years of service. This prevents members from getting more benefits than they are eligible. There is oversight of supervisors of staff in the agency reviewing benefits and approval. Ameren then balances with agency’s pledges. System works well to prevent fraud and abuse.

<b>Stakeholder Question 3: CHALLENGES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN</b>	
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)?	Updated LIHEAP forms, short-form applications, online portals, single-point-of-entry systems.
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?	Statewide systems share eligibility and program utilization.
c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?	Use of LIEHAP applications for eligibility determination.

<b>Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION</b>	
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?

Fixed charges impact households of low income more than others. Even when they work to lower their usage, they are still charged certain fixed charges that they have no control over.

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

The seasonal usage and rates cause members to need assistance programs to prevent the disconnection of services. It is hard for members to be surprised by higher than budgeted utility bills. These higher seasonal rates cause budget billing members to end up owing at the end of the year when they reconcile usage.

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

It is difficult for members to do their laundry and dishes during certain times. With work schedules, they may have to use energy during peak times. They don't have as much flexibility as others.

**Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS AND 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 leveled billing)

Debt forgiveness in exchange for on-time payments, monthly bill credits for energy cost burdened households, and budget billing.

**Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES**

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

Training in systems and program implementation with staff, additional administrative tasks, adequate staff for demand

**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*

*Provide information on the time and duration of administering program (for example: Weatherization – February 1976)*

**Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION**

Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
		LIHEAP		DSS	
Program Start Date	1965	Program End Date	Current	Total # Employ	7

Job Title 1	Energy Program Manager	Duties	Oversee LIHEAP Department and Staff	# Employ	1
Job Title 2	Energy Assistant Specialist	Duties	Determine Eligibility and Process Applications	# Employ	5
Job Title 3	Energy Program Coordinator	Duties	Staff training, assist manager, staff and members, Ameren Special programs	# Employ	1
Annual Average Enrollment #	7,940	Monthly Average Enrollment #	954		
Comments	Season runs October-May for EA and November-September for Crisis ECIP				

Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
Program effectiveness surveys throughout year, Community needs Assessment surveys every 3 years	

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS	
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>STRENGTHS</b> of this program?	
The assistance helps members avoid disconnection or with reconnection beyond what LIHEAP can cover.	
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>WEAKNESSES</b> of this program?	
Cap on the amount of grant per year. Households could use more than allowed with the higher utility bills. Lack of funding, we consistently run out of funds.	
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 <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?	They do what they can. Some members only need one time. Others would be without power without it.
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.)?	Does not require a disconnect so it helps bridge gap of higher bills without waiting for crisis.
c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?	Non Ameren customers are not eligible for this program.
d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?	Funding caps and no administrative dollars included which results in not enough staff for demand
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?	Income-based caps and automatic enrollments

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?
Energy burden households needs – vulnerable households (seniors, disabled, medically needy and households with children, low- income households, general energy burden households).
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?
200% FPL is consistent with other programs. Energy burden metric would allow more households in need to be served.
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?
Yes, that would cut down waiting times for consumers and administrative burden
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?
Random audits, data matching
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?
Program matches social security numbers which reduces chances of duplicating benefits per members household. Benefits are available to members on an annual basis. Data shows history of years of service. This prevents members from getting more benefits than they are eligible. There is oversight of supervisors of staff in the agency reviewing benefits and approval. Ameren then balances with agency’s pledges. System works well to prevent fraud and abuse.

<b>Stakeholder Question 3: CHALLENGES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN</b>
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)?
Updated LIHEAP forms, short-form applications, online portals, single-point-of-entry systems.
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?
Statewide systems share eligibility and program utilization.
c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?
Use of LIHEAP applications for eligibility determination.

<b>Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION</b>
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 <b>fixed charges</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?	Fixed charges impact households of low income more than others. Even when they work to lower their usage, they are still charged certain fixed charges that they have no control over.
b2. How does the rate design element of <b>seasonal usage and rates</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?	The seasonal usage and rates cause members to need assistance programs to prevent the disconnection of services. It is hard for members to be surprised by higher than budgeted utility bills. These higher seasonal rates cause budget billing members to end up owing at the end of the year when they reconcile usage.
b3. How does the rate design element of <b>time-variant pricing</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?	It is difficult for members to do their laundry and dishes during certain times. With work schedules, they may have to use energy during peak times. They don't have as much flexibility as others.

Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS AND REDUCING RELIANCE ON CRISIS 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 leveled billing)	
	Debt forgiveness in exchange for on-time payments, monthly bill credits for energy cost burdened households, and budget billing.

Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES	
Describe the implementation challenges that should be anticipated when launching new assistance programs.	
	Training in systems and program implementation with staff, additional administrative tasks, adequate staff for demand

**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*

*Provide information on the time and duration of administering program (for example: Weatherization – February 1976)*

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
		Weatherization		MO Department of Department of Natural Resources	
Program Start Date	1965	Program End Date	Current	Total # Employ	3

Job Title 1	Housing Development Director	Duties	Oversees Weatherization Department	# Employ	1
Job Title 2	Weatherization Admin and Billing Coordinator	Duties	Outreach, Administrative and Billing	# Employ	1
Job Title 3	Weatherization Inspector	Duties	Housing audits	# Employ	1
Annual Average Enrollment #	100	Monthly Average Enrollment #	12		
Comments	Funding cuts will produce fewer homes being weatherized.				

Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
Program effectiveness surveys throughout year, Community needs Assessment surveys every 3 years	

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS	
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>STRENGTHS</b> of this program?	
The assistance helps members avoid disconnection or with reconnection beyond what LIHEAP can cover.	
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>WEAKNESSES</b> of this program?	
Cap on the amount of grant per year. Households could use more than allowed with the higher utility bills. Lack of funding, we consistently run out of funds.	
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 <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?	
They do what they can. Some members only need one time. Others would be without power without it. Weatherization is a long term solution to energy burden reduction.	
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.)?	
Does not require a disconnect so it helps bridge gap of higher bills without waiting for crisis.	
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.)?	
Funding caps and no administrative dollars included which results in not enough staff for demand	
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?	

Income-based caps and automatic enrollments

<b>Stakeholder Question 2: CRITERIA AND MECHANISMS FOR PROGRAM ENROLLMENT</b>	
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?	Energy burden households needs – vulnerable households (seniors, disabled, medically needy and households with children, low- income households, general energy burden households).
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?	200% FPL is consistent with other programs. Energy burden metric would allow more households in need to be served.
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?	Yes, that would cut down waiting times for consumers and administrative burden
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?	Random audits, data matching
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?	Program matches social security numbers which reduces chances of duplicating benefits per members household. Benefits are available to members on an annual basis. Data shows history of years of service. This prevents members from getting more benefits than they are eligible. There is oversight of supervisors of staff in the agency reviewing benefits and approval. Ameren then balances with agency’s pledges. System works well to prevent fraud and abuse.

<b>Stakeholder Question 3: CHALLENGES OF ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN</b>	
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)?	Updated LIHEAP forms, short-form applications, online portals, single-point-of-entry systems.
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?	Statewide systems share eligibility and program utilization.
c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?	Use of LIHEAP applications for eligibility determination.

<b>Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION</b>	
a. What metrics should be used to evaluate program performance, measure impacts, and assess cost-effectiveness?	# of households who experienced improved health and safety due to improvements within their home. # of households with improved energy efficiency and/or energy burden reduction in their homes.
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?

Fixed charges impact households of low income more than others. Even when they work to lower their usage, they are still charged certain fixed charges that they have no control over.

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

The seasonal usage and rates cause members to need assistance programs to prevent the disconnection of services. It is hard for members to be surprised by higher than budgeted utility bills. These higher seasonal rates cause budget billing members to end up owing at the end of the year when they reconcile usage.

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

It is difficult for members to do their laundry and dishes during certain times. With work schedules, they may have to use energy during peak times. They don't have as much flexibility as others.

#### Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS AND REDUCING RELIANCE ON CRISIS 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)

Debt forgiveness in exchange for on-time payments, monthly bill credits for energy cost burdened households, and budget billing.

#### Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES

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

Training in systems and program implementation with staff, additional administrative tasks, adequate staff for demand