

**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: 04/24/2026**



**West Central Missouri Community Action Agency**

**Mission:** West Central helps people and communities reach their fullest potential by cultivating and coordinating resources, building partnerships, and advocating for change.

**Vision:** West Central envisions a region where people and communities are thriving.

<b>Organization: West Central Missouri Community Action Agency</b>
<b>Name: Mary Lou Schussler</b>
<b>Title: Chief Executive Officer</b>
<b>Date of Submission: 04/24/2026</b>
<b>Provider? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please complete both Part A and Part B</b>
<b>Stakeholder only? <input type="checkbox"/> Please complete only Part B</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. LIHEAP</li> <li>2. Weatherization</li> <li>3. Keeping Current (Ameren)</li> <li>4. Dollar Aide (Evergy)</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	
Over 100 utility companies participate in our energy assistance programs. While major providers such as Evergy, Liberty, and Spire serve portions of the region, much of our nine-county rural service area relies on municipal utilities, electric cooperatives, propane suppliers, and wood suppliers. This diverse utility landscape significantly increases administrative coordination and compliance requirements.		LIHEAP-Energy Assistance and Emergency Crisis Intervention Program		The program is administered in partnership with the Missouri Department of Social Services (DSS) West Central Missouri Community Action Agency	
Program Start Date	10/01	Program End Date	09/30	Total # Employ	34 core administrative employees, supported by

					seasonal and additional Community Services staff during peak periods.
Job Title 1	Community Services Administrative Team (Director and Manager)	Duties	Provides overall program oversight, including regulatory and compliance responsibilities, financial management, vendor payments, and adherence to whistleblower and accountability requirements. This team ensures proper stewardship of public funds across multiple funding streams and utility partners.	# Empl oy	2
Job Title 2	LIHEAP Coordinator	Duties	Responsible for outreach and education, program coordination, process support, and crisis application oversight. This role also leads to implementation of bundled services, coordinating energy assistance with additional supports such as food, housing, and workforce services.	# Empl oy	1
Job Title 3	LIHEAP Specialists	Duties	Provide day-to-day service delivery of energy assistance programs, including application intake and processing under strict timelines. This role involves high-volume participant communication through phone, email, text, mail, and in-person meetings, particularly during peak seasons when households are in crisis.	# Empl oy	1 full-time staff member and 2 seasonal staff members
Annual Average Enrollment #		6,500+/- applications	Monthly Average Enrollment #		1,000
Comments	Enrollment numbers depend on fund availability. We share results when requested and through our annual report for all programs.				

<b>Provider Question 2: EVALUATION FOR EFFECTIVENESS</b>	
Do you conduct surveys to gauge effectiveness of this utility assistance program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>
Do you conduct any non-survey evaluations to gauge effectiveness of this program?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies? <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
<p>West Central conducts customer satisfaction surveys to assess the effectiveness of our all programs including utility assistance programs, with a primary focus on participant experience and access to services. Survey responses consistently highlight strong appreciation for the program, with many households expressing deep gratitude and noting that without this assistance they would not know how they would keep utilities connected or remain stable during times of crisis.</p> <p>At the same time, the feedback also surfaces repeat themes of frustration—particularly around delays and limited ability to connect directly with staff as quickly or frequently as participants would like. These</p>	

concerns reflect the reality of a very high volume of applications and inquiries being managed by a small number of staff, especially during peak seasons. While participants value the program and its impact, the surveys help illustrate the strain placed on both households seeking urgent assistance and the limited workforce administering the program.

This feedback is used internally to better understand participant experience, identify pressure points within service delivery, and reinforce the need for adequate staffing and administrative capacity to meet growing demand while maintaining compliance and customer service standards.

### Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the **STRENGTHS** of this program?

Energy assistance programs play a critical role in stabilizing households facing rising utility costs, particularly in rural areas and among households with fixed or limited incomes. Across participants served, these programs effectively prevent utility disconnections and support housing stability during periods of financial stress. Participant feedback consistently reflects that energy assistance provides immediate relief and helps households remain safely housed, especially seniors, people with disabilities, and families with children.

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the **WEAKNESSES** of this program?

From an administrative and program design perspective, a key weakness is the program's standardized benefit structure, which does not fully account for the wide variability in household circumstances, utility costs, and risk factors. Households with similar incomes may face vastly different utility burdens depending on housing type, fuel source, regional provider, and health or accessibility needs. In particular, the LIHEAP structure prioritizes crisis response, with initial benefits limited and additional assistance often unavailable unless a household is in threat or disconnection status. While effective for emergency intervention, this limits the program's ability to support prevention and sustained stability, which providers consistently identify as a gap. As a result, agencies across the network must work within rigid eligibility and benefit parameters established at the program level to serve households with high and ongoing need—especially elderly and disabled individuals on fixed incomes—despite escalating utility costs statewide.

If you have it, please provide empirical and/or anecdotal data that support your comments.

Agency-wide customer satisfaction surveys consistently show strong appreciation for energy assistance, with participants reporting that the support helped them avoid disconnection and maintain safe housing. At the same time, staff observations and application data reflect recurring patterns of unmet or partially met need due to standardized benefit limits and eligibility thresholds. These trends are most evident during peak seasons, when demand increases, and households with fixed incomes face compounding cost pressures.

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
Ameren		Keeping Current		West Central Missouri Community Action Agency	
Program Start Date	NA	Program End Date	NA	Total # Employ	2-3
Job Title 1	Community Services Manager and Director	Duties	Provides overall program oversight, including regulatory and compliance responsibilities, financial management, vendor payments, and adherence to whistleblower and accountability requirements. This team ensures proper stewardship of public funds across multiple funding streams and utility partners.	# Employ	1
Job Title 2	LIHEAP Coordinator	Duties	Responsible for outreach and education, program coordination, process support, and crisis application oversight. This role also leads to implementation of bundled services, coordinating energy assistance with additional support such as food, housing, and workforce services.	# Employ	1
Job Title 3	LIHEAP Specialist	Duties	Provide day-to-day service delivery of energy assistance programs, including application intake and processing under strict timelines. This role involves high-volume participant communication through phone, email, text, mail, and in-person meetings, particularly during peak seasons when households are in crisis.	# Employ	1
Annual Average Enrollment #		5-15	Monthly Average Enrollment #		Fluctuates
Comments	Enrollment numbers depend on fund availability. We share results when requested and through our annual report for all programs.				

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies? <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	
<p>West Central conducts customer satisfaction surveys to assess the effectiveness of our all programs including utility assistance programs, with a primary focus on participant experience and access to services. Survey responses consistently highlight strong appreciation for the program, with many households expressing deep gratitude and noting that without this assistance they would not know how they would keep utilities connected or remain stable during times of crisis.</p> <p>At the same time, the feedback also surfaces repeat themes of frustration—particularly around delays and limited ability to connect directly with staff as quickly or frequently as participants would like. These concerns reflect the reality of a very high volume of applications and inquiries being managed by a small</p>	

number of staff, especially during peak seasons. While participants value the program and its impact, the surveys help illustrate the strain placed on both households seeking urgent assistance and the limited workforce administering the program.

This feedback is used internally to better understand participant experience, identify pressure points within service delivery, and reinforce the need for adequate staffing and administrative capacity to meet growing demand while maintaining compliance and customer service standards.

Provider Question 1: PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION					
Utility Company		Program Name		State Agency Partner	
Evergy		Dollar Aide and Dollar Aide Credits		West Central Missouri Community Actio Agency	
Program Start Date	NA	Program End Date	NA	Total # Employ	3-4
Job Title 1	Community Services Manager and Director	Duties	Provides overall program oversight, including regulatory and compliance responsibilities, financial management, vendor payments, and adherence to whistleblower and accountability requirements. This team ensures proper stewardship of public funds across multiple funding streams and utility partners.	# Employ	1-2
Job Title 2	LIHEAP Coordinator	Duties	Responsible for outreach and education, program coordination, process support, and crisis application oversight. This role also leads to implementation of bundled services, coordinating energy assistance with additional support such as food, housing, and workforce services.	# Employ	1
Job Title 3	LIHEAP Specialist(s)	Duties	Provide day-to-day service delivery of energy assistance programs, including application intake and processing under strict timelines. This role involves high-volume participant communication through phone, email, text, mail, and in-person meetings, particularly during peak seasons when households are in crisis.	# Employ	1-2
Annual Average Enrollment #		15-30	Monthly Average Enrollment #		1-5
Comments	Enrollment numbers depend on fund availability. We share results when requested and through our annual report for all programs.				

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Do you share the results...with utility partners? <b>Yes</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ...with state agencies? <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Yes</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>No</b>	
If you conduct surveys or other evaluations, please explain the process you use.	

West Central conducts customer satisfaction surveys to assess the effectiveness of our all programs including utility assistance programs, with a primary focus on participant experience and access to services. Survey responses consistently highlight strong appreciation for the program, with many households expressing deep gratitude and noting that without this assistance they would not know how they would keep utilities connected or remain stable during times of crisis.

At the same time, the feedback also surfaces repeat themes of frustration—particularly around delays and limited ability to connect directly with staff as quickly or frequently as participants would like. These concerns reflect the reality of a very high volume of applications and inquiries being managed by a small number of staff, especially during peak seasons. While participants value the program and its impact, the surveys help illustrate the strain placed on both households seeking urgent assistance and the limited workforce administering the program.

This feedback is used internally to better understand participant experience, identify pressure points within service delivery, and reinforce the need for adequate staffing and administrative capacity to meet growing demand while maintaining compliance and customer service standards.

**Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the **STRENGTHS** of this program?

A key strength of the Dollar Aide program is its flexibility and ability to provide timely, targeted assistance to households facing utility-related financial hardship. Dollar Aide is especially effective in addressing gaps not fully met by larger or more restrictive assistance programs, allowing staff to respond quickly to individual household circumstances. Another strength is the ease of integration with existing agency service delivery, which allows Dollar Aide to be used alongside other energy or housing stabilization programs. This flexibility supports coordinated case management and helps agencies tailor assistance to prevent service disruption or escalation to crisis situations. Participant feedback also indicates that Dollar Aide provides meaningful, immediate relief, reducing stress, and supporting short-term household stability. From an administrative standpoint, West Central values the program’s clear purpose and practical impact, which makes it a reliable tool for addressing urgent needs while maintaining compliance and accountability.

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the **WEAKNESSES** of this program?

A primary weakness of Dollar Aide is the administrative burden associated with eligibility verification, documentation, and compliance requirements relative to the limited level of assistance available. There are zero administrative dollars to support the program. The program is also restricted to Evergy customers only, which limits its usefulness as West Central serves households with other utility providers. Additionally, the requirement that participants make a payment within 90 days to qualify presents a significant barrier, as many households seek assistance while already under threat of disconnect and are financially unable to make the required payment, resulting in otherwise eligible participants being denied assistance.

If you have it, please provide empirical and/or anecdotal data that support your comments.

From agency experience, Dollar Aide requires a disproportionate level of administrative effort relative to the limited assistance provided, including required training, documentation, and compliance steps.

Agencies also regularly encounter eligibility barriers due to the program being limited to Every customers, resulting in otherwise eligible households being turned away.

Anecdotally, staff report that most participants seek assistance when already under threat of disconnect, at which point the requirement that clients make a payment within 90 days becomes a significant barrier. Additionally, the maximum benefit amount is often insufficient to cover disconnect balances, which are frequently very high by the time households seek help. In many cases, even when Dollar Aide is combined with ECIP, the total assistance is not enough to prevent disconnection, particularly for households with significant arrearages or prolonged financial hardship.

**Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS**

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the **STRENGTHS** of this program?

One of the program’s primary strengths is its focus on long-term utility stability rather than crisis intervention. Participants consistently report that Keeping Current helps them stay current on their Ameren utility bills over time, preventing recurring disconnection cycles and reducing the stress associated with arrearages. This proactive structure supports households in establishing more sustainable payment patterns rather than relying solely on emergency assistance programs.

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the **WEAKNESSES** of this program?

A key weakness of the Keeping Current program is limited accessibility due to capped enrollment and periodic enrollment pauses, which can prevent eligible households from receiving assistance before reaching crisis. Because the program is not designed as an emergency intervention, households facing immediate shutoff must rely on other resources, creating service gaps. From an administrative perspective, program rule changes, enrollment pauses, and re-enrollment timelines can be difficult for participants to understand, often increasing clarification, case coordination, and follow-up responsibilities for local agencies. Additionally, the program’s structured payment requirements can be challenging for households with unstable incomes or unexpected life disruptions, sometimes limiting successful completion despite ongoing need.

If you have it, please provide empirical and/or anecdotal data that support your comments.

From an agency perspective, launching new assistance programs often strains staff capacity and administrative workload, as training, intake, eligibility verification, data entry, and communication occur simultaneously. System and process alignment challenges, including limited integration with existing programs, can increase manual work and delays. Additionally, clear communication with participants can be difficult during early rollout, and demand frequently exceeds initial funding or enrollment capacity, limiting timely access to assistance.

**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.

<b>Stakeholder Question 1: EFFECTIVENESS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS AT REDUCING ARREARAGES AND DISCONNECTIONS FOR HIGH-BURDEN HOUSEHOLDS</b>	
<b>a. How much do <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?</b>	Existing programs are highly effective at providing short-term crisis relief, such as preventing utility disconnections or restoring service during periods of immediate hardship. However, their impact on long-term household stability is more limited. Because assistance is often tied to emergency thresholds or one-time benefits, many households continue to experience recurring arrearages once assistance is exhausted. As a result, programs tend to interrupt crises rather than fully prevent repeat cycles of financial strain for high-burden households.
<b>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.)?</b>	Program features that offer predictability and flexibility are generally most effective at stabilizing households. These include income-based payment structures, arrearage forgiveness, hardship protections, and coordination with other supportive services. Approaches that reduce volatility—such as predictable assistance levels or protections that prevent immediate disconnection—help households better manage ongoing costs, particularly when paired with broader supports addressing food, housing, or income instability.
<b>c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?</b>	Households with high energy burdens and limited disposable income are often underserved by existing programs, even when technically eligible. This includes families earning below a living wage, households facing high cost-of-living pressures, and those balancing utilities alongside other basic needs such as food, housing, and transportation. Elderly and disabled households on fixed incomes are particularly impacted, as rising utility costs outpace income adjustments. Families with irregular income streams or overlapping financial stressors may also struggle to maintain stability within current program structures.
<b>d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?</b>	Risk management should rely on post-enrollment verification, targeted or random audits, and data-matching across programs, rather than placing heavy documentation requirements on applicants at the point of entry. These approaches support program integrity while maintaining accessibility for eligible households. Designing oversight mechanisms that occur behind the scenes allows households to receive timely assistance without unnecessary delays, while still safeguarding public funds.
<b>e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?</b>	Effective program design balances accountability with access by using standardized data systems, cross-program data sharing, clear eligibility rules, and consistent benefit tracking. Streamlined enrollment processes, automatic eligibility where appropriate, and coordinated intake across assistance programs

reduce duplication and administrative errors. Investing in administrative capacity and data infrastructure is widely recognized as a best practice for preventing fraud while ensuring eligible households can access assistance efficiently and with dignity.

**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: 04/24/2026**



**West Central Missouri Community Action Agency**

**Mission:** West Central helps people and communities reach their fullest potential by cultivating and coordinating resources, building partnerships, and advocating for change.

**Vision:** West Central envisions a region where people and communities are thriving.

<b>Organization: West Central Missouri Community Action Agency</b>
<b>Name: Chris Richardson-McQueen</b>
<b>Title: Chief Housing Enrichment Officer</b>
<b>Date of Submission: 5/11/2026</b>
<b>Provider? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Please complete both Part A and Part B</b>
<b>Stakeholder only? <input type="checkbox"/> Please complete only Part B</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. Weatherization</li> <li>2. Home Repair</li> <li>3.</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	
Everty MO West, Everty MO Metro, Liberty Gas, Liberty Electric, Liberty Mid-States, Ameren Electric, Ameren Gas, Spire		Weatherization		DNR	
Program Start Date	1976	Program End Date	Currently Operating	Total # Employ	11
Job Title 1	Administrative	Duties	Certification, recertification, invoices, data entry	# Employ	4
Job Title 2	Auditor/QCI	Duties	Audits, inspections, supervise crew	# Employ	2
Job Title 3	Crew	Duties	Weatherize homes	# Employ	5
Annual Average Enrollment #	72	Monthly Average Enrollment #	6		
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? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" 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.	
Monitor CFM reduction identified through a blower door reading on each home.	

Provider Question 3: STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
--

Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>STRENGTHS</b> of this program?
Utility savings, health and safety repairs, providing heat in the winter months and air conditioning in the summer months for people with disabilities, available money for weatherization readiness work
Based on experience and participant feedback, what are the <b>WEAKNESSES</b> of this program?
Getting applicants to submit required paperwork. Lack of connection between Weatherization and Energy Assistance. The NEAT/MHEA system recommendations are questionable at times.
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.

<b>Stakeholder Question 1: EFFECTIVENESS OF EXISTING PROGRAMS AT REDUCING ARREARAGES AND DISCONNECTIONS FOR HIGH-BURDEN HOUSEHOLDS</b>
a. How much do <b>existing programs</b> help improve long-term household stability versus one-time crisis relief (i.e. reduce repeat disconnects)?
Weatherization does by lowering utility bills.
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.)?
See Jamie’s response.
c. What customer categories (e.g., irregular income, medical debt, unbanked, etc.) are currently underserved or excluded by existing programs?
I don’t understand the question.
d. What aspects of existing programs limit or reduce effectiveness (e.g., funding caps, restrictive eligibility windows, administrative barriers, etc.)?
The expense of SEER upgrades
e. What specific modifications or alternative models (e.g., income-based caps or automatic enrollment) could close identified gaps?
One application for LiHEAP and WAP.

<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?
Unknown
b. What income thresholds, vulnerability indicators, or energy burden metrics to determine program eligibility?
Unknown
c. Would automatic or categorical enrollment be effective?
Yes
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?
Conduct a 10 sample each year. Request utility data and return to do a follow-up energy audit.
e. What program design elements can be included that prevent fraud, collecting duplicate benefits, or mismanagement while maintaining accessibility for eligible households?
Unknown

<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)?
Online portal and single point of entry – sign up for WAP and LiHEAP at the same time.
b. What program design elements would reduce administrative workload while maintaining accurate eligibility determinations?
The amount of data that is uploaded to MoWAP. HUD doesn’t require that documents are uploaded; we are only required to certify that the information on the Owner’s Certification of Compliance with HUD’s Tenant Eligibility and Rent Procedures is accurate.

c. What strategies from other jurisdictions that have effectively reduced verification or recertification barriers?
Allow for 100% electronic files.

<b>Stakeholder Question 4: METRICS AND EVALUATION</b>
a. What metrics should be used to evaluate program performance, measure impacts, and assess cost-effectiveness?
Utility bill comparison, CFM reduction, # of health and safety repairs
b. What metrics should be used to evaluate the effectiveness of marketing, education, and outreach efforts?
Number of applications. Surveys are generally ineffective and a waste of administrative resources.
c. What customer-experience metrics should be used to evaluate program accessibility, clarity, and ease of navigation, including the application, verification, and enrollment processes?
10% client sampling
d. What metrics should be used to evaluate whether verification requirements are appropriately calibrated to risk?
DNR annual monitoring
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?
Unknown due to available resources

<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?
Unknown
B31. How does the rate design element of <b>fixed charges</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
Unknown
b2. How does the rate design element of <b>seasonal usage and rates</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
Unknown
b3. How does the rate design element of <b>time-variant pricing</b> affect households with limited or no income flexibility?
Unknown

<b>Stakeholder Question 6: EFFECTIVENESS AND REDUCING RELIANCE ON CRSIS 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 levelized billing)
Unknown

<b>Stakeholder Question 7: IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES</b>
Describe the implementation challenges that should be anticipated when launching new assistance programs.
Hiring and training staff.