

WEAF Advisory Group

Agenda

January 25, 2023

KEY TOPICS: Status check on new WEAF calculator and changes effective 1/22/23, Rate Discount and Arrearage Management Program design.

GOALS FOR MEETING OUTCOME: Ensure all is going well with WEAF changes and new calculator, address any issues or questions, finalize 1 – 2 key decisions for new program design.

Key Decisions or General Agreements from 1/25/23 meeting:

The group agreed we will utilize the tier structure listed below.

T1	0-25% FPL, 0-10% AMI
T2	26-50% FPL, 11-20% AMI
T3	51-100% FPL, 21-40% AMI
T4	101-150% FPL, 41-60% AMI
T5	151-200% FPL, 61-80% AMI

There was general agreement among the group on the following:

- Customer self-attestation of income, HH size, etc.
- Establishing a post-qualification verification process.
- Post-qualification verification process likely to be conducted by the Community Action Agencies.

1. Status check on new WEAF calculator and changes – Dan Tillis

Tillis, Daniel -We wanted to check in to see how things are going with the changes and the new calculator that went into effect on January 22nd. The calculator really should be taking care of the changes for the agencies as far as the minimum of \$125, max of \$625, the 25% adder and incorporating 80% AMI. So, let's start with the agencies - How are things going? Any questions? Any issues?

Lorena Shah - I think from our perspective, it's going fine. We are working on our individual one. We've been going back and forth with Chris to identify a couple of additions that have come out. But, I think all is going well at least from Opportunity Council.

Tillis, Daniel - OK, great.

Mickelson, Christopher - How about your internal calculator? I know we provided some feedback on that, has that been incorporated?

Lorena Shah -Yes, Jen incorporated those. The errors that you found in ours, yes. I don't know if she's fully deployed it yet, but she's been working on those.

Mickelson, Christopher - Ok

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit - We are using the one you gave us until Jen gets the one fully incorporated. It's working fine.

Mickelson, Christopher - Good to hear.

Tillis, Daniel - OK, great.

Candi Jaeger - I've not heard anything that it's not working. I think it's working just fine with us too.

Tillis, Daniel - Great. Thank you, Candi, Marie, and Lorena. Hopefully we've seen some higher pledges with the 25% addition and have seen some hit the \$625 max instead of the \$500.00.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit - So now that we're using the new calculator, when could we expect getting the information from you guys on all the prior customers that are going to get the increases?

Tillis, Daniel - Great question. I was going to ask Shannon if she could provide a status update on how we're doing on those calculations and spreadsheets.

Steed, Shannon - It's in process, but you will get a list of your clients or customers for your agency. I'll let you know when those are coming out.

Tillis, Daniel - OK. Any other feedback or questions on any of the changes or the calculator? No

2. Design of rate discount and arrearage management programs (see below) – Byron Pfordte

Tillis, Daniel - This really is a massive topic obviously and now that prior year changes are behind us and in place, we'd really like to turn our attention and the larger full advisory group's attention, to designing and developing the new rate discount program, and hopefully the new arrearage management program that would replace WEAf, and whatever we end up calling the two programs, separately or combined. With that, I asked Byron Pfordte on my team to provide a summary of what was discussed since he led the conversation for us during the last meeting, where there was fairly extensive discussion on program design. One to refresh everyone's memory and then I think we can go from there and decide what we want to discuss today. It might be a continuation of some of those items that were discussed last time and try to get to decision points, or it could be a different topic. I did put the list of topics to discuss related to those programs in the agenda. One of the goals we have for the meeting is to maybe finalize one or two key decisions for the new program design, so hopefully we can get to that as well. Lori and I do need to drop off the meeting a little bit early today, but you all can continue the discussion if it's still ongoing, and we'll catch up later. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Byron.

Pfordte, Byron - I'm sharing what we discussed. We talked about tier levels a little bit in our last meeting and Chris shared these with me today. He shared the Tiers. These are the two proposed tier levels. We had SMI in there at some point and those have all been changed to reflect AMI as you can see in the first set of tiers.

Tillis, Daniel – There are some key differences. One is the ranges are a little different on FPL between the two. The second one only incorporates AMI once you get to that 151% to 200% FPL tier. So those are really the two differences between the design.

Yochi Zakai - I think that first I'll just say the second one is what Avista agreed to as its tiers. So, I think that's where that came from as we were just providing an example of what Avista will be using. And

then I think the first set is probably a modified version of what Cascade proposed earlier. Does that sound right?

Pfordte, Byron - Yes.

Yochi Zakai - I guess I would recommend that we focus our first decision on the similarity with the calculator we just rolled out. We decided to have the benefit curve fixed for the entire service area, even though the eligibility cap varies based by county. So that approach is kind of like the second grouping there, where you're just using FPL to determine the benefit tier. While in the first option, you're using both area median income and FPL to determine the tier. So, I think that's probably a good first decision - do we want to have the tiers fixed for the entire service territory, or do we want it to vary based on area median income? If I can suggest we try to tackle that specific item first.

Pfordte, Byron - Chris, correct me if I'm wrong, but with the second group of tiers the calculator is a bit simpler, correct? There are less inputs needed, is that correct?

Mickelson, Christopher - So for either one from a calculator standpoint, when we implement it, it will be simpler, and that's partly because we don't really need a benefit curve. When you fall into a tier, you're getting a flat discount amount, so either one will be simpler to apply. If anything, the first option would be more accurate and provide the most benefit to the most people.

Yochi Zakai - And can you say a little bit about why you think that?

Mickelson, Christopher - Because you're having the ability between FPL and AMI and so some customers, and we've seen this in Oregon, where maybe a customer would be at 26% FPL, but they really kind of fall in between. There's kind of these in between boundaries where they would be considered 10% AMI. And, so in that instance they would get the higher benefit of the AMI versus the second-tier benefit of an FPL. We've noticed this where they are right on that edge of that range. Where you go from 1 tier to the next - hopefully that makes sense.

Roberts, Andrew (UTC) - If the AMI tier is wider, why is there an FPL option as well?

Mickelson, Christopher - Well, it's not always that AMI will be wider. Sometimes the FPL will be a better option. It varies by county, so your higher cost counties AMI will be wider in your lower cost counties, your FPL will be wider. So, it kind of depends which counties you're looking at.

Roberts, Andrew (UTC) - OK. Thank you.

Corey Dahl (PCU-he/him) (Guest) – Taking a look at specific examples of how much customers would be receiving with either of these options, I would agree that the first one. It looks to be the more comprehensive in terms of the coverage it would provide, particularly looking at the range of incomes included in tier one, which would be the largest discount that would be offered to customers, so that that's my first impression. But, obviously interested in hearing more from others.

Charlee Thompson - That's a good point, Corey. I was trying to figure out how to say that because I was looking at that second grouping that I think came from Avista. And if we did go that route, I was going to bring up maybe increasing the first tier from zero to 5% to maybe the zero to 25% proposed in the tier one and the top grouping. But I think I agree having the more comprehensive FPL versus AMI. It sounds

like it's not any more difficult on Cascade to add that functionality? Also, curious to hear what other people think, but I do like the zero to 25% as opposed to the zero to 5% in Tier 1.

Yochi Zakai - So if I can guide our conversation a little bit, I want to encourage us to let's start with the structural decision of should we include AMI or not, before we move on to what the exact level should be. Hopefully we can accomplish at the very least that today if not more.

Tillis, Daniel - Yeah, I think that's fair. If you're looking for votes, my vote would be for the top recommendation with the FPL and AMI included at each tier level.

Pfordte, Byron - That is what sparked this whole conversation to begin with, right? We had SMI included and the goal was to include AMI, so if that is the goal of this group, then I don't know how much more effective you can be than the AMI tiers that we have presented.

Lorena Shah - I would agree, I like the idea of it being kind of household of 1. We're looking at 150% of FPL, or 200% of FPL, or 80% AMI, whichever is higher for that household size. That's how we describe that in our other programs that share income eligible or income guidelines. Thank you for explaining how the top one is and can be more expansive and include more people. So, for that reason if it's not more complicated to install an AMI calculator, I am in favor of the top one at this point. Meaning the income part of it.

Pfordte, Byron - So anybody opposed to using AMI in that top tier or group of tiers?

Yochi Zakai - I'd love to hear from some of the CAAs and anyone from the agencies who joined. Misty put in the chat that she's supportive as well of using AMI so.

Pfordte, Byron - I don't hear anybody voicing any concerns against it so we'll move forward with that and on to the next topic.

Shannon and I met with Avista, and they've broken a little more ground in this area than we have, thus far. They did a couple of tests which I found interesting, and I'll share with you what they shared with us. They reached out to customers who have not received assistance in the past but had a past due balance and did direct mail and contact with these customers. They found that only 4% of who they reached out to actually called or reached out to an agency or the utility directly for assistance. So, they were surprised by the very low return rate. Alternatively, they are sending weekly reports to agencies of customers enrolled by the utility and that they found has been much more effective. And, as we know we look to make sure that anybody contacting the utility directly for a bill assistance is also being introduced and exposed to agency funding and programs. I do like the approach, and it wouldn't be an issue for us to share who we enroll on a weekly basis, I think we had talked about that briefly in the last meeting. I did have some concerns about the extent of the information that we would share back and forth like names, phone number and contact information for customers enrolled, certainly wouldn't be an issue. I do have concerns about sharing anything else or collecting anything from our customers outside of what we would need to enroll them in our services. I've had talks with our internal security groups and they have concerns with storing information and we will continue to look at ways to securely do so, but we have a responsibility, obviously to make sure that anything we collect from our customers stays secure and so a lot of the demographic and socioeconomic questions or data that we've discussed possibly collecting, really adds quite a bit of burden to a utility that isn't normally in the business of collecting this sort of information. I am all for a weekly report to the agencies letting you know who has

reached out to us for assistance, so the agency can reach out and approach these customers with funding. And I'm open to any other ideas for how to cross promote these programs.

Yochi Zakai – If we don't collect some demographic data, then how can we track if we are actually serving the vulnerable populations that would be identified by collecting the customers demographic data?

Pfordte, Byron - Correct me if I'm wrong here, but to qualify for LIHEAP or any of the federal funding, the agency has to collect that information firsthand from the customer to enroll. Then it's my understanding is that they can't use the information we provide anyway to qualify a customer. Am I correct in that?

Yochi Zakai - I'm not talking about qualification in other programs. I'm talking about tracking the success of the bill discount rate in serving specific vulnerable populations. My point is, if you don't track who you're serving, then you can't tell if you're doing a good job of serving the vulnerable populations that the program is designed to reach.

Pfordte, Byron - Based on self-attestation and then doing these audits, I think that is where we will rely on whether or not these programs are actually serving the population that they should. I just hesitate to, I have issues with the utility collecting citizenship information, insurance information, social security, etc.

Tillis, Daniel - Couple things here, I think we've jumped ahead. I appreciate Byron sharing that information that he gathered from Avista and his thoughts on it. I think that's a great topic for future discussion, and it gives us some information to consider. I think we'd like to figure out a way where we can securely collect certain types of information. I do think there is certain information that we likely will not want to collect, and Byron just referenced a couple of those, like anything related to the customer's medical situation. I think where we wanted to go next was the actual ranges within each tier. So, let's take that step back, we want to confirm that we all decided as a group that we will have five tiers, with FPL and AMI included for each tier, correct? Yochi - if I understood you correctly, your suggestion was to then talk about the actual ranges themselves for each tier, try to maybe get to a decision on those today or at least close to that if possible. And then probably the next logical decision would be trying to figure out what the discount level at each tier might be that's missing from this information right now. So, if it's OK with the group, I think talking about those ranges might be next step. Byron, I appreciate the Information and I think it gives us food for thought for a future meeting. I would like to get a couple of these tiers settled.

Pfordte, Byron - I'm sorry, I thought we had agreed on that and moved on. My apologies if I jumped ahead.

Tillis, Daniel - No, that's OK. We agreed on the top structure. We just wanted to go to the ranges within each tier and with that does anybody have an opinion on what's on here already for the ranges. Any particular one you don't like, or you do like – I'll open it up for the group.

Yochi Zakai - Well, I'll start off by saying they think you're right, Dan, in that looking at the discount that will be applied to the bill is probably something that at least I'd like to set the income tiers and the discount percentage at the same time so that there is a tradeoff between the two. If you're only serving the lowest in your first tier, is it really focused on low income, you can feel more comfortable having a

really, really high discount for there. On the other hand, if it's a broader group, you might want the discount to be a little less, and I think that's kind of true with every tier. And so, the decision at least in my mind are the income level and the percentage of discount are intertwined.

Charlee Thompson - I agree with that Yochi.

Tillis, Daniel - That makes sense. Chris, did we have a recommendation with that top structure we're going with for the AMI and FPL on every tier level to share?

Mickelson, Christopher – No, not based off a 5 tier structure. I mean we did have what we proposed last year but that was based off of a four tier structure. We would have to re-evaluate to see what adding a fifth tier and what those kinds of numbers would look like.

Tillis, Daniel - OK. So then we're probably not ready to talk about the ranges then since we don't have the discounts to share.

Charlee Thompson – Would it help to share what Avista has proposed for those five tiers that they had?

Tillis, Daniel – They're going with the same structure. For the AMI and FPL on every tier level, did we have that already to share?

Mickelson, Christopher – No, not based off of a 5 tier structure. I mean we did have what we proposed last year but that was based off of a 4 tier structure. So, we would have to reevaluate to see adding a fifth tier and what those numbers would look like.

Tillis, Daniel – OK, so then we're probably not ready to talk about the ranges then since we don't have the discounts to share.

Charlee Thompson - Would it help at all to share what Avista has proposed for those five tiers that they had. We might have a number to work off of for the top set.

Mickelson, Christopher - 94% for tier 1, 75% for Tier 2, 35% for Tier 3, 20% for Tier 4 and 15% for tier 5.

Charlee Thompson - I think Yochi what you were saying was, like Avista's first Tier 0 to 5% and they have a really high discount at 94, which is great. But if we're now considering a 0 to 25% range, do we still want it to be like at around that 94% or because it's broad or do we want it to be 90% or something else?

Lorena Shah - One other point of clarification that might be helpful, and it may just be a reminder for me – in the new model that will be coming up in October, the rate discount will go away and there will be an arrearage management plan of some sort that will be working as needed in conjunction with the build discount rate. Is that correct?

Tillis, Daniel - That's the recommendation from Cascade.

Lorena Shah - OK, there will no longer be a WEAFF type bill assistance program anymore to consider cause with PSE, we're considering the two together. And I just want to make sure we are talking really only about the bill discount rate is going to be the main mechanism for reducing bills and the AMP will come in as necessary for people that have.

Tillis, Daniel - Correct.

Lorena Shah - Arrearages is not to be considered as a part of the overall benefit to the client in a future focused way.

Tillis, Daniel – Yes. So just the way we have things structured in Oregon right now for example, starting this past October 1st is that one calculator determines, based on customers income level, household size and arrearage amount. Current arrearage amount determines whether or not they qualify for an OLIBA discount in Oregon, which is very similar to WEA. So, an arrearage management pledge would offset either part or all of their current past due balance. Then, at the same time whatever tier, if any, they qualify for the rate discount and that's the way the company envisions it working in Washington as well, with maybe some minor differences, but that that's what we would like to have happen, yes.

And Chris, correct me if I'm wrong, the ranges at least for FPL that are there, and the initial 4 tiers, were informed by the low income needs assessment conducted by Forefront Economics for us. And I'm assuming Chris, you probably took that and tried to still massage it into the 5 tier ranges as well. Is that fair?

Mickelson, Christopher - Correct. And the same with AMI, but they don't go as granular. So, kind of going back to what Yochi was indicating, if we change it to smaller tiers, we may not have that granular information currently to be able to kind of analyze - we'd be making some assumptions, I'll put it that way.

Yochi Zakai - I think no matter what we do, we're going to be making some assumptions here. But I would appreciate the next time we have a discussion about the tiers, if the company wanted to try to use what data is available to you, I think that would be good. And I can commit for TEP to go back and think some more. The one thing that I have been thinking of that I know isn't super helpful, but, is a principle that I have been thinking of is, the significant overlap with PSE service territory, if it might makes sense to also think about coordinating the tiers and discount levels with PSE still in the design phase, they haven't figured this out either. I'm not saying they have to be exactly the same, but of course, one thing that comes to mind for ease of explanation to customers who are dual fuel with PSE, is that if there was a little bit of overlap that might be nice, but not a requirement for sure.

And the other thing I wanted to mention, just because we touched on the arrearage management plan as well, and this is definitely a more free flowing agenda than I was anticipating, we could drill down and now really focus on one topic that when we've been able to prepare but TEP envisions n Arrearage management program that would provide a certain percentage of forgiveness after on time payments, so if you've got 12, if you're going to do full forgiveness after 12 months, then you might forgive 1/12th of the past due balance on each payment. And I think that I would consider a kind of a more traditional type of arrearage management program is different than what the company had proposed before and that was just to give you some insight. One of the reasons why I was a little uncomfortable with the name AMP to what you were using before because that doesn't meet kind of what I see in the literature as the definition of the traditional arrearage management plan, and so one of the things that we'll have to consider is the design of an arrearage management plan and exactly what we want it to look like, and TEP's hoping that it can be more of what I described along the lines of, what I would consider a traditional arrearage management plan.

Tillis, Daniel - Once we get close to finalizing our structure for rate discount program, I think we will want to dive into the arrearage assistance program that we're going to develop. I know that there's a

desire not to call our recommendation an arrearage management plan. I guess I'm curious why TEP supports something that requires the customer to make a potential long-term commitment versus the design that Cascade previously recommended, that gives the customer immediate relief from a what could be almost all, if not all of their arrearage balance down to a smaller percentage in assistance.

Yochi Zakai - It's my understanding that coupling an arrearage management plan with a bill discount rate is a tool for bringing total energy burden down to the manageable level, which is our goal. And I think, and I'm curious to hear if Lorena or others have thoughts on the primary purpose of having forgiveness as you go is that it's a plan that encourages regular payments at the sustainable level. I have to admit I'd have to go back to the literature. I just recall that it is the best practice. But I don't remember everything that went into why it was the best practice. So, I can certainly come back if others don't know, I can do that research and bring that back to our next meeting.

Lorena Shah - I think you hit on the main purpose, or the main angle on TEP's thinking on encouraging and motivating folks to be able to make payments at both rates and payment amounts that they can afford to encourage that positive payment behavior to sort of help draw people out of that crisis mode. To help modify that payment behavior was really the reason of having the more classic AMP we considered.

Charlee Thompson - I have an example that maybe would be helpful, when I was with the energy project I studied and did some analysis on COVID programs for Washington's five IOUs, and one thing that came out of that study was that customers who received the one time COVID assistance or a couple times COVID assistance payment, eliminated all or most of their arrears. It was great because it, like Lorena said, it kind of took them out of that crisis mode for that month. But then in the following months their arrears just climbed back up, which was an issue because they didn't have a consistent way to reduce their energy burden. So, I guess in support of what you can learn, having a long term but consistent way to be able to have a manageable bill, every single month.

Tillis, Daniel - I know we're getting pretty far into this discussion, and I think it's OK because it allows us understanding for future discussions. In my opinion, and I think it's shared by a lot of folks at Cascade, there are a few reasons why we recommended what we did previously and now have in place in Oregon. Now it's still under the OLIBA umbrella, but it's working the way we previously recommended with Washington, one reason is simplicity as part of it for everyone involved. Rather than here is what you have to do for the next 12 months - here's your pledge now and that will offset either all or part of your arrears balance. And now this is your rate discount going forward. If they have remaining arrearage balance then we can discuss payment arrangements to help with those as well. But they get the pledge or the credit right away.

The other reason is when I think about those folks in that very low tier, someone that may be at 10% FPL or less than 10% AMI, one of the goals of energy assistance is to remove the stress those customers are under for paying all of their bills including their utility bills. And that's something we heard about a lot during COVID, and we hear about regularly, is that real stress of -I get my utility bill or other bills and its trauma. So, as much as we can just remove that stress and trauma and set up that pay plan arrangement if there's remaining balance or they can just be current. If it took care of most or all of the arrearage and get the discount, and hopefully be able to keep up going forward and maybe get assistance again at some point but have a better shot at keeping current. So those were the couple of reasons why we designed the program the way we did.

Yochi Zakai - I think as we're talking about serving higher income customers, different approaches might be appropriate for the different income tiers in terms of arrearage management as well. For example, Avista designed their Arrearage management program to provide immediate forgiveness for customers between 0 and 50% FPL, and then those who are 50% to the top income tier are entered into a traditional arrearage management plan. I forget if they use 12 months or 18 months for their time period. So that's something to consider as well. I don't know what went into the analysis for figuring out at what point it makes more sense to have, I'll just call it the one year program for simplicity. But for whatever longer time period we want, perhaps for the lowest income customers that immediate forgiveness does make sense, and for those that have a little bit more of an income than providing that incentive to pay on time is, coupled with the BDR is a good approach.

Tillis, Daniel - I do recall seeing that presentation on their programs. I think that was a good use of time. At least it was for me to get some thoughts there on where we might be headed with the other part of the two programs are trying to design. Maybe we jump back to EDP for a minute? I need to drop off in about 15 minutes or so, and I think Lori's dropping about similar time, but maybe we could have a little bit of conversation around another component and that's part of the qualification process and is self-attestation. Our EDP recommendation for the temporary program was using self-attestation. And so, the company is supportive of that. We have it in Oregon, and it's implemented as part of the temporary program that's in place, effective last year. Any thoughts on self-attestation? Anyone disagree with that approach? Obviously, we have to work out what that all looks like, but just in general, how do people feel about that?

Charlee Thompson - I'm all for the use of self-attestation. That's what the other four utilities in Washington are talking about right now. So, I think it makes sense to be consistent.

Corey Dahl (PCU-he/him) (Guest) - Public counsel supports self-attestation as well.

Yochi Zakai - TEP supports self-attestation as well. It is a big change for the agencies and there will be a change management aspect of implementing this program that will be necessary in order for it to be successful for all.

Candi Jaeger – OIC is in support as well.

Tillis, Daniel - Does anyone disagree with self-attestation as a concept? Nobody disagreed. Maybe continuing the thread and that chain of thought with self-attestation often comes some post some desire for a post qualification audit process. Any general thoughts on the having an audit process and then any thoughts on percentages that you might think are reasonable to audit?

Corey Dahl (PCU-he/him) (Guest) - I think from a high level, I think language and especially from a customer facing standpoint, calling it an audit, this is a really scary sounding thing. So, income verification or something like that, enrollment verification is probably a better thing from an operation standpoint, getting into the details of the number of customers that would be income verified. That's more the details that we can talk about as we go.

Charlee Thompson - Dan, that's such a big question. High level thoughts are great but with Avista we've been going through a bunch of details slowly over the past few months and we're kind of stuck on this one, it's all good and productive conversation. There's like so much to figure out about it and so many different thoughts, so I don't know how much we're going to decide on that right now. I did want to

back up, just really quickly to the self-attestation piece. Something that we'll either want to talk about now or likely in the future, is, its self-attestation of net income or gross income with LIHEAP deductions or not? And can those of us who are in other subcommittees for different utilities share what's been going on there too. But I guess just flagging that for the future.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit - I have a question regarding that, are we expecting CAP agencies to do these income verifications at some point, and if so, my vote would be to use the LIHEAP standards for income, so with the deductions that LIHEAP uses and stuff like that, just to make it easier and we don't have so many different standards to have to remember and go off of when we're doing these. If that's the route it's going.

Yochi Zakai - So you have to support the agencies, being the entity to perform the income verifications.

Tillis, Daniel - I think that's the company's position at this time, and unless there's a better option that comes up for some reason and you know, Misty, I don't know a lot about those LIHEAP standards for income, so I think that's definitely something we'll have to talk through more details on because if that's what we're going to use in the post enrollment verification process, then we'll want to have our Cascade employees asking for that kind of information in some way up front, so that you know we're verifying on the back end what we've used to qualify with on the front end. So, I think we'll have to work through that. I think we have general agreement on self-attestation with a lot of details to work out. I think the general agreement on some sort of post enrollment verification process, probably general agreement, that will be done by the agencies. So, there's some general guiding agreements that we have right now.

Corey Dahl (PCU-he/him) (Guest) - I was just about to jump in and say that I agree that. It makes sense for the agencies to be doing that income verification, since they're experts in that they know how to do it and to a large extent will be going through the process of income verifying for LIHEAP and other programs as well, so that will cover a number of customers that would be included in the income verification process.

Tillis, Daniel - I think you mentioned PSEs programs earlier and I don't know that I've seen those. Do you or does anyone else have what they're working on so far? I know you said they aren't final, but if not, I can reach out, we actually have a meeting tomorrow with Carol Wallace from PSE, I could ask then.

Yochi Zakai - Carol hasn't been involved in their committee discussions on how things are going. But I think she is the VP that things report up to over there. I would say they have been in kind of a sprint to figure stuff out there taking an IT project management approach to their decision making. They are prioritizing making decisions based on how they need to do modifications to their customer and billing systems. And so, it's a different approach than folks who are in these committees are used to taking to program design and they kind of have teed up a lot of items for discussion, and there's been some consensus, but Avista is much further along in having a design, for example of tiers and stuff like that, PSE isn't there yet. We just agreed that they would go up to 80% AMI, but we haven't figured out what the tiers are yet. So, they're kind of more where you are in terms of some of the specific design decisions.

Tillis, Daniel - Ok being tied for second is better than being in last, so that's good to hear. We will just see if they're willing to share anything they have so far, and then maybe stay connected along the way. We could try to be as close as possible knowing that they are a combo utility, and we're stand-alone natural.

gas. So, I need to drop off here in just a couple minutes, I'll ask Chris, Byron or Shannon to continue guiding the conversation along. I think we've covered a lot of ground today with getting agreement on the General 5 tier structure and general agreements on self-attestation, post qualification verification and the agencies likely doing that. Do you all want to continue, or do we want to just adjourn? For the tier discount percentages, we can talk about that in the next meeting and work around some of the other topics as well.

Pfordte, Byron - I do want to ask a quick question, and Shannon I think you brought this up, using LIHEAP to verify income and collecting some of that information up front when we qualify, I'm curious – this was brought up in a conversation that we had with Avista, if we're collecting all this information at the utility level, is there going to be confusion with customers that they're actually qualifying for LIHEAP and these other programs and expecting us to enroll them at the same time? We do the energy discount program or any of our programs as well. And so, I do have concern about collecting, you know, that type of information on the front end.

Lorena Shah - I think, correct me if I'm wrong, Misty, what Misty is trying to say is that we wouldn't be using terms like LIHEAP, income and that. It's a just about how we ask and then handle that income. So, like what we're talking about with PSE, potentially because they'll have a fairly sophisticated online application, and I don't quite know how much development CNG will plan to do. But we've talked about basically building in a couple of formulas so that when the utility is collecting the income information, there would be, for instance, a field that we would enter the last 30 days, or whatever the time frame is of gross earned income. Then, they would enter the gross income and then the behind the scenes there would be a calculator that would deduct 20% off of that, because that's how LIHEAP deducts and how it calculates. And then there might be one other area where there the gross and net differs and these are less common is with tax pensions taxed, unemployment. There could be like one additional field for entering those types of income that would take a 10% deduction and then the rest you would enter. You know, Social Security, SSI, and any other exceptions, but we don't need to get into those. Those are pretty much going to be the same whether they're gross or net. It's really, the earnings where we want to handle that. The same where we get to take a 20% deduction rather than relying on that client to enter their net, which then is different from how we calculate it. So, if there's a way for the application to do a little bit of that calculation, then I think it would be pretty straightforward to keep all of the programs in alignment as to how they calculate that income.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit - Exactly. Thank you, Lorena.

Tillis, Daniel - I need to go to another meeting. I'll let you all decide if you want to continue adjourn, thanks everyone.

Pfordte, Byron - I'll just I'll bring up this last point and see if we just wanted to go ahead and set some topics for our next meeting and that way we're not caught off guard and unprepared. Discount levels is something that we were discussing and so internally, and I think Chris is going to gather some information to develop some preliminary discount levels, and then if we want to work out these pieces of what we need to collect on our end that is going to streamline and help everything to be cohesive from us to the agency, for our surveys or online applications or however we qualify. I think that would be a good topic as well. Any other suggestions

Yochi Zakai – Can you say the second part of that again, I didn't catch it.

Pfordte, Byron - Kind of building off what we were talking about at the end there, having some form of outline for how we want to collect this or what information exactly we want to collect on our end so that we're providing everything that the agency needs and without overstepping our bounds as well. On the utility side, we're actually kind of doing this process in Oregon as well, kind of developing questions that makes sense for both sides and how we can align all of those. What the agencies needs as well as ours. I developed a form that we went through, and they critiqued, and we took some notes and that's just a work in progress. I can do the same thing here, start working on what that would look like on our end so that you all have something visually to look at and say, this isn't going to work, this is where we need to make changes, and if that's something that would help, I'm happy to do that.

Yochi Zakai – So, if we're talking about data fields to be collected, do we think it would be helpful to start with the information? And again, I'm not saying that all this information needs to be collected, but it might be helpful to start in terms of like having a list of things to start crossing things off from, looking at the information that's collected on the household information form for LIHEAP.

Pfordte, Byron - Yeah, that would be a good starting point. Shannon, do you have what's required there? I don't have what's all collected for a LIHEAP application. I don't know if Shannon has it or somebody can share that with me. But that would be great.

Steed, Shannon – No, I'm sorry I don't have it. Lorena, do you have it?

Lorena Shah – Yes, we can share that with you.

Pfordte, Byron - In my mind those two topics, based off of the last couple of conversations, will eat up the majority of our time. Anybody else have anything they want to add to that? If not, we can get out of here a little early.

Yochi Zakai - That sounds good. I would like to reiterate the request that the agendas get out by Friday and they're a little bit more specific. I think we've done some of that work now by choosing the specific topics, but it would really help us to prepare and chat in advance and think about what's going to be discussed.

Pfordte, Byron – OK. When Dan sends out the next agenda, I'll try to have those data fields included from the LIHEAP application so everybody can look at those ahead of time and hopefully have some notes and some good input for the next meeting. Alright, Chris, Shannon, anybody else have anything they want to include?

Steed, Shannon - No, I can't think of anything else from me.

Mickelson, Christopher - Nothing for myself.

Pfordte, Byron - Anybody else? Once, twice, well thank you have a good day.

3. Set key topic(s) for next meeting – All

- Arrearage Management and Rate Discount Design
 - Design of income-based tiers

T1	0-25% FPL, 0-10% AMI
T2	26-50% FPL, 11-20% AMI
T3	51-100% FPL, 21-40% AMI
T4	101-150% FPL, 41-60% AMI
T5	151-200% FPL, 61-80% AMI

T1	0-5% FPL
T2	6-50% FPL
T3	51-100% FPL
T4	101-150% FPL
T5	151-200% FPL, 80% AMI

- - Joint administration between utilities and community action agencies (CAA)
 - Ensuring utility-enrolled customers can access other services, including LIHEAP, weatherization, childcare, rental, banking, water assistance, etc.
 - Tracking number of customers enrolled by utilities that proceed to CAA intake.
 - Information sharing, i.e., individual customer demographics provided to CAAs.
 - Enrollment
 - Self-attestation of income/HH size
 - Audits for verification
 - Type of income, length of enrollment, processing changes in income, time to provide documentation, selecting customers for audit, etc.
 - Use of categorical eligibility to either very incomes or enroll customers.
 - Utility and CAA design a joint communication plan documenting:
 - Program launch, informing customers they are selected for audit, informing customers they are not income-qualified, and responding to media inquiries about eligibility and fraud.
 - Managing overlap between LIHEAP and bill discount program; developing a plan to maximize use of federal funding.
 - Reporting