

# WEAF Advisory Group

## Agenda

February 22, 2023

**KEY TOPICS: Decisions and general agreements, bill discount rate tiers, data to be collected by company and agencies.**

**GOALS FOR MEETING OUTCOME: Ensure agreement from key decisions and agreements, decide on bill discount rate tiers, develop list of data to be gathered by the company and agencies.**

1. Recap of decisions and general agreements as of 2/8/23 meeting – Byron Pfordte

The group agreed we will utilize a tier structure with both FPL and AMI included in each tier.

There is 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.
- CNG employees will qualify customers for Arrearage Management assistance and Bill Discounts.

Tillis, Daniel – The first topic was a recap of decisions and general agreements as of our last meeting. One of the things I want to talk about is the feedback on having more than one topic on the agenda. We are tracking our general agreements on our notes and agenda. We are going to move those over to a document where we just keep those separately. But for now, we will just leave this one on here until we do that, as a very quick topic to just remind us where we're at on these items. Hopefully, everybody had a chance to go through them, removing arrears management assistance for CNG employees, qualifying customers, but it's fine to revisit it separately later on during the Oregon management program, once we get there. For now, we will edit that to add to the build discount program. Before I moved to the second topic, does anybody have any questions on these four decisions/general agreements or anything you want to discuss on this? No.... OK. I know I said Byron was going to cover that but that was because I was going to be a little bit late for today's meeting, but my other meeting got cancelled. The other two topics, just to address Yochi more direct on the feedback of having more than one topic on the agenda, our thought process is for having really two agenda items that require some detailed discussion. For the second item for example, the build discount rate tiers, if we were to get to a decision early in the meeting before an hour and a half is up, then we could move on to the third topic. Or, if we get to a point on that topic where we can't go any further with it because for example, you guys might want to go back and work with the Excel document from Chris again, and then talk about it again in two weeks, then we could move on to item number 3. In the future, we will just list the others as if time permits so that we maximize the use of all of our time, and we can continue moving this these program design discussions along. So, unless anybody has an objection to that, we will approach it that way going forward.

Yochi Zakai - That sounds good. Thanks for setting that expectation.

Tillis, Daniel - We will move to the bill discount rate discussion, I will let Chris will take it over from here.

2. Bill discount rate tiers (see updated Excel document Chris sent separately) – Chris Mickelson

Mickelson, Christopher - For my understanding, the main piece the Advisory Group wanted to talk about was crossover. Are there specific questions you would want addressed before just hopping into it? Nothing, OK. It is kind of high school algebra, so I mean it's not really rocket science, I have notes indicated in the appendix section. If you go to the appendix section it's showing FPL to SMI, but you can do also the same math to AMI. It shows different counties, and Appendix B shows the math and how that works. They even have a crossover equivalent cutoff point and what the SMI cutoff would be for FPL and vice versa. So, that is these two tables, and these are referring back to this math, figuring out what those equivalents would be. If 100% FPL in Adams County, what would that be in AMI terms and in this case 38.4% is the equivalent to 100% FPL. And so, 200% FPL, what would the equivalent AMI be for Adams 76.9%. And then this one is kind of the inverse - if you have 80% AMI, what would that equivalent be in FPL and in this case it's 208.2%. So, it's looking at each and every county based off of simple algebra. You're taking UH-3 variables and solving for X in essence, and one thing we've talked about before is the more costly counties will have those different thresholds, and so part of the reason why we have these particular taggers or AMI crossovers is because some of these counties, for example, at 100% FPL, Snohomish would be 25.4%. While you'll notice, the others are up closer to 40% and so what would 80% AMI be for Snohomish? Well, that would be equivalent to 300 and 14.3%, so that's part of the reason we're trying to create these crossover points that could be more unified. Otherwise, we would have to eighty different discount rates within our billing system, which I don't think would be doable. So, any questions about crossover?

Lorena Shah - OK, I'm pretty clear on the math around the equivalencies. And so, then the crossover, I think I'm getting clearer on. I guess my question mainly has to do with the 80% and when we talk about that top tier, I can't quite remember where we're at with our tiers to be quite honest. If we were saying the top tier is 50%, so 80% or 200%. But are we talking about that being individualized in each county?

Mickelson, Christopher - I'll take a step back. So, tier one would be FPL at 25%, hypothetically, we haven't really come to a solid number yet on this first tier or 10% AMI. Now figure calculating for the individual county like Snohomish for example, which is the costlier, you would take that individual county, their income, their household size to figure out what their personal FPL and AMI would be. So, let's just say it calculated 15% AMI, they would fall into Tier 2 bucket and maybe on the FPL they were 60%, so we would give them the lower or better benefit based off FPL or AMI. That's how we've applied it in Oregon, and I would expect a similar treatment in Washington, if we all agree on that.

Lorena Shah - OK. Thank you. That makes sense. Appreciate it.

Mickelson, Christopher - Any other questions about tiers crossover, anything else? Yochi, I know you or the group asked to have this kind of breakdown. Did that help? Is there anything you want to walk through or discuss?

Yochi Zakai - I have to say I'm relying on others that I work with here because I was not able to follow that, I would encourage everybody else to just ask questions, and make sure that you understand what's

going on because I'm going to be relying on other CA's to provide feedback and make some decisions here.

Mickelson, Christopher - Anything else on crossover? Hopefully, people had a chance to read the report and see how that's done. By the way, the reason it is set at these breaking points is, it's taking the crossover mode of all of these counties to define where that crossover happens the most, and rounds to the nearest whole percent, at least for crossover breaking point. That's how we got the 10 that corresponds to 25%, 20 corresponds to 50 and so forth to 200 to 80.

Roberts, Andrew (UTC) - What is the purpose of this crossover workbook?

Mickelson, Christopher - Just to help show how we ultimately came up with this tier structure. Avista doesn't have AMI for the first four tiers, they just have 550, 100, 150, 200 FPL and 80% AMI for that last tier. The agreement for this group was to have FPL or AMI apply to each of the tier and we will take the lower of the two or the most beneficial calculation and then put them in that tier. In the future, like we do in Oregon, we'd have some kind of WEAf. We have the WEAf calculator, but we would have some kind of calculator where you pick your county, put in the household size and the monthly income, and then it's going to calculate your actual household FPL and AMI percentage. Our Oregon calculator is automatically based off these percentages and tells you which tier you qualify for.

Yochi Zakai - I want others to ask questions, but the other tab that I think it would be helpful if you could go over, is the assistance tab, and talk about where that comes from and maybe go over each of the data fields so we can understand what those are.

Mickelson, Christopher - Basically this assistance comes from the company. This is our own internal data. We're looking at county. This is the number of customers we serve in those counties, and the number of WEAf recipients within those counties. The WEAf total bill within that county, their total assistance they received, so total bill minus assistance will show you what was left. Then you have the number of LIHEAP recipients. See recording for examples.

Lorena Shah - So the things like the LIHEAP average assistance or the arrears level forgiveness, as it pertains to the dashboard, it's basically being used for informational purposes only, or are we thinking this will be part of how we calculate a future arrearage management program?

Mickelson, Christopher - I would assume it would. So, on here, it's kind of being used to see energy burden after discount and after additional assistance received, what their account balance would be and then what their energy burden percentages would be, based off what I've seen in Avista's program. I think this was one of the things Yochi brought up earlier, wanting to utilize other assistance first, that way not all of this energy discount burden is layered on strictly the customer. So, we're kind of utilizing all that federal and state or whatever funds available. I noticed on Avista, as they're doing their mock bill, trying to figure out percentages, is they take LIHEAP first before discounts get applied, and so the best way for me to model that was to show average bill, minus the discount. Then, energy burden afterwards and that bill then taking that same number kind of that average assistant to figure out what each of those of accounts, at different tiers, would likely have as their account balance. And so then based off that try to get to an energy burden percent overall program.

Lorena Shah - Just to clarify, currently the average assistance, the 374, that was an average of all three big heart, WEAf and LIHEAP, not just LIHEAP.

Mickelson, Christopher - Correct. Are we comfortable with this kind of tier structure, 5 tiers, Tier 1 being 50% FPL, 10% AMI and then Tier 2 up to between 25 and 50% FPL and 10 to 20% and so on and so forth or?

Yochi Zakai - I think I'm still not at a point where I'm comfortable being pinned down to an exact position on what each percentage should be. I think what you have heard agreement for in the past is continuing to support a general structure with about 5 tiers and corresponding FPL and AMI that increases as we go. As we're still figuring out how to use that large amount of information that you've provided us, to be able to use in this tool. Again, I don't think I'm comfortable saying a specific amount, but the general structure is in line with what we were thinking. And I can't say that I have specific objections now, just that it's taking a while for us to absorb all the information and all the variables that are out there.

Mickelson, Christopher – Ok. By the way, I added page numbers for references of where you'll start to find some of these things.

Yochi Zakai - I appreciate how you responded to my request to put in more precise percentage numbers so that we can look at 1 and 2% energy burdens. I was playing with some of the numbers and then nothing was moving because it was rounded to 1% or 2%. So, it's nice to be able to see how a little bit more of how much an impact that has.

Mickelson, Christopher - By the way, I noticed you asked for a unlock, I'm working on a protected sheet even here, so I'm not sure what exactly you're wanting it unlocked for. Maybe my previous version it didn't allow you to click in the cell to see where things were, but if that's what you were wanting this version should.

Yochi Zakai - I was looking at energy burden and I was just trying to change the format of the cells that didn't round to the nearest whole number, and I wasn't able to do that. I don't know if Corey or Lorena spent some time in the spreadsheet, and I don't know if there's anything else they were hoping to get that was being restricted as well, or anybody else that spent time, not just them.

Corey Dahl (PCU-he/him) (Guest) - That was really the focus of what I was hoping to get from the unlocked cells after we had our discussion.

Mickelson, Christopher - By the way, as a reminder, the green shaded areas, if you plug in numbers then it will flow through everything that's a non-shaded, or just a black font with white background. Those are typically formulas, so I try not to have people play with that, but feel free, you break it, you break it. I know we haven't moved to rate design, but eventually we will, and you'll see the drop down that says open, based off that, you can actually put in how you want that to be spread across customer classes.

Yochi Zakai - Can you remind me how the WEAF tariff right now is spread?

Mickelson, Christopher - I believe that's a by them.

Lorena Shah - I just had a question in the energy discount section. So, the only one that we're able to manipulate right now is in Tier 1, the 25%. So, does 5100, 5200, do they go up proportionally? Is that how that's working, or can we go up to 45% in Tier 1, 20 In Tier 2, maybe up to 55 - or can we only change cell C28?

Mickelson, Christopher - Right now you can only change Tier 1 and that was to go lower, not higher. Part of the conversation I keep hearing is having a uniform program across utilities. Well, these tiers are what Avista has. So, if you did want that, it would take some time.

Yochi Zakai - So another question, what does adjusting the arrearage frequency do and what does that mean?

Mickelson, Christopher - I thought you didn't want to get into arrears.

Yochi Zakai - I don't, but now you have me just asking questions about what everything does.

Mickelson, Christopher - So if you open up the arrears piece now, by the way, arrears do not affect energy burden, you'll need to say yes so the dollar amounts flow in down to program costs. Frequency is how many times a customer can receive some type of forgiveness within a program year. Right now, I have it as one that I built this in because this has been a talk with Oregon, whether we should allow more than one within a program year. So, if you say 2, it just doubles what that overall program is by that frequency number because that's what you expect. Without official data, especially on customer breakdown or their actual average arrears, it's kind of the best we have at this moment. Once the programs in place, say three to five years, we'll have a lot better data and probably would go back and modify accordingly. Anything else? No.... Well I guess with that I'll turn it over to Byron.

### 3. Data Collection during Qualification Process – Byron Pfordte

- Data Fields to Consider (compiled from LIHEAP, PSE, Avista, and CNGC applications)

Primary Applicant Name	Secondary Applicant Name	Residence Address	Mailing Address
Marital Status	Language Spoken in Home	Ethnicity/Race	Employment Status
Phone (primary)	Gender	Date of Birth	Number of people in Household
Email	Account Number	Housing type	Time at Residence
Education Level	Household composition (ages, gender, employment status, disabled, vet, etc.)	Housing Status (own, rent, etc.)	FPL, SMI, AMI, HHI
Average Monthly/Annual Energy Costs	Additional Income Sources	Energy Type	Do you currently have a payment arrangement?
Have you applied for/received assistance in the last 12/24 months?			

Pfordte, Byron - We met internally and discussed some of these and from a security standpoint, whether we collect 1 piece of personal information or 100 pieces, the security measures would still need to be the same, so with that in mind we've gone through the list and are willing to collect, many of these are

optional. Anything that's not marked with asterisk, is something that we require from the customer applying for assistance. All of those with the asterisks would be presented as optional. We had additional income sources in that original table that I sent, but I don't think that we can really get into the weeds on our end with that. And my thinking is that through the application with the agency that information can be gathered much more easily, and the agencies are set up to collect that information already. So, I'll give you a moment to kind of read through this list and if there's any disagreement or agreement, please let me know your thoughts.

Yochi Zakai – Is that everything that was in the agenda, and then it looks like minus that one where you have the strike through.

Pfordte, Byron - Every field that was in the table. I just put it into a list form. It seemed a little easier to group everything that as optional and required together.

Lorena Shah - I just wanted to point out that currently though I know census is rethinking this, but race and ethnicity, those are two separate fields. Ethnicity, being Hispanic, non-Hispanic and then race being race.

Roberts, Andrew (UTC) - So just to be clear, these items are items that the utility or are data points that the utility be collecting, but the items that the asterisk by them would be optional for the customer to answer.

Pfordte, Byron - Correct. If a customer calls or through an online application, we would either ask the questions or present them in the form as optional, and then securely passed that information along to the agency. Handoff from us to the agency is a little more smooth, and as Lorena asked, to have information when they call customers and then also to expose these customers to as much of agency programs as they can apply for and utilize. So, streamlining that piece of exposing the customer to programs outside of what we're just offering, if they contact us directly for assistance.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - Although I would love to have all of that information up front, I think how many people live in the home should be a requirement because isn't that needed to determine what their income level based off of how many people are in the home?

Pfordte, Byron - Not for us, we just look at household income.

Tillis, Daniel – We will need the number of people in the household as part of the rate discount program, we collect that today in Oregon and that goes into our calculator.

Lorena Shah - You need it because your AMI and FPL is all based on household size.

Tillis, Daniel -I think one another thing I noticed, we probably don't need to collect energy type because we only have one energy type, we're not a combo utility in Washington. So I think we could take that off the list.

Yochi Zakai - Isn't that heating type? I could be wrong but how did the agencies use that?

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - We have Cascade Natural Gas customers that do not heat with gas, they heat with another source, but they do have gas in their home for cooking. So, that would come into play with our LIHEAP program to determine whether or not they heat with electric.

Yochi Zakai - And is that what energy type is designed to collect? You're really asking what is the fuel source for heating?

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - Yeah, that's what I would interpret it to be.

Tillis, Daniel - Since the customer is either going to our website or calling us when we're collecting this information, I think it would be an odd question to ask what their energy type is since we're their natural gas provider.

Pfordte, Byron - I think if it's heating type that would make sense.

Yochi Zakai – If you want to be a little bit more exact, you could say heating fuel source.

Mickelson, Christopher - That's what I was going to recommend.

Tillis, Daniel - Our CSRs would be able to see that because we list the appliances, the customers using their natural gas for the website wouldn't know that. But our CSRS could really answer that question on their own – they could just say “it appears that you use a furnace, a natural gas furnace for your space heating, is that accurate”, and confirm that we could set it up like that and it wouldn't sound as odd.

Yochi Zakai - I'm going to defer to others about what needs to be on the necessary list versus the optional list. I'm pleased to see that Cascade is willing to ask these as optional collect questions and pass that information on to the CA, so thank you for that. And that is something that TAP would support. The only thing that you are proposing not to ask at all is additional income sources. So, I guess what I would tee up for the CIA's is, is that necessary to have? I think that would be an optional question probably and would that be helpful to include or are we OK not including that?

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - My concern would be with not having that if we are speaking with clients, if we were doing any kind of income verification for Cascade Natural Gas, and we're talking with clients and just having that additional income sources, in my opinion it's easier when we know up front what a client's income really is coming from versus going in blind trying to get information out of someone. If we're doing that when calling a client to determine whether they're for LIHEAP, we're going to be asking them those questions anyway, and then they're probably going to be upset with us because Cascade Natural Gas didn't ask us that information; why are you asking us that information? So that's where it's going to come into play.

Tillis, Daniel – I think part of that also depends on how the calculator ends up being designed. If the type of income impacts the calculation, we might have to collect that, so that might be one we want to wait to make a final decision on.

Lorena Shah – Currently the field is additional income sources. Am I missing a field on this list? Am I correct that there isn't currently a question about what type of income?

Pfordte, Byron - We have employment status. But beyond that, no, we don't have anything that addresses what we're collecting to qualify customers for LIHEAP, I really don't want the customers to be confused that when we ask these questions. Even if our representatives tell them on the phone specifically what this is for, it doesn't qualify them for anything other than our discount programs and eventually our arrearage management programs. There will still be customers who say, “I thought I qualified”. And so that's one of my concerns with collecting this type of information.

Lorena Shah - I would say this isn't being collected just for a LIHEAP application. Part of what I think Misty was getting to is that in order to do the eligibility verification, which may or may not come with LIHEAP, these fields are very helpful to begin that interview process. So I do think they're related to BDR, not something we're just collecting for LIHEAP. Some of them have different types of eligibility, which is why the importance of race and ethnicity, it is a little bit different than just for eligibility. These may help inform LIHEAP, but they're also what's going to help an agency complete the eligibility verification.

Yochi Zakai - Yeah, I would agree, Lorena. And emphasize the data and in response to Andrew's question, the data can also be used to assess program performance and the ability to reach folks in certain communities. If we're able to track that, then we'll know who we're reaching and who we're serving. And then also by comparing that to the demographic data of a county as a whole, or an area as a whole, then we can know who we're not reaching as well. Back to the additional income sources, what we have been discussing with PSC along the lines of tracking this, is that there would a check box in the application if it was an online application, that would just say I have these types of income, then list the potential types of income that there could be. This would be an optional question, but the customer could check by all the types of income that they do have and then that way you know, if they get selected for verification or they come into the CAA's for another purpose, the CA's will be ready with that information.

Tillis, Daniel - We're missing income on here altogether and it was probably just because it's a given that you have to have that to qualify, but we should probably add it just as a field that just to show we're going to collect it, and I'm not opposed to asking for the source of the income and then asking if they have any additional sources of income in the household. It sounds like those are questions the agencies ask and they could give us the options for customers to select from. I don't know why they wouldn't be willing to share the source of the income and if they have any additional income. Going back to the discussion around the purpose of collecting the information, I agree it's for purposes other than just seeing if they might qualify for LIHEAP. When we get to the point of starting to establish the processes for our team to qualify customers for the discount program, or potentially arrearage management, that we work together to help our team members with some verbiage to use as their entering into asking these questions because this is not data we collect today and that our team members discussed with customers at all. And so we have really no experience with that, so we'll want to lean on you all for help with the best way to approach that and enter into that conversation with customers.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - I just saw one more thing, so FPL, SMI, AMI, HI, whatever that is, in my experience, clients and people who are applying for these programs have absolutely no clue where they fall, in that, they just know their income level. So, to have that on there as a question that they need answer, it's going to baffle them, in my opinion.

Pfordte, Byron - That's why household in HI is there. Most people know what household income refers to and those were all presented on one line. As you know, optional fields for how to get that information if they don't know their FPL or SMI or AMI percentage, that's fine, they can just include their household income.

Lorena Shah - In my mind it would be easiest, how many people are in your household? What is your monthly income or whatever we decide for the time frame for income, not even mentioning what FPL, SMI, and AMI because it seems nobody knows what that is; totally confusing to them. For marital



status, can someone remind me where that one came from? Was that one that another agency suggested?

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - I think at one time it was on one of the applications, LIHEAP board, PSE help or something like that. I don't remember what might have been on LIHEAP at one time, but I think it's been taken off.

Lorena Shah - I was going to say we don't collect that one and so I think that unless CNG finds a need for it, I think that one can be removed. The only way I could think of that one being helpful is when your primary is not the applicant, not so much with the actual household makeup or anything so.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - Wouldn't that be like a Co customer or something? I agree.

Lorena Shah - Exactly. That's the only thing I could think of it would be helpful for, but I think that one to me, since that's not something we're currently asking as agencies, doesn't seem like we should add it does. I don't think there's much of value added that one.

Tillis, Daniel - I'm good with taking it off.

Lorena Shah - I just want to add to that I'm thrilled that CNG is open to having these as optional fields. And thank you for that.

Tillis, Daniel - You're welcome. Any other questions on the list or anything you see missing or that's not really needed?

Yochi Zakai - No other questions really. I'll just loop back around to income and perhaps this is something that we can spend more time on later. But the vision that I have for this is really what is your household income. Hopefully having just checkboxes saying this income comes from, or includes, and then having all the apps in an optional place where people can just select what type of income their household income includes, then it prompts them to include those which will hopefully lead to more accurate self-attestations of income.

Pfordte, Byron - Do you have those additional income sources listed anywhere that our most typical, so that we can include those as checkboxes or drop down or wherever we decide to pretend to present it.

Misty Velasquez Community Action of Skagit (Guest) - Sure do.

Lorena Shah - Yes, we can provide that.

Pfordte, Byron - If you wouldn't mind sending those to me, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

Lorena Shah - We can also send you the ED levels that are equivalent to the CSBG ones. We have everything pretty much for household composition.

Pfordte, Byron - Anything else on this? If not, there was a topic that we were discussing right before this meeting and it doesn't have to do anything with it, but I know Chris wanted to at least introduce it.

Mickelson, Christopher - Who would have thought that we'd be so productive today? This kind of goes back to earlier conversations related to the WEA benefit calculator. I don't know if you remember that within the old calculator and also within Jean Lew's Commission staff testimony it talked about annual

cost times 62%, and then whatever that amount would have been was applied, but the calculator later actually did this divide. One thing this came up over the last week, we start getting questions from some agencies asking is this cost really the backup costs and well yes, based off dividing it by a lower percentage, it would make that average cost higher. Then we started looking at what's our average residential annual bill. And so that's what this amount is, this percent is showing what this backup gas cost is calculating over what that average Cascade residential annual bill is, so we're seeing some of these backup costs. Almost every county or every agency and county except for one is substantially higher than what our average residential bill is, so I was thinking that's probably not correct, especially since if you do have backup gas costs. In all likelihood, I would expect to see the western side of Washington state, at least gas costs, heating to be lower than that on the eastern side, where it gets much colder, and we're not seeing that, we're seeing the opposite. In addition, this is almost 78% greater versus what we typically see for residential, that's pretty extreme. So, instead of, and of course all of this comes from Department of Commerce, separating the agencies and figuring out these average heating costs, could we substitute and use Cascades annual average residential gas costs, divided by 62. Plus, we wouldn't have to wait on Department of Commerce to fill out this information, which held us up this year and in previous years. We already have this number, which we calculate at the time we do PGA, which is also right around the time we do our program, beginning of program year. We could just plug it in and that is what would be used as the average backup gas costs. Thoughts? Please speak up.

Lorena Shah - Historically, PSE gives us the backup that it is not calculated individually for each county. So, I don't know if their calculation is very similar to your calculation, but I just want to say, the concept of you giving us this number based on some level of calculation that the agents or that the company does, seems very reasonable.

Yochi Zakai – The \$902 that you're talking about using, is that the average known low-income bill or just the average customer bill for all customers?

Mickelson, Christopher - That is the average for all customers. You actually wouldn't really even need to ask for the household type because it includes all possible dwelling types, which is another thing that could increase or decrease this number.

Yochi Zakai - Would the average bill for known low-income customers be higher or lower than the average bill for all customers?

Mickelson, Christopher - Lower. I'm considering low income and then the average is 607.

Yochi Zakai - And that's the average before any assistance?

Mickelson, Christopher – Yes. Any thoughts? Decisions, maybe make that correction? Do we want to bring this up at our next full meeting and then implement it if possible, or if we get consensus.

Lorena Shah - I think that feels like a fully YAC consensus question.

Mickelson, Christopher - OK.

Lorena Shah - Can we look at the county-by-county backup that you pulled up? The heat cost back up that you had in there, so that average bill, is that total bill or heat cost?

Mickelson, Christopher - Total bill.

Lorena Shah - And then if we look back at the LIHEAP cost table, those should be actual heat cost. You know, average heat cost of LIHEAP recipients. It's just interesting that those are almost as much as the total bill. Regardless, I think we're on the right track, though. If you're 902 that that seems like a reasonable starting point. So, I just wanted to look at that one more time. Thanks.

Mickelson, Christopher - I don't know where that 62% came from, but cooking is a very small piece of a total bill, and water heating adds on average about an additional \$5 to a monthly bill. And so having this represent that averaging cost, that would be your largest portion of the bill. And those are typically the three applications we see for natural gas. We will put this on the large advisory meeting to discuss changing that.

Tillis, Daniel - Our last topic is just what we want our primary topic to be for the next meeting of this group 2 weeks from today. It sounds like the group wants to review the calculator a little more and then discuss that again in two weeks to try to get to a final decision on those tiers, is that correct?

Yochi Zakai - Yes, thank you for your patience. As we absorb lots of information that is included in that very useful tool.

Tillis, Daniel - OK, great. Yeah, it's a great calculator. Chris did an awesome job without our spreadsheet. So, any other topics that obviously will be a big topic, and I think it'd be great in that meeting to maybe get to a final decision. I'm not necessarily saying we have to have any other topics, but is there anything else on anyone's mind that you don't you'd want to add as a second if time permits topic?

Yochi Zakai – It seems like we've started to get into types of income, how we're going to do the income calculation that came up a couple times in today's conversation. Would that make sense to tee up as the next item since we've already kind of started talking about it a little bit?

Tillis, Daniel - I think that's a good idea. It's probably one that is a second if time permits, we could at least start getting into a little bit more and then continue in the next meeting. Well, if anybody thinks of any other topics you can always send an e-mail and we'll adjust and distribute the agenda the Friday before the next meeting, which is March 8<sup>th</sup>.

Mickelson, Christopher - For March 8<sup>th</sup>, is the group thinking like scenario testing that you come up with, or send to us in advance or how are you envisioning that?

Yochi Zakai – I actually don't have a vision. I am sorry, but what I can commit is that I will spend a lot of time over the next two weeks talking with my colleagues and looking at the calculator and thinking about it, and come prepared with either more questions or a proposal. But I don't have an exact vision of how that would go. If others do, I'm open to hearing that, but I'm sorry I don't have an exact vision.

Mickelson, Christopher -That's helpful. That works.

Tillis, Daniel - All right, great discussion today everyone. Thanks a lot. We will talk to you in a few weeks.

4. Set key topic(s) for next meeting – Byron Pfordte

List of program design topics agreed to by group:

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