

Be extended beyond 24 months, please specify. - What duration should Time Payment Agreements (TPA) be set at?

- 36 months
- 60 months
- Be extended 24 months beyond the state of emergency for COVID crisis, and past whenever the Oregon Unemployment Department has caught up with claims
- The PUC should have an extension provision for a customer who can demonstrate a financial need for a longer repayment time taking into consideration their prior credit history with a utility.

Other, please specify. - How many times should a customer be able to break a TPA and renegotiate a TPA before the utility can start to disconnect?

- 3, due to specific circumstances such as job loss or childcare needs, medical bills homelessness. Or if for instance a customer is able to pay off the bill earlier it should reset the clock and remove the TPA from their account completely.
- At least one time or depending on customer's financial situation at the time during the pandemic. Perhaps the customer could be required to provide certain documentation, e.g., unemployment benefits, etc. so that treatment is consistent.
- At least two, and perhaps more if the customer can show an interruption in employment
- Dependent on medical conditions - have a matrix of conditions, not one size fits all
- I don't know what a TPA is.
- If a customer is communicating with the utility, and taking action to pay balances, even if they occasionally miss a payment, or need to negotiate a lower payment, there should be no disconnections.
- It should depend on energy/utility industry and type, I can see one for electric with an 18-mo TPA and none for natural gas with an 18-mo TPA.
- No one size fits all model.
- One, unless there are extenuating financial circumstances. Case-by-case basis.
- PacifiCorp maintains flexibility with customers to work with them individually to renegotiate plans as needed.
- PGE renegotiates a TPA if the customer is making good-faith efforts to get current on their account. If customers don't contact PGE to work out payment arrangements PGE will initiate the disconnection process.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Suggest a disconnection moratorium until April 2021, then two renegotiations.
- Utility service should be universally accessible, like public education and healthcare. PUC should play a role in ensuring reliable service regardless of ability to pay, using just rate design and carbon fees for example.
- Utility should have discretion because all situations are different.

Other, please specify. - Should utilities open equal payment plans to customers that currently have outstanding balances?

- "A. Equal Pay is typically only successful for customers with a usage history. Without sufficient history (12 months), including arrearages increases the likelihood of large balances at the annual true up."
- Current rules require utilities to offer 12-month equal pay plans (levelized) for customers with outstanding balances. Once a customer outstanding balance is paid off they could then participate in an equal pay plan.
- I would answer yes but this and the previous question go hand in hand. We don't want to drag out the problem over years but address the outstanding balance more up front.
- PacifiCorp already allows customers who are behind to enter into equal pay arrangements. The customer pays their average bill plus a portion of their past due each month.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Should if they can pay the current and 1 month past due, then the rest on a tpa to get caught up.

Other, please specify. - Should utilities establish a deferred payment plan for customers in arrears that pushes payments out to allow a customer who has a reasonable expectation of being able to provide payment in full by a certain date in the future?

- "i. Possibly yes. Parameters around breaking DPA would need to be specified if considered."
- PacifiCorp intends to allow customers to defer partial payment plan payments to have lower early month payments and essentially "back end" payment plan debt to pay later.
- Perhaps. If a customer is able to stay current with their ongoing bills, then it may be possible to defer payment of arrearages for a limited period. However, this would further increase the c
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Something to consider if deferral applications are approved.
- Yes and perhaps the customer could be required to provide certain documentation, e.g., unemployment benefits, etc. for consistent treatment.

Other, please specify. - How long should repayment of the debt be delayed before the customer must begin to make payments on it?

- 3 months if a customer is asking for a deferral to make payment in full rather than a tpa then 3 months should be the max if in 3 months payment in full can't be done, then they must make a tpa
- Again, should be dependent on broader economic conditions and status of state support agencies for unemployment claims. After that, 12-24 months seems reasonable
- Depends on the season, if summer I could see a 4- to 6-mo delay, but if winter then maybe 1- to 3-mo delay since balances could become too large to manage.
- Up to 12 months, but this should not be set in stone. The pandemic is still going on and we don't know if that might need to be extended.

- Up to 3 Months

Other, please specify. - Concerning a deferred payment plan, how many months should a customer be allowed to fully satisfy (amortize) the debt?

- 3 mo
- 60 months
- See response to previous question.

Other duration, please specify. - Considering such a tariff that allows some level of debt forgiveness, what duration of current payments should a customer be required to make to remain eligible for debt forgiveness?

- 18 months
- 18 Months
- 18 these are customers would be hud housing or at or below the federal poverty line there is no way they will ever be able to pay it off in full without choosing food or energy each month
- 2 years.
- 3 months. We will have households that will not be able to pay for 6 months straight. The higher the duration of current payments we set the more it favors households with steady incomes and higher wages. That is not fair.
- 6 months or possibly less, with tiered forgiveness.
- I do not agree with debt forgiveness
- None, because such a tariff should not be allowed
- Other ratepayers shouldn't have rates increased to help pay for others who can't.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- See response to previous question.
- Seems contradictory to make debt forgiveness reliant on ability to make current payments.
- This answer depends on the approval of the deferral applications. The longer the period the less likely chance of payments being completed.
- This would be contingent on how a bill assistance program is implemented

Other amount or percent of debt owed - If utilities were to put in place a tariff that allows some level of debt forgiveness, what maximum level of debt should be forgiven?

- \$ 1
- \$2500 or the amount incurred since April 1st, 2020.
- 0
- 0
- 10%

- 100%
- 25% of debt owed
- 3 months worth of bills immediately prior to the customer making such a request.
- As commercial and residential customers will have utility bills of different scales, perhaps an amount equal to 6 months utility billing.
- Depends on whether we are talking about commercial or residential customers. For residential, should be up to and including the entirety of the bills incurred during the COVID crisis. We would have selected \$2,500, but it may be more, time dependent
- I do not agree with debt forgiveness
- "i. If there were to be a level of debt forgiveness, due to differences in average level of arrearage debt, each utility should offer a unique level of debt forgiveness based. A fixed dollar amount for all utilities is not appropriate."
- No more than 150% of average monthly billing
- No one size fits all
- Percent of debt owed.
- Percent of debt owed.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- The amount should be different for residential versus commercial. At this point I would recommend 50% of the average annual bill for the customer class.
- This would be contingent on how a bill assistance program is implemented
- Unsure
- Up to 10% of balance owed.
- W/o additional info. such as avg amount of debt across utilities, I'm unsure and do not want to be arbitrary.
- We believe that forgiving a maximum of 20% of the debt strikes a good balance between encouraging customers to get current on their bills and socialization of debt forgiveness costs to other customers.
- would have to get energy assistance first, then debt forgiveness after 18 months and be at or below federal poverty guidelines in hud housing etc.

Other, please specify. - If utilities were to put in place a tariff that allows some level of debt forgiveness, what customers should be eligible for some level of debt forgiveness?

- 300% federal poverty levels
- 50% of federal poverty levels
- affordable housing uses tiers of area median income, which is a more granular measurement of poverty. 60%-80% AMI are two tiers used for pricing units and utility allowances.
- customers in hud housing, not just who qualify for energy assistance, receiving food stamps, people who are collecting unemployment or other government assistance
- Customers specifically affected financially by COVID and a job loss or reduction in hours.
- None

- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- See response to previous question (Should utilities put in place a tariff that allows some level of debt forgiveness if customers maintain current monthly payments?)
- tbd by community action agencies
- We believe 150% of the federal poverty level is appropriate to qualify for debt forgiveness, but we are open to discussing the thresholds with stakeholders. Criteria other than current income could be considered to qualify customers for debt forgiveness.

Other, please specify. - If utilities were to put in place a tariff that allows some level of debt forgiveness, how many times should a customer be allowed to miss a monthly payment before losing the benefit of debt forgiveness?

- 2 within a 18 month rolling period
- debt forgiveness should be considered in context of other payment plans. For example, missing 6 regular payments or 3 consecutive alternative payment arrangements.
- if a customer misses a payment and makes it up within 30 days they should be able to remain on the debt forgiveness program. Otherwise, if they miss a payment they should lose the benefit of debt forgiveness.
- It depends upon the circumstances. I think 1 payment with the option of more if there are extenuating events.
- None. We believe that a better metric than number of missed payments is the percentage of their arrearage that they have paid. For example, if they have paid 80% of their arrearage, then they would qualify for the full 20% forgiveness.
- Once the debt is forgiven, it should NEVER be reinstated. If the criteria are met for number of payment made, that is enough. No "zombie debt" should come back
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- See response to previous question.
- Three
- Two late payments should be forgiven. Missed payments should not be allowed.

Other, please specify. - What additional steps should utilities take prior to disconnection?

- 1 and 2 weeks prior to disconnection
- Engage with community organizations to provide information about utility policies in general (in multiple languages).
- Give a two-week notice prior to shutoff if that is not currently done.
- In person
- Offer weatherization and payment deferral plans to avoid disconnection entirely
- They need to walk the household through the Energy Assistance Application process for their county
- USPS

Please list current or other proposed options that would increase accessibility to customers to pay past due amounts before disconnections.

- All utilities should offer all free payment options to residential customers, including mail, lobby, phone, pay station, and online with any form of payment. Self-service tools should be extremely accessible and easy to use.
 - Enroll customers for text alerts and offer alerts through the mobile app.
 - Many of the utilities have added new payment arrangements, providing additional flexibility to customers. In addition to the new payment arrangement plans, many utilities are offering a second payment arrangement for customers with previously broken arrangements.
 - "None, utilities do enough.
 - I know a few people who have been disconnected. The utility tried to contact them multiple times, and they ignored those contacts."
 - Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
 - "Please refer to PacifiCorp response to Staff IR 10 and IR 18 regarding the Company's collection process that includes notices per OAR 860-021-0405 as well as additional outreach to customers prior to disconnection.
-
- Prior to lifting the voluntary moratorium PacifiCorp intends to provide additional outreach to customers to make them aware of their payment options, payment plan eligibility, energy assistance availability, and any other programs developed to help customers. "
 - Possibly going back to accepting payments in the field...
 - Text reminders, customer initiative to return contact.
 - There needs to be a balance of the costs applied to all remaining customers, but in general a reasonable level of bill assistance, payment plans, debt forgiveness can be implemented. As for timing, I believe about 60 days after the state reaches the final phase to normal as the cutoff for such extraordinary programs is appropriate.
 - there really aren't any. people simply don't have money so they can't pay, or they have to choose food or medicine before electricity. the other option is to pay before you use which would force people to not be in a disconnection situation in the first place. that might be a better option for many customers who are always getting disconnected or behind. instead of

paying what you have used, have it be like gas or other commodities you pay the average before use, you know how much you can use, pay ahead and that's it. if you go over, you pay that on your next bill but you won't risk a shut off as easily.

- Unsure considering physical locations have closed due to cost, transition to online payment, etc.

Should utilities be required to take payments at the door?

If yes, please explain:

- All means to contact people in crisis are needed. Also payment should be taken via PayPal/ Venmo / Cashapp
- At least during COVID to help allow additional avenues for people to pay.
- Cash only payments are the only means of some customers paying the bill.
- Customers have been trained for years to pay when the "wolf is at the door." If there is someone to collect and they have money to keep their service on, they will pay and the utility will get some/all of the money owed.
- For many customers, particularly customers in vulnerable populations, this is an important avenue of payment.
- I think taking payments at the door is great customer service. Unless there is a danger to the employee
- If a person is able to pay some type of payment, they should be able to keep their utilities on
- If they are going to disconnect payment and are knocking at a person's door, should be able to accept a check or cash from the person.
- If they can shut off when they come to your door, a person should be able to stop that from happening if they have the means to do so by making a payment.
- is this in addition to other payment options? yes, utilities should be able to receive payments in person in addition to other methods.
- It would save the customer reconnect ion fees in an already stressful financial time. And in the case they happen to have the money on-hand, it's a guaranteed payment for the utility. win-win
- Many low-income customers lack, or are unable to take advantage of banking services and are used to paying in cash. Maintaining a place for them to do so could help reduce bill arrearages and would help them avoid having to pay for more expensive money orders, thereby helping to stabilize their household economics.
- Many people have debt cards. They should have a debt card reader that will accept payment.
- Marginalized customers, such as elderly, stay at home parents, low income, may not have internet or resources to pay electronically.
- Maybe not required but at least the ability. I think they no longer allow payments at the door.
- Need to make it as easy as possible for customers to make payments
- Some clients are unable to leave their home to pay in person or do not have the technology to pay online. If they are unable to leave the home especially now, during COVID19, then they can't even purchase stamps to mail out the payment.
- The more places to pay your bill the better
- via debit or credit card but not cash. lots of people wait until the last minute to make a payment or forget or things happen. if utilities did collections at the door via credit or debit card reader it would be helpful to customers. field collections would require making a call to the home to tell

them they are on the way to disconnect they can make a payment via debit or credit card. if no one is there to make a payment at xyz time, disconnection will happen. that gives the customer a specific timeframe that they have to be there they have to make the payment and they have 0 excuse.

- yes if they don't have a mechanism already in place to accept payments at a wide variety of places the way PGE does.

If no, please explain:

- `Very expensive way to do collections. There are ample free payment options available.
- At "door" meaning the residential's home, no. Customers are responsible for paying their bills as usual by phone, mail, or walk-in to centers.
- Attempting to collect at the door is cost prohibitive for the company and the most expensive option for the customer. With AMI we no longer do site visits to every customer prior to disconnect. Further, it is much safer to not have an employee go to the customer's site.
- Can be unsafe and add additional costs.
- "Cash payments could be mishandled."
- This may likely be considered privacy intrusion."
- Chance for corruption.
- Concerns over safety of utility employees. Cash is the best payment method but then employees are at higher risk when collecting cash.
- Covid
- Credit/debit cards, yes. Check, yes. Cash, no.
- Customers have enough opportunities to pay, plus there is additional cost to the utility to send someone to the door.
- Customer's have the option to pay over the phone, online, or by mail. If the customer's circumstance does not allow them to pay using these options, then I could see an exception being made.
- Employees should not have to carry collected cash during the work day and be at risk of being targeted by criminals.
- Heightened Covid infection exposure for customers and staff.
- I don't think that low income families could make the payment at the door.
- I would be concerned about the safety of the collector carrying cash in some neighborhoods.
- In order to keep utility employees safe and have proper physical distancing, utilities should not be required to take payments at the door.
- In this day and age, companies should have as many electronic payment means as possible. Requiring employees to carry cash has become dangerous as well.
- It is a safety concern for utility employees to have to approach the door in this kind of domestic situation. Utility employees work 24x7 to provide safe, reliable service for customers and should not have to put their lives at risk when all efforts have been made in front of the disconnect to keep the service on. The utility employee deserves advocacy as well.
- It is not safe for a utility worker to be carrying money. So many people are angry today, it is not safe for the tech.
- It puts our employees in unnecessary danger.

- Its not safe for an employee to carry money.
- Most utilities have multiple ways of receiving payments already. There are plenty of options.
- No, this is a safety concern for our utility employees generally and for our customers during the public health emergency. PGE offers over 300 locations in our service territory through Western Union and Checkfree Pay for customers to conveniently make payments. These locations are in Fred Meyer, Walmart, etc. where customers are already shopping. Our website and automated phone system are available 24x7 for payments and our advisors can also take payments via phone.
- Other options are available to customers.
- payment at payment center
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Plenty of options already available to all customers to make payments.
- Primary opposition is to the security issues associated with utility employees collecting payment in person. However, I am open to a hybrid approach in which the utility is able to collect payment via an online platform via a tablet or receive confirmation of digital payment to allow them to turn power or service back on.
- Safety, liability
- Taking in person payments at the door would require additional staffing requirements for NW Natural Water in Oregon.
- There are other means to do so such as pay stations.
- This opens the door to fraud/impersonators.
- To much fraud relating to people in uniform asking for money at the door, impersonating utilities. Not safe.
- Too much opportunity for fraud.
- undue safety risk to utility employees due to illness, violence, animals.
- Unsafe for the employees.
- utilities have online payment options; the customers have the ability to make payments online, so it shouldn't be necessary for utilities to take payments at the door
- Utilities should be required to offer all free payment methods to residential customers. Because of the many way to make payment for free, payments at the door should not be required. This is especially true for utilities with the ability to remotely disconnect/reconnect a meter.
- While I think doing this is a positive customer service idea, it can also be unsafe. Angry customers in normal times and covid restrictions in abnormal times

What modifications to existing regulatory mechanisms, if any, do you propose in order to address impacts to low-income customers, or other groups of utility customers?

- Ask for emergency authority to allow the electric utilities covered by SB 1149 to spend more than a collective \$20 million/annually for low-income assistance. 2.) During times of economic hardship call for a GRC to reduce rate-of-return to lower bills or redirect % of planned dividend to pay for bill-forgiveness programs.

- A lot of Low-Income households have a hard time, for one reason or another, reaching out to their utilities. I think it would benefit the customer and utility to open up new ways of communication. Perhaps text or email.
- A low income tariff would provide a means of developing offerings and policies for low income customers. Absent a defined tariff there are many challenges.
- Any modifications should cover all customers, not just low-income customers.
- arrearage forgiveness
- As a rate payer and also an advocate it is important to find balance between non and low-income to minimize financial impacts to those that are not low-income. Non low-income customers should not bear the burden and this cost should come from the investor side of the utility.
- At this time, PacifiCorp has not identified any regulatory mechanisms impeding low income customers.
- Bank card/credit card fees should be eliminated for all customers and merchant fees treated as other operating expenses.
- Consider reducing or eliminating access fees.
- Develop programs that allow funding payments to go directly to utilities based on LIEAP qualifications or other income qualifications rather than requiring and depending on customers to apply for the funding.
- Don't give so many chances. It doesn't really help the people who need help
- I am unsure if there is any changes that need to be made
- I don't know.
- Implement a PIPP program.
- low income customers are already behind, it makes no sense to charge them late fees, collection fees and other fees to simply make payments. they are already getting paid less, making less, and getting behind everyone else. there is no point to charging them more than everyone else simply because they are on the bottom rung. People over the age of 55, people who are classified as disabled per the ADA and anyone who is low-income should not have to pay late fees or processing fees when making a payment.
- Modify low income weatherization programs to pay 100% of the cost of all eligible weatherization, and provide a 25% admin fee that goes directly to the low income weatherization Agency.
- N/A
- n/a
- None at this time.
- None.
- None.
- None.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Review disconnection policies and practices to eliminate the need for disconnects, especially, but not only for low-income customers and small businesses. All households receiving energy assistance should be automatically evaluated for weatherization services.

- See rate discount comment on next question.
- Sliding scale
- Small business have been financial hit hard by COVID-19. Many of these small business should be allow the same regulatory modifications that might be made to low income customers.
- The utilities may need to be able to categorically approve such customers. the agencies are limited in how many customers they can serve so many may fall through the cracks.
- There is a whole new group of potentially low-income customers due to COVID-19 and being laid off, businesses closing, etc. Figuring out how to help these newly impacted households should be priority. They have a greater likelihood of getting back to work and paying bills and taxes--which keeps programs for low-income more sustainable in the long run.
- "There should be a low-income tariff.
- All payments suspended during COVID-19 should not be charged in retrospect; all debt accrued during COVID for mid- and low-income customers (or those that request it) should be forgiven."
- Unknown
- Unknown at this time.
- We are always willing to discuss potential options for low income customers such as rate discounts, revisions of how LIHEAP and OEAP are allocated and distributed, and other programs that could improve affordability. Categorical eligibility is a step in the right direction.
- What ARE the existing regulatory mechanisms that address impacts to low-income customers and other groups of utility customers? Consumer education should be part of developing regulatory mechanisms. Utility discount programs, just rate design, renewable energy investments, federal weatherization and LIHEAP programs, should all be part of a cohesive strategy to address impacts to low income customers. Not just low income programs in isolation.

Please identify other rate / regulatory relief measures such as low income discounts and optional customer voluntary donations that utilities should be providing to customers currently and in the future?

- Low income differentiated rates. 2) Basic amount of energy guaranteed monthly for almost no cost. 3)Community Solar allocations to address energy burden. 4) C-suite utility donations to low income customers as a percentage of salary
- "1. reconnects for partial payment.
- 2. increasing minimum arrearage amount for disconnection"
- "1.) Create a ""Community Support"" voluntary program to take donations for bill-forgiveness programs.
- 2.) Offer to ""round up"" bills to the nearest \$5 increment to make donations for bill forgiveness programs. "
- A low income tariff would provide a means of developing offerings and policies for low income customers. Absent a defined tariff there are many challenges.
- A tiered rate can be a helpful incentive for small households to reduce usage and keep their bills lower.
- Consider creating a lower rate class for energy burdened customers.

- I don't know.
- I think it would be great to implement programs. However, as a rate payer and also an advocate it is important to find balance between non and low-income to minimize financial impacts to those that are not low-income. Non low-income customers should not bear the burden and this cost should come from the investor side of the utility.
- Implement a PIPP program, also consider an optional pre-pay program.
- In the future, some type of design of discounted rates as a percentage of normal rates could be helpful for low-income customers. Such as, low-income customers get 10% off base rates or total residential bill. Maybe doing a pilot program to see if disconnects and late payments are reduced from such offerings.
- It would be nice to see a voluntary donation option so that customers who have the means can make the choice to donate to a low income discount.
- Low income discounts for all fixed income households, optional customer voluntary donations, arrearage forgiveness and wider access to equal payment plans.
- Low-income rate discounts, arrearage management plans, PIPP or other billing determination based on energy burden. Eliminate late fees and security deposits for low-income customers.
- Maybe a 10% discount on the bill for low income customers as long as it is not passed on to other rate payers. Although verifying low income eligibility may be administratively burdensome.
- N/A
- None.
- None.
- None.
- "PacifiCorp supports the development of a low income rate schedule balancing the need to support low income customers while keeping costs low for all customers.
- PacifiCorp's customers donate to assist with other customer bills, with the company matching the dollar amounts two to one. The company is willing to review the cap on company contributions."
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- provide a discount to those households that have incomes below 30% of area median income. OR are on State assisted programs such as SSI or TANF.
- Provide consumption breakdowns to clients so they are aware of the most energy consuming sources in their home.
- Rate design that informs customers of how to control their energy usage, enables adoption of energy saving technologies by low income customers, and rewards conservation. Carbon fees and cap/fee on investor returns.
- Rate discount programs would be a useful tool to offer, however they must align with LIHEAP. Current statutory language may open the door for electric utilities to offer a discount, but prevents natural gas utilities from doing so.
- should have the deposit requirement for customers who have been disconnected. Most people who aren't low income can't afford a deposit for a utility reconnection when their service is disconnected when they paid late or missed a bill in the mail.

- Since LIHEAP is for residential customers, it would be great if utilities could work on figuring out how to help the small businesses in their areas be able to try to keep afloat during this time. Small business commercial accounts can be addressed by them and their residential service could get help from an agency.
- "There should be a low-income tariff and industrial customers and customers in the highest income brackets should have to and be able to choose to pay more to allow lower rates for lower income customers.
- Additionally, we should take more advantage of efficiency and weatherization programs, and engage in discounts such as: if a customer applies for weatherization, they should have all debt forgiven, or a permanent discount on energy costs.
- I think disconnections should become obsolete entirely - no one should have to lose utilities based on an inability to pay. All measures possible should be put in place to ensure energy burdens (% of household income going to utilities) are not too high"
- There should be parity between regulatory relief measures for low income and small business customers.
- Unknown
- Unknown at this time.
- Utilities should have very liberal upfront policies regarding debt forgiveness, arrearage payoffs, etc: like no late fees, and no interest. but this should be coupled with a "tough Love" approach of limits on missed payments and otherwise breaking agreements
- Voluntary customer donations that could be used to reduce low-income bills.
- We would support low income discounts and Bill Round Up program (voluntary donation to help neighbors. However, we believe that legislation would be necessary in order to implement a low income discount tariff.

What current tariff provisions are particularly difficult for low-income customers, and do you have suggested changes that should be made?

- At this time, PacifiCorp has not identified any regulatory mechanisms impeding low income customers.
- due dates. Some people get paid once a month such as social security and it may be the 1st through the 4th. Some people get paid the 1st or the 15th and it's not always a Friday. Some people get paid every Wednesday. Having a set due date is not always reasonable for all customers and sets them up for ALWAYS having a late fee. Customers should be allowed to pick a due date that works for them, and if circumstances happen that the date doesn't work for a particular month they can change it without penalty. OR if the bill is late they are not charged a late fee. Also, if a customer calls to make a payment on the phone with someone, don't charge them for making a payment. They are giving you money, don't charge them for taking their money.
- Eligibility requirements.
- Ensure long term payback
- high bills, encourage equal bill plans
- I don't know.

- I feel customers who have solar and their credits are given to energy assistance, should be evaluated before their excess is given away
 - It seems that the more desperate your situation is in certain places the quicker you are able to get financial help so there isn't an incentive to make payments on your account as there is to get it disconnected. Provide incentive to those that make manageable payments.
 - keep disconnect/reconnect fees low, but do not eliminate them.
 - n/a
 - N/A
 - None.
 - None.
 - NW Natural Water has not received information from our customer base that would illustrate a particular difficulty for low income customers.
 - Only the lowest of the tiered rates for utility costs should be charged to households considered low-income.
 - Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
 - "Reconnect fees - lower or waive.
-
- After disconnect, the expectation to pay reconnect fees and half the past due is very difficult. Maybe options to put it on a 6 month plan, and only need to pay a quarter of the past-due. "
 - The agencies ability to process all application is a bigger barrier than tariff restrictions. Categorical eligibility can be a big help to agencies and companies.
 - The current tariff in Oregon for CNG low income weatherization is inadequate. The PUC did not allow CNG to increase the administrative amount paid to the Agency. I suggest the PUC allow CNG to change the tariff so that the Agencies and afford to weatherize homes occupied by CNG low income customers.
 - Unaware of any current tariff provisions that make it particularly difficult for low-income customers.
 - Unknown
 - Unsure at this time.
 - We would need a full list of tariff provisions relevant to low income households to adequately answer this question.
 - What are the current tariff provisions?
 - When disconnected, they must pay 50% to get service back on and 50% within 30 days. PGE splits out the 2nd 50% into 3 monthly payments. I would like to see PAC and Idaho Power do the same. NWN gas bills are typically not as high so does not impact as much. Maybe it should be \$30% to get back on, 30% the following month and 30% the final month. Those 50% payments also take a big chunk of energy assistance as many use energy assistance to restore service.

Other, please specify. - Should Natural Gas Companies' Public Purpose Charge (PPC) be increased to allow more funding for low income programs?

- I think a reduction is needed
- N/A
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.

What is your view about the appropriate level of additional low-income customer support that should be allowed to be recovered through utilities' rates charged to all customers?

- 100%
- A 1 to 3 percent increase to all other customers should be the maximum without imposing rate shock. Each percentage increase may push other customers into the inability to pay bucket though.
- A balance between helping customers and not increasing rates too much for general customers.
- All customers need to share in the burden of help covering for those who are less fortunate.
- All LI customer support should be recoverable through rates. Rates have been set to reflect a fair, just, reasonable, and sufficient return.
- All rate payers should hold responsibility for low income customers, but industrial and commercial customers with noticeable gender/race pay inequity hold more responsibility.
- All utility customers can be considered low income if circumstances arise that cause a situation in their family. Rates should meet the amount of support needed. However, rates should not impact customers to the point where low income customers are paying higher rates to pay their own bills, that doesn't make a lot of sense. Some customers are willing to pay more for green energy, we should have the option for customers to donate a monthly amount to pay for low-income customer support and have it be a charitable gift line item for tax purposes. With churches being closed due to Covid it would give people who are so minded a chance to donate towards a cause and still be able to contribute and know their money is going to actually help someone. Quarterly updates can be put in bill inserts.
- As stated earlier, allow CNG to provide 100% reimbursement of the cost of eligible weatherization measures AND allow a 10% indirect fee and a 15% project administration fee, calculated as a percentage of the cost of work.
- Bad debt forgiveness programs should be rate based, the companies and consequently customers will pay less overall if much of the debt is socialized.
- consider a per therm rate instead of a per customer rate
- Considerations should include the relative impact to existing customer base and other factors such as the median income level or other economic challenges that may be unique to individual IOU service levels.
- Dependent on the total need and other mechanisms available. Industrial and commercial customers should bear additional costs, not just residential. Need full accounting of unrecoverable forgivable arrears.

- Helping low-income customers to reduce or eliminate their energy burden would, over time, benefit all ratepayers by helping them (the low-income customers) to build wealth. Utility efficiency incentives could be delivered to these customers so that they are able to move out of the energy burdened category.
- I don't believe we need any more than we currently have.
- I don't feel customers should be forced to pay for other customers. I feel they should have the option, but not be forced
- I would need to see the entire picture. All customers are already supporting the low income through Public Purpose Charge, through rates when customers do not pay their bills, through our taxes that support energy assistance. And many of the customers paying all of these things are truly struggling themselves. There is a fine-line between middle income and low income and if you burden the middle income too much, they become the low income.
- It should be commensurate with the population demographics. Notably, those who are near low income are the most exposed in terms of rate impacts. If 30% of the population is low income/ near low income the other 70% of customer base should bear the subsidy of the low income customers.
- It should not be increased at this time. There are lots of funds available from other sources to help low-income customers
- Keep as is.
- Minimal that what is already provided.
- No additional should be passed on to other rate payers.
- None.
- None.
- PacifiCorp requests that the burden of a bill payment program or additional assistance for low income customers be determined prior to the implementation of the program. How those costs are shared would be determined at that time.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Providing funding for energy assistance is important, but even more important is energy efficiency for low-income homes to persistently lower bills. While short-term increases in bill assistance may be needed, would be good to see long-term increases focused on energy efficiency assistance.
- "Right now there are a bunch of people thrust into being low or no income due to loss of employment or business closures. Focus on getting them help so that they can also be customers that pay in. The more people you get safely back to work or businesses that can safely reopen--the more paying customers that can contribute.
- Basic economics. "
- Since I don't know the current level, I am unable to comment on what I feel would be more or less appropriate.
- small business customers that demonstrate financial need should be offer the same additional low-income support.
- The appropriate level of additional support will likely vary by utility based on the need of its customers. Near-term we support up to one percent of revenue for a utility administered arrearage program to address immediate COVID-19 relief. For the longer term, we are willing to

participate in a future Commission process to address energy burden. We believe that any such charge should apply to all customers. Any additional low income bill assistance, whether it is for arrearage forgiveness, low income bill credit, or other, should be within the utility itself rather than through existing crisis assistance system.

- The current level seems adequate, particularly when matched with Federal funds.
- The long term goal should be to achieve a an energy burden of 6% or less for all customers and that there is enough energy assistance available to support all customers who need it. Achieving this level of support is no easy task and would take many years to do so. There should be a gradual increase to achieve this goal each year. And percent of income payment plans would be a necessity.
- Unsure how to respond since some utilities like NW Natural already have a PPC.
- Up to 25% of additional low-income customer support should be allowed to be recovered through rates.

Other, please specify. - Should the Commission relax certain cost effectiveness tests to allow the Energy Trust to invest more heavily in low-income weatherization and other energy efficiency initiatives such as ductless heat pumps beyond what is cost-effective?

- Cost effectiveness tests should be reexamined, however the energy trust is not the right entity to deliver low income weatherization programming that is now handled at the Community Action level
- energy trust doesn't really help a lot of low income people unless they own their own home and lets be honest, most low income people who own their own home own run down trailers and they can't have new windows put in them so energy trust doesn't help.
- N/A
- The Commission should condor all alternative as well as assisting small business customer who demonstrate need
- The ETO already can request exceptions for cost effectiveness tests. An increase in low-income weatherization and other energy efficiency initiatives is supported, including high efficiency natural gas furnaces and ductless heat pumps.
- Yes. "Cost effectiveness" in isolation may not factor economic/health costs of wealth inequality.
- Yes. Within reason the enhanced incentives should be incorporated into the funding and work of the entities that provide free whole-house weatherization services for low income housing.

Other, please specify. - What enhanced reporting should the utilities be providing to the Commission and stakeholders above the current disconnect reports?

- "• Total amount of past due receivable, by customer class, over each specified time-period: 30 day, 60 day, 90+ day ar • Average duration of disconnection, by customer class • # completed deferred payment plans, • # enrolled in a bill assistance program "
- High bill alerts to customer if usage points to a higher monthly bill. 2.) High-bill alerts to weatherization programs or ETO when a monthly bill is one to two deviations beyond historic usage or nearby neighbors in zip codes with X% above poverty.

- Arrears by county as it aligns with the disconnection reporting and can identify the appropriate energy assistance agency.
- customers that are past due, amount past due, when the last payment was made and physical location not just zip code (map would be more helpful vs zip codes)
- I would need to understand what this reporting would exactly be used for. Would you be treating customers differently by county based on these reports? If the reports don't change anything, don't waste the manpower (rates) on them.
- If the information is related to COVID-19 impacts, arrears data would be helpful. This should not be a permanent requirement like disconnect reporting.
- Lists of small business commercial accounts that have a residential account in the service territory.
- none
- None
- Number of disconnects by zipcode in general
- PGE provides disconnect data to the PUC annually. We are willing to work with parties to determine what data is needed, how the data will be used, and how frequently the information should be reported (until the impacts of the pandemic have subsided).

Other, please specify. - When should the disconnection process be started (including all notifications)?

- Difficult to place a time frame considering the volatility of the pandemic and unknown long-term effects.
- Disconnections should resume effective November 1, 2020 for Commercial and Industrial customers and March 1, 2021 for Residential customers. Notifications of pending disconnections should resume two billing cycles prior to actual disconnection.
- I'm concerned as I know many in the agricultural field who cannot find workers as they are told by previous year workers, they are earning more unemployment than working. So not coming back to work. This skews the unemployment averages.
- It should begin based on each utility's current policy.
- June 2021. with information going out starting October 2020 telling customers to get on a tpa because discos will begin in June if not on a tpa or have a plan to pay in full, then they will be disconnected. envelopes have to be a completely new color
- No specific timeline, but based on COVID recovery and status of state agency support mechanisms. Also though - access to energy needs to be seen as a human right
- October 1, 2020
- October 2020
- On a case-by-case basis depending on employment status and reason for unemployment.
- PacifiCorp suggests a date of October 1, 2020 to allow sufficient outreach and notice to customers. Targeted outreach will provide customers with additional information.
- Phase 3 plus 30 days to allow time for communications about collections resuming.
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- related to county Phases, but with an emphasis on not disconnecting customers with small balances

- Should be started as soon as is permitted notwithstanding any waivers or executive orders.
- This should be done on a case by case basis. For example..If the customer was on SS before and is on SS now, then they are getting the same income so they should be treated as they always were
- unknown
- When a county enters Phase 3 and when bill-assistance programs are fully in place.
- When the whole state reaches Phase 3. Some companies may not have the ability to treat on a county specific basis differently but may need to treat the state as a whole.

If a utility resumes disconnections, and a county subsequently reverts to an earlier Phase, should disconnections in that county be suspended again?

If yes, please explain:

- A regression in County status would imply imminent closures increasing unemployment as subsequently client's ability to pay their utility bills.
- By going into the earlier phase - this may mean the closing of certain businesses, which means loss of revenue by the customers to be able to pay their bills.
- Collection and disconnections will need to be monitored closely and be flexible in stopping and starting. Likely it will be difficult for a utility to start collections by county. Instead they will likely have to restart collections and disconnections when all counties they serve are at the same stage.
- consider business closures and layoffs in disconnect policy
- Counties forced to revert to earlier, more restrictive phases are certain to suffer economic impacts and job losses. Keeping customers connected to an essential service like electricity and water will be critical to maintaining community health.
- Customer ability to pay, particularly for low-income customers, is dependent on their access to income. Low income workers are disproportionately affected by changes in Phases and are more likely to be laid off when counties revert to an earlier phase.
- Customers are likely to lose their jobs again, making paying utility bills difficult.
- Disconnections are likely to harm essential workers
- Disconnections should be tied to Phase 3 openings. If a county is not in Phase three (whether moved in, then moved back), should be the standard.
- If a county reverts to a lockdown, the same "deal" should be extended again. While this will be confusing to ratepayers, it will be necessary if ratepayers incomes are disrupted again.
- If customers are not able to work, due to loss of job, or lack of childcare, they will not be able to pay their bill.
- If reverting to the earlier phase causes loss of jobs again.
- If the county is reverted to a phase 1 or 2 and customers' employment is affected by the change, then disconnects should be suspended again.
- If the County reverts to an earlier Phase, then the unemployment rate could climb.
- It may not be within the customer's ability to control if the status of the county changes.
- Job losses may increase if an earlier phase kicks in.

- Nobody knows what to expect, so I say: plan for that uncertainty!
- People will need to shelter in place again.
- Returns the customer to the status that caused the arrears.
- reverting to a previous phase will have economic impacts again. It makes no sense to continue disconnections.
- reverting to earlier phases means more people unable to earn regular income, meaning fewer people able to afford bills, meaning it is appropriate to suspend disconnects
- Small business customers would be severely impact since the economy in that country would be shut down.
- Suspend disconnections until COVID is not longer a problem - people can't work, they don't have funds to pay their bills until the country gets the virus under control.
- The phase the county is in directly impacts a number of peoples income. In later phases, people in the service industry have more opportunity to make a living wage. Closing early, limiting the number of patrons, all impact a persons ability to make enough money to survive. Managing a home during covid is hard, adding fear of utility disconnection seems like unnecessary hardship.
- the state of recovery phase should be a factor
- This presumes there will be greater unemployment and more arrearages.
- Yes because that means customers might be at risk of losing their job or reduction in hours if their county reverts back to an earlier Phase.

If no, please explain:

- A county's phase does not mainly directly, perhaps indirectly, have an impact on one's ability to pay. Disconnection should proceed.
- Counties have seen a large influx of Federal dollars connected to Covid and energy assistance. If another stimulus package is put together, incomes will not be impacted as much either. Someone on unemployment was often receiving more income than with their job. Energy costs should not be impacted.
- covid is a virus, it's not going away. we can't expect utility companies to halt disconnects based on a medical disease that has no cure and doesn't follow a clock.
- Customers impacted by COVID should work directly with their utilities to keep their services on. There does not need to be a mandate to accomplish this.
- Disconnects by county would be cost intensive for utilities and therefore customers.
- It will be difficult for the utilities to put in a different disconnect procedure per county.
- It would be difficult for utilities and customers to go back and forth.
- Many of the utilities have offered expanded payment payment arrangements. Implementing a statewide or service area wide mandated moratorium will lead to increase costs for all customers.
- Once you go down that path it will be more confusing going back and forth
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.

- The programs would be in place to help customers so there would not be a need to go back to the moratorium again. The programs may need to be extended however.
- Why should utility companies keep taking more economic hits?

If other, please explain:

- I don't believe disconnections should resume.
- I don't think it should be based on phases for this reason. And phases does not = jobs the same in all county's.
- "It would be great to see data to see if there are newly identified consumers needing assistance or if the greatest balances are coming from households that have already received assistance in say the past year.
- Are the people that have always made payments still making payments? Or are they getting the help that is out there?"
- No. Starting and stopping the moratorium based on movement between COVID Phases would lead to confusion and disruption for customers and utilities.
- Should be contingent on the circumstances at the time.
- The company is only able to provide notice and subsequent collection action by state. Limiting disconnection to a county would be a manual process and the customer would still receive a shut off notice.
- Yes and no, but it depends on whether the utility billing system can handle a county by county level for disconnects; especially for multi-state utilities since utilities mention this during workshops. Thus, I would lean more towards no and any metrics should be on a state or service area level, not county level.

Other, please specify. - In relation to the previous question, are you in favor of any of the following?

- As previously stated, PacifiCorp requests cost sharing be determined prior to the implementation of any programs.
- I really don't know that there is a good answer
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- The PUC, utilities and parties need to work together to ensure the customers adversely economically impacted as a result of COVID-19 have access to needed bill assistance programs and that utilities are able to recover their costs.
- Utilities need to stop incurring un-necessary costs. They provide heat and light and are not lending institutions.

In relation to the previous question, are you in favor of any of the following? Who should bear costs, customers or utilities?

Please explain your rationale:

- Asking investors to bear the impact will result in lower future investment and further negatively impact the IOUs.
- Customers are already struggling to make ends meet. To raise rates to recoup bad debt or costs associated with implementing a low-income program just continues to place additional burden

on low-income (an middle-class) customers. Shareholders should not continue to reap profits and benefits on the shoulders of the low-income.

- Customer's ultimately responsible for their utilities cost. I do not see any rationale for a blend or deferment of any associated costs to others.
 - deferral (regulatory asset) applications to capture costs that are not predictable, have significant impact, etc. It is appropriate for utilities to use this mechanism to recover from customer the costs associated with utilities' response to COVID.
 - It is still their debt - not the other ratepayers.
 - NW Natural Water cannot bear the cost of lost interest and write offs.
 - "Possibly selfish--but the various assistance dollars will have to come out of somewhere in the future and if each company that we deal with in our daily lives puts in on the customer which they likely will--it will be a lot to take on for those with modest incomes.
-
- I'm okay with a reasonable mix IF every company we deal with also does their parts. "
 - Rates have been previously set to provide a fair return to shareholders. Placing this additional burden on shareholders puts the utility company at a disadvantage to other investments and ultimately costs the customer more in the long run.
 - Regular companies are suffering profit loss due to the pandemic and are not able to their customers make up that loss. IOU's should be no different. If regular companies increase their prices to try to recoup losses the customer has the choice of not purchasing from that company. This is not the case with a utility company.
 - Shareholders bought into the company, they should be held accountable for profits AND deficits
 - Shareholders have already shared by providing additional donations during these times. Also, there is an expectation that the shareholder be allowed the opportunity to earn its allowed rate of return. Excluding cost recovery not only hampers that ability but is essentially disallowing recovery of uncontrollable costs required to provide service.
 - The company stopped disconnects to benefit the customers who needed this. From my perspective, this need crossed most of the classes, it was not just the lower or middle class that could have been impacted by this pandemic. It seems fair that customers as a whole share the burden of paying for the peace of mind they were given. It relieves a level of stress to know their power, their parents power, their child's power would stay on if something happened and they got ill.
 - Utilities are in the business of providing safe and reliable service for our customers. To the extent utilities have incurred costs (and likewise have incurred savings or other benefits), those should be passed along to consumers, after a prudence review demonstrating why those costs are appropriate. For example, utilities incurred increased sanitation, PPE, and other safety-related costs, all of which were incurred such that we could protect our workers such that we could continue safe operations for customers.
 - Utilities provide a public service and should be regulated as such. Shareholders rely on public resources (land, water) for private revenue and should bear cost of vulnerable customers impacted by COVID-19.
 - Utility shareholders have enjoyed decades of stable returns and are invested in a monopoly business, not a competitive corporation. The only risk typically borne by IOU shareholders are

lower sales due to weather, and regulatory uncertainty. This is part of that risk and a few quarters of low dividends and lower share price will not break them. However, disconnecting households from heat, light, cooking, communications and burdening struggling families with debt will break people. The PUC needs to understand their responsibility in maintaining social and familial stability. This is a moral duty to serve people, not just a business decision.

- While the utilities voluntarily entered into temporary disconnection moratoriums, a long-term moratorium exceeds what is reasonable for the utility's shareholders to cover.

Please explain your rationale and what percentage of costs each (customers or Utilities) should bear:

- "25% customers; 75% shareholders
- Shareholders have more ability to bear associated costs than customers, particularly those who are low income."
- 50/50 seems fair.
- 50/50. Costs need to be shared by the company and some can be shared by other customers.
- All entities should share the pain to address the Covid crisis.
- An accurate analysis of who bears costs cannot be answered until the costs are better identified.
- COVID 19 is an extremely situation and all should pitch in and help the ecomopny including th shareholders
- Customers and companies are all struggling. We can all bear the downside of the epidemic.
- customers have used the service, so they have to pay for what they have used. on the flip side the utility last year had a billing issue and didn't stop customers from using service and collecting, and now we have double billing issues. consumers are using service with no curtailment, which the company should disconnect based on payment history, but they shouldn't THIS YEAR because no one alive has seen something like this happen. Everyone is responsible so, the utility is responsible for the costs of providing service and making exceptions, the customers are responsible for paying for the service they have used. Both must make concessions.
- Customers should bear 50% or greater of the cost of the service they receive. Without any cost liability there is no means by the utility or region to drive toward reductions in energy use. This is counter to all environmental goals and could set customers up for a difficult transition if/when normal billing restarts. Shareholders of utilities should cover 50% or less as they benefit from the retention of customers.
- Everyone should share in the burden. I could see an 80/20 sharing of responsibility between customers and shareholders.
- I believe both the investors have a stake in the current situation and can provide a share of the burden that customers are faced with. I'm not sure what the % should be but further evaluation should occur
- I don't have enough information to provide an actual mix. Again, many customers who are not low income are struggling. They can't hold the burden without being put into low income themselves. I would need to see how much shareholders bear now and see the long term effect models to both customers and shareholders.
- If a utility is receiving its authorized ROE minus 100 basis points there should be a sharing (2/3 customers, 1/3 shareholders).

- Money doesn't grow on trees. I don't have a specific percentage in mind. Someone is going to end up paying for it.
- Only high earning or profiting customers should help bear costs.
- Ratepayers who are current in their payments and shareholders have the capacity to share the burden and help keep the utility solvent. The appropriate mix should be decided by the commission.
- Rates can cover the customer costs, and shareholders should be able to take a 10% hit on profits in order to serve all customers with weatherization.
- Shareholders ought to bear the majority of costs. Maybe 75% shareholders - 25% customers.
- Shareholders should shoulder some but not all risk exposure with operating a for profit business and ratepayers are paying for a regulated cost of service
- "The pandemic is an unusual event, the financial consequences of which should not all be placed on the customers shoulders. Utility shareholders should share the pain and take a lesser profit for awhile.
- Customers - 75%
- Shareholders - 25%"
- Unknown
- utility shareholders should not be better off than credit card and mortgage company shareholders

In your opinion, what is the one action that can be taken that will make the biggest difference for ratepayers?

- "1) Direct consultation or survey of ratepayers that have experienced disconnection or used payment plans or debt forgiveness; or consult customers via proxy, such as a survey or interview directed to Tenants Union, Community Action partner agencies, Community Energy Project, affordable housing program managers, community development agencies. 2) Profit and/or emission based fees to fund low income services. 3) Ratepayer education to understand and respond to terms used in survey... time payment agreements, Equal payment plans, Deferred payment plans, Annual deferrals, General rate cases, Current tariff provisions, Natural Gas Companies' Public Purpose Charge (PPC), etc."
- Allow the IOUs to design programs that favor the low income customer and the Agency that serves them.
- Allowing IOUs flexibility in dealing with ratepayers that are in arrears and trying to pay the past due balances. One plan will not fit all ratepayers and IOUs need the ability to address each individual situation.
- Cleaning up bills so they are easier to read especially when someone is on equal pay. Have you looked at one of those? It's a nightmare. Just make it be you owe this much this month period end of story done. No one wants to know what all the extra little bits and garbage is, they don't understand and it's just confusing. If customers want the option of all the extra bits and details they can ask for an extended bill copy. Just print, amount of energy used, last months bill, this months bill, past due, current, total due, payment received, due date done.
- Continue to remain flexible in light of the current situation, working with customers to get them energy assistance and avoid large balances and potential disconnection of service.
- debt forgiveness coupled with not charging interest on delinquent accounts

- Debt forgiveness.
- Direct bill assistance up to a certain amount that doesn't material effect the remaining rate payers. I believe a 1-3 percent increase in rates (for a limited time) for bill assistance and categorically approving customers will get everyone back on track and back to normal.
- "Direct more LIHEAP and bill assistance monies to low-income customer accounts and then target those residences for enhanced incentives from utility incentive programs to lower energy use and future utility bills.
- "
- do not disconnect customers with small arrearage balances
- Education about the programs and options in place.
- Effective communication with what ever course of action is taken
- Effective debt forgiveness program.
- Enact long term low-income rates now, and allow debt forgiveness for ALL arrears incurred by low income families during COVID crisis.
- Encourage weatherization programs through additional funding and opportunities
- Equal / Average Pay as a DEFAULT billing option - this helps and stabilize month to month payments.
- Forgiving balances.
- Hard to say, since this is such a unique event, thus I'm not sure what one action would make the most difference since COVID is impacting individuals differently than a normal recession. One difference might have an impact on one group, but not another and visa versa.
- Having utilities resume collection activity (including sending reminder notices and final disconnect notices) will encourage customers to pay, set up a payment arrangement and/or seek energy assistance; ultimately reducing the amount of socialization of costs among non-impacted customers.
- Help customers take advantage of funds available to pay utility bills.
- Holding off on disconnections until spring 2021.
- If available assistance dollars can be paid directly to IOU based on qualifying factors rather than depending on customers to take the initiative to apply for funding.
- Improved access to energy assistance funds. It is very difficult to navigate the system in the best of times and even more difficult now as agencies deal with COVID-related changes to the way they provide services.
- Lower the cost of service to ratepayers. Right now, we all are affected by the pandemic. Supplies are tough to obtain, costs are inflated and money coming in isn't going up. Work together to try to get more people stabilized to get back to work when they can, reopen businesses if possible and see the value in assistance programs because it worked for them when they were in need.
- Making sure as many ratepayers as possible resin service through the COVI 19 crisis.
- More effectively get energy assistance funds directly to those in need through some form of categorical eligibility.
- No additional rate increase until COVID has been addressed and jobs are not at a loss.
- No blanket statements or policies. Help folks as they need/ask for it
- Open the economy up and send people back to work. This has gone on long enough.

- Overall lower rates. Making sure that what is implemented from green energy to removing fossil fuels. While all is very important, the ratepayers cannot bear the costs. It shouldn't be about just Oregon "looking good and green" while people cannot put food on the table. Make sure the Commissioners and the Governor's agenda really understand what they are asking for and the cost on the low income or even more important, the cost to the middle class. The middle class seems forgotten while they are trying to support the low income.
- PacifiCorp supports a flexible framework to meet the diverse needs and changing financial status representative of our customers.
- Payment forgiveness & tariff programs
- Please NW Natural's detailed survey response submitted to the PUC for our response to this question.
- Rate freeze to lowest pricing Tier for low-income ratepayers.
- Some level of debt forgiveness and active review of utility GRCs by staff and stakeholders.
- Stay solvent, maintain adequate cash flows.
- Suspending shutoffs and providing a reasonable repayment program with ample time to pay back
- temporary relief through suspended disconnections and suspended late fees, and then allow time payment arrangement plans for customers who accrue large balances. Relief should be temporary, not permanent (e.g. debt forgiveness).
- The approval of a differentiated low income tariff.
- To take each case into consideration individually. If needed have verification of income processes in place to keep things on an even playing field.
- Trying to recover the outstanding accounts caused by non payment.
- Unknown
- Waive late fees. Continue non-disconnect.