LIHEAP EMERGENCY FUNDS

Data from the National Weather Service show that there was an intense heat wave gripping the central Great Plains and the Corn Belt, and reaching the Northeast and mid-Atlantic, which began on July 11 and ended on July 15 (See Attachment A). In responding to this crisis, Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) emergency funds would be allocated to those States affected most severely by the heat wave, based on the extent of the excessively hot weather and on the number of low-income households in each State.

METHODOLOGY

Funds would be allocated based on how much the cooling degree days (CDD)[1] for the week diverged from the 30 year average. (See Attachment B for a discussion of how CDDs are estimated.) This number is then adjusted for the number of low income households in the state. Data for CDDs are for the week ending July 15. Household poverty data are from the 1990 Census.

Determination of which states had weather Crises:

Option 1 -- Absolute Deviation in Cooling Degree days

Option one treats as an emergency those states with CDD deviations in excess of 20. This methodology assumes that one degree day above normal for a typically hotter state is the same as one degree day above normal for a typically cooler state. ("Normal" refers to the State's average.)

Option 2 -- Percent Deviation in Cooling Degree Days

Option two treats as an emergency those states where the percent deviation in CDDs exceeds 30 percent. This methodology assumes that one degree day above normal for a typically hotter state is less severe than one degree day above normal for a typically cooler state. ("Normal" refers to the State's average.)

To clarify these concepts, suppose for example there are two states, Yankee, a Northern state, and Dixie, a Southern state. For these states, suppose the weather for a day was as follows:

	Actual Mean Temp.	Average Mean Temp	Actual CDD	Average CDD	CDD Deviation	Percent Deviation
Dixie	90	85	25	20	5	25%
Yankee	80	75	15	10	5	50%

In this example, Option 1 would assess the crisis in the two states as equal, because on this day the average temperature in both states was 5 degrees above normal. However, Option 2 would assess the crisis in Yankee as double the crisis in Dixie, because Yankee is generally cooler than Dixie. Note, however, that the actual temperature in Dixie is much greater than the actual temperature in Yankee.

---

[1] A "cooling degree day" indicates how many degrees the mean temperature rose above 65 degrees Fahrenheit for the day. If the day's mean temperature were 85, there would be 20 cooling degree days for that date.

OPTION 1 STATES

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL
Wisconsin	97	53	120%
Nebraska	130	49	60%
Iowa	114	47	70%
Illinois	111	45	68%
Minnesota	83	39	89%
Missouri	125	35	39%
Michigan	81	34	72%
Indiana	98	33	51%
South Dakota	98	31	46%
Kansas	133	29	28%
Ohio	82	27	49%
Kentucky	104	27	35%
Arkansas	133	24	22%
Oklahoma	143	23	19%
Georgia	117	22	23%
North Dakota	61	21	53%
Tennessee	105	21	25%
Alabama	119	19	19%
Pennsylvania	71	19	37%
Delaware	96	19	25%
New York	72	19	36%
New Jersey	80	17	27%
Connecticut	64	16	33%
Rhode Island	56	15	37%
Virginia	89	15	20%
Vermont	43	15	54%
Louisiana	132	14	12%
Massachusetts	55	14	34%
South Carolina	115	14	14%
New Hamphsire	43	14	48%
Maryland	88	13	17%
West Virginia	67	12	22%
North Carolina	95	10	12%
New Mexico	79	9	13%
Mississippi	118	9	8%
Wyoming	39	8	26%
Texas	133	7	6%
Dist. of Col.	109	6	6%
Maine	28	5	22%
Colorado	32	3	10%
Oregon	19	3	19%
Washington	17	3	21%
Arizona	151	3	2%
Florida	119	2	2%
Montana	22	-1	-4%
Nevada	101	-2	-2%
Utah	58	-4	-6%
Idaho	34	-4	-11%
California	40	-9	-18%
Hawaii			
Alaska			

OPTION 1 — STATES SELECTED BY DEVIATION

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL	Households below 125%	DEVxhSH	Allocation ($ in Millions)
Wisconsin	97	53	120%	248,626	13,177,178	$8.0
Nebraska	130	49	60%	94,666	4,638,634	$2.8
Iowa	114	47	70%	167,468	7,870,996	$4.8
Illinois	111	45	68%	597,031	26,866,395	$16.3
Minnesota	83	39	89%	220,939	8,616,621	$5.2
Missouri	125	35	39%	350,675	12,273,625	$7.4
Michigan	81	34	72%	543,002	18,462,068	$11.2
Indiana	98	33	51%	296,984	9,800,472	$5.9
South Dakota	98	31	46%	53,227	1,650,037	$1.0
Kansas	133	29	28%	149,834	4,345,186	$2.6
Ohio	82	27	49%	648,286	17,503,722	$10.6
Kentucky	104	27	35%	341,105	9,209,835	$5.6
Arkansas	133	24	22%	227,010	5,448,240	$3.3
Oklahoma	143	23	19%	265,856	6,114,688	$3.7
Georgia	117	22	23%	434,017	9,548,374	$5.8
North Dakota	61	21	53%	47,393	995,253	$0.6
Tennessee	105	21	25%	393,664	8,266,944	$5.0
TOTAL				5,079,783	164,788,268	$100.0

— add 1/3 under current formula

OPTION 1 USING ELDERLY POPULATION

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL	Total Elderly	Elderly x Deviation	Allocation
Wisconsin	97	53	120%	102,045	5,408,385	$8.0
Nebraska	130	49	60%	41,066	2,012,234	$3.0
Iowa	114	47	70%	73,007	3,431,329	$5.1
Illinois	111	45	68%	234,674	10,560,330	$15.6
Minnesota	83	39	89%	97,398	3,798,522	$5.6
Missouri	125	35	39%	156,175	5,466,125	$8.1
Michigan	81	34	72%	194,784	6,622,656	$9.8
Indiana	98	33	51%	123,000	4,059,000	$6.0
South Dakota	98	31	46%	22,983	712,473	$1.1
Kansas	133	29	28%	62,311	1,807,019	$2.7
Ohio	82	27	49%	248,333	6,704,991	$9.9
Kentucky	104	27	35%	139,225	3,759,075	$5.6
Arkansas	133	24	22%	108,463	2,603,112	$3.8
Oklahoma	143	23	19%	109,789	2,525,147	$3.7
Georgia	117	22	23%	181,621	3,995,662	$5.9
North Dakota	61	21	53%	18,602	390,642	$0.6
Tennessee	105	21	25%	179,828	3,776,388	$5.6
TOTAL				2,093,304	67,633,090	$100.0

OPTION 2 STATES

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL
Wisconsin	97	53	120%
Minnesota	83	39	89%
Michigan	81	34	72%
Iowa	114	47	70%
Illinois	111	45	68%
Nebraska	130	49	60%
Vermont	43	15	54%
North Dakota	61	21	53%
Indiana	98	33	51%
Ohio	82	27	49%
New Hamphsire	43	14	48%
South Dakota	98	31	46%
Missouri	125	35	39%
Rhode Island	56	15	37%
Pennsylvania	71	19	37%
New York	72	19	36%
Kentucky	104	27	35%
Massachusetts	55	14	34%
Connecticut	64	16	33%
Kansas	133	29	28%
New Jersey	80	17	27%
Wyoming	39	8	26%
Tennessee	105	21	25%
Delaware	96	19	25%
Georgia	117	22	23%
Arkansas	133	24	22%
West Virginia	67	12	22%
Virginia	89	15	20%
Oklahoma	143	23	19%
Alabama	119	19	19%
Maryland	88	13	17%
South Carolina	115	14	14%
New Mexico	79	9	13%
Louisiana	132	14	12%
North Carolina	95	10	12%
Mississippi	118	9	8%
Dist. of Col.	109	6	6%
Texas	133	7	6%
Maine	28	5	22%
Colorado	32	3	10%
Oregon	19	3	19%
Washington	17	3	21%
Arizona	151	3	2%
Florida	119	2	2%
Montana	22	-1	-4%
Nevada	101	-2	-2%
Utah	58	-4	-6%
Idaho	34	-4	-11%
California	40	-9	-18%
Hawaii			
Alaska			

OPTION 2 --- STATES SELECTED BY PERCENT DEVIATION

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL	Households below 125%	DEVxhSH	Allocation ($ in Millions)
Wisconsin	97	53	120%	248,626	13,177,178	$7.7
Minnesota	83	39	89%	220,939	8,616,621	$5.0
Michigan	81	34	72%	543,002	18,462,068	$10.8
Iowa	114	47	70%	167,468	7,870,996	$4.6
Illinois	111	45	68%	597,031	26,866,395	$15.7
Nebraska	130	49	60%	94,666	4,638,634	$2.7
Vermont	43	15	54%	28,071	421065	$0.2
North Dakota	61	21	53%	47,393	995,253	$0.6
Indiana	98	33	51%	296,984	9,800,472	$5.7
Ohio	82	27	49%	648,286	17,503,722	$10.2
New Hamphsire	43	14	48%	38,261	535654	$0.3
South Dakota	98	31	46%	53,227	1,650,037	$1.0
Missouri	125	35	39%	350,675	12,273,625	$7.2
Rhode Island	56	15	37%	51,486	772290	$0.5
Pennsylvania	71	19	37%	665,959	12653221	$7.4
New York	72	19	36%	1,038,066	19723254	$11.5
Kentucky	104	27	35%	341,105	9,209,835	$5.4
Massachusetts	55	14	34%	282,050	3948700	$2.3
Connecticut	64	16	33%	108,401	1734416	$1.0
TOTAL				5,821,696	170,853,436	$100.0

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1981

[Public Law 97-35, August 13, 1981 (95 Stat. 357)]

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXVI—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated in each fiscal year for payments under this title, in addition to amounts appropriated for distribution to all the States in accordance with section 2604 (other than subsection (g)), $600,000,000 to meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency. Funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection are hereby designated to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such funds shall be made available only after the submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President (for all or a part of the appropriation pursuant to this subsection) that includes a designation of the amount requested as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act.

(42 U.S.C. 8621)

(g) Notwithstanding subsections (a) through (f), the Secretary may allot amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2602(e) to one or more than one State. In determining to which State or States additional funds may be allotted, the Secretary shall take into account the extent to which a State was affected by the emergency or disaster, the availability to an affected State of other resources under this or any other program, and such other factors as the Secretary determines relevant. The Secretary shall notify Congress of the allotment pursuant to this subsection prior to releasing the allotted funds.

(42 U.S.C. 8623)

HHS—LIHEAP

LIHEAP EMERGENCY FUNDS

Data from the National Weather Service show that there was an intense heat wave gripping the central Great Plains and the Corn Belt, and reaching the Northeast and mid-Atlantic, which began on July 11 and ended on July 15 (See Attachment A). In responding to this crisis, Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) emergency funds would be allocated to those States affected most severely by the heat wave, based on the extent of the excessively hot weather and on the number of low-income households in each State.

METHODOLOGY

Funds would be allocated based on how much the cooling degree days (CDD)[1] for the week diverged from the 30 year average. (See Attachment B for a discussion of how CDDs are estimated.) This number is then adjusted for the number of low income households in the state. Data for CDDs are for the week ending July 15. Household poverty data are from the 1990 Census.

Determination of which states had weather Crises:

Option 1 -- Absolute Deviation in Cooling Degree days

Option one treats as an emergency those states with CDD deviations in excess of 20. This methodology assumes that one degree day above normal for a typically hotter state is the same as one degree day above normal for a typically cooler state. ("Normal" refers to the State's average.)

Option 2 -- Percent Deviation in Cooling Degree Days

Option two treats as an emergency those states where the percent deviation in CDDs exceeds 30 percent. This methodology assumes that one degree day above normal for a typically hotter state is less severe than one degree day above normal for a typically cooler state. ("Normal" refers to the State's average.)

To clarify these concepts, suppose for example there are two states, Yankee, a Northern state, and Dixie, a Southern state. For these states, suppose the weather for a day was as follows:

	Actual Mean Temp.	Average Mean Temp	Actual CDD	Average CDD	CDD Deviation	Percent Deviation
Dixie	90	85	25	20	5	25%
Yankee	80	75	15	10	5	50%

In this example, Option 1 would assess the crisis in the two states as equal, because on this day the average temperature in both states was 5 degrees above normal. However, Option 2 would assess the crisis in Yankee as double the crisis in Dixie, because Yankee is generally cooler than Dixie. Note, however, that the actual temperature in Dixie is much greater than the actual temperature in Yankee.

---

[1] A "cooling degree day" indicates how many degrees the mean temperature rose above 65 degrees Fahrenheit for the day. If the day's mean temperature were 85, there would be 20 cooling degree days for that date.

OPTION 1 STATES

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL
Wisconsin	97	53	120%
Nebraska	130	49	60%
Iowa	114	47	70%
Illinois	111	45	68%
Minnesota	83	39	89%
Missouri	125	35	39%
Michigan	81	34	72%
Indiana	98	33	51%
South Dakota	98	31	46%
Kansas	133	29	28%
Ohio	82	27	49%
Kentucky	104	27	35%
Arkansas	133	24	22%
Oklahoma	143	23	19%
Georgia	117	22	23%
North Dakota	61	21	53%
Tennessee	105	21	25%
Alabama	119	19	19%
Pennsylvania	71	19	37%
Delaware	96	19	25%
New York	72	19	36%
New Jersey	80	17	27%
Connecticut	64	16	33%
Rhode Island	56	15	37%
Virginia	89	15	20%
Vermont	43	15	54%
Louisiana	132	14	12%
Massachusetts	55	14	34%
South Carolina	115	14	14%
New Hamphsire	43	14	48%
Maryland	88	13	17%
West Virginia	67	12	22%
North Carolina	95	10	12%
New Mexico	79	9	13%
Mississippi	118	9	8%
Wyoming	39	8	26%
Texas	133	7	6%
Dist. of Col.	109	6	6%
Maine	28	5	22%
Colorado	32	3	10%
Oregon	19	3	19%
Washington	17	3	21%
Arizona	151	3	2%
Florida	119	2	2%
Montana	22	-1	-4%
Nevada	101	-2	-2%
Utah	58	-4	-6%
Idaho	34	-4	-11%
California	40	-9	-18%
Hawaii			
Alaska			

MW + South

Cooling Degree Days =
above 65
(80-65=15)
then cumulate
for 1 week

OPTION 1 -- STATES SELECTED BY DEVIATION

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL	Households below 125%	DEVxhSH	Allocation ($ in Millions)
Wisconsin	97	53	120%	248,626	13,177,178	$8.0
Nebraska	130	49	60%	94,666	4,638,634	$2.8
Iowa	114	47	70%	167,468	7,870,996	$4.8
Illinois	111	45	68%	597,031	26,866,395	$16.3
Minnesota	83	39	89%	220,939	8,616,621	$5.2
Missouri	125	35	39%	350,675	12,273,625	$7.4
Michigan	81	34	72%	543,002	18,462,068	$11.2
Indiana	98	33	51%	296,984	9,800,472	$5.9
South Dakota	98	31	46%	53,227	1,650,037	$1.0
Kansas	133	29	28%	149,834	4,345,186	$2.6
Ohio	82	27	49%	648,286	17,503,722	$10.6
Kentucky	104	27	35%	341,105	9,209,835	$5.6
Arkansas	133	24	22%	227,010	5,448,240	$3.3
Oklahoma	143	23	19%	265,856	6,114,688	$3.7
Georgia	117	22	23%	434,017	9,548,374	$5.8
North Dakota	61	21	53%	47,393	995,253	$0.6
Tennessee	105	21	25%	393,664	8,266,944	$5.0
TOTAL				5,079,783	164,788,268	$100.0

CDD 1/3 under current formula

OPTION 1 USING ELDERLY POPULATION

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL	Total Elderly	Elderly x Deviation	Allocation
Wisconsin	97	53	120%	102,045	5,408,385	$8.0
Nebraska	130	49	60%	41,066	2,012,234	$3.0
Iowa	114	47	70%	73,007	3,431,329	$5.1
Illinois	111	45	68%	234,674	10,560,330	$15.6
Minnesota	83	39	89%	97,398	3,798,522	$5.6
Missouri	125	35	39%	156,175	5,466,125	$8.1
Michigan	81	34	72%	194,784	6,622,656	$9.8
Indiana	98	33	51%	123,000	4,059,000	$6.0
South Dakota	98	31	46%	22,983	712,473	$1.1
Kansas	133	29	28%	62,311	1,807,019	$2.7
Ohio	82	27	49%	248,333	6,704,991	$9.9
Kentucky	104	27	35%	139,225	3,759,075	$5.6
Arkansas	133	24	22%	108,463	2,603,112	$3.8
Oklahoma	143	23	19%	109,789	2,525,147	$3.7
Georgia	117	22	23%	181,621	3,995,662	$5.9
North Dakota	61	21	53%	18,602	390,642	$0.6
Tennessee	105	21	25%	179,828	3,776,388	$5.6
TOTAL				2,093,304	67,633,090	$100.0

OPTION 2 STATES

19–Jul–95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL
Wisconsin	97	53	120%
Minnesota	83	39	89%
Michigan	81	34	72%
Iowa	114	47	70%
Illinois	111	45	68%
Nebraska	130	49	60%
Vermont	43	15	54%
North Dakota	61	21	53%
Indiana	98	33	51%
Ohio	82	27	49%
New Hamphsire	43	14	48%
South Dakota	98	31	46%
Missouri	125	35	39%
Rhode Island	56	15	37%
Pennsylvania	71	19	37% - Specter
New York	72	19	36%
Kentucky	104	27	35%
Massachusetts	55	14	34%
Connecticut	64	16	33%
Kansas	133	29	28% - Dole
New Jersey	80	17	27%
Wyoming	39	8	26%
Tennessee	105	21	25%
Delaware	96	19	25%
Georgia	117	22	23%
Arkansas	133	24	22%
West Virginia	67	12	22%
Virginia	89	15	20%
Oklahoma	143	23	19%
Alabama	119	19	19%
Maryland	88	13	17%
South Carolina	115	14	14%
New Mexico	79	9	13%
Louisiana	132	14	12%
North Carolina	95	10	12%
Mississippi	118	9	8%
Dist. of Col.	109	6	6%
Texas	133	7	6%
Maine	28	5	22%
Colorado	32	3	10%
Oregon	19	3	19%
Washington	17	3	21%
Arizona	151	3	2%
Florida	119	2	2%
Montana	22	-1	-4%
Nevada	101	-2	-2%
Utah	58	-4	-6%
Idaho	34	-4	-11%
California	40	-9	-18%
Hawaii			
Alaska			

OPTION 2 -- STATES SELECTED BY PERCENT DEVIATION

19-Jul-95	CDD WE 7/15/95	DEV FROM NORMAL	% DEV. FROM NORMAL	Households below 125%	DEVxhSH	Allocation ($ in Millions)
Wisconsin	97	53	120%	248,626	13,177,178	$7.7
Minnesota	83	39	89%	220,939	8,616,621	$5.0
Michigan	81	34	72%	543,002	18,462,068	$10.8
Iowa	114	47	70%	167,468	7,870,996	$4.6
Illinois	111	45	68%	597,031	26,866,395	$15.7
Nebraska	130	49	60%	94,666	4,638,634	$2.7
Vermont	43	15	54%	28,071	421065	$0.2
North Dakota	61	21	53%	47,393	995,253	$0.6
Indiana	98	33	51%	296,984	9,800,472	$5.7
Ohio	82	27	49%	648,286	17,503,722	$10.2
New Hamphsire	43	14	48%	38,261	535654	$0.3
South Dakota	98	31	46%	53,227	1,650,037	$1.0
Missouri	125	35	39%	350,675	12,273,625	$7.2
Rhode Island	56	15	37%	51,486	772290	$0.5
Pennsylvania	71	19	37%	665,959	12653221	$7.4
New York	72	19	36%	1,038,066	19723254	$11.5
Kentucky	104	27	35%	341,105	9,209,835	$5.4
Massachusetts	55	14	34%	282,050	3948700	$2.3
Connecticut	64	16	33%	108,401	1734416	$1.0
TOTAL				5,821,696	170,853,436	$100.0

$30 mill

OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1981

[Public Law 97-35, August 13, 1981 (95 Stat. 357)]

* * * * * * *

TITLE XXVI—LOW-INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE

(e) There are authorized to be appropriated in each fiscal year for payments under this title, in addition to amounts appropriated for distribution to all the States in accordance with section 2604 (other than subsection (g)), $600,000,000 to meet the additional home energy assistance needs of one or more States arising from a natural disaster or other emergency. Funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection are hereby designated to be emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such funds shall be made available only after the submission to Congress of a formal budget request by the President (for all or a part of the appropriation pursuant to this subsection) that includes a designation of the amount requested as an emergency requirement as defined in such Act.

(42 U.S.C. 8621)

(g) Notwithstanding subsections (a) through (f), the Secretary may allot amounts appropriated pursuant to section 2602(e) to one or more than one State. In determining to which State or States additional funds may be allotted, the Secretary shall take into account the extent to which a State was affected by the emergency or disaster, the availability to an affected State of other resources under this or any other program, and such other factors as the Secretary determines relevant. The Secretary shall notify Congress of the allotment pursuant to this subsection prior to releasing the allotted funds.

(42 U.S.C. 8623)

Lihwap

When put $ out
must states run heat, prog, not
cooling prog

so give to Comm Action Agencies
15% can be buying air conditioners
for poor people

IL did take $15 mil to buy air conds.
for ppl
but we can't make 'em;

also - did pay bills w/ 'em

2 yrs ago, did same thing & states
used it over course of yr

HHS wants it to be reg grant, can use
over 1 yr; not every

or

reg grant, have to do leg in next
3 mos.

HHS & states go ballistic
b/c want to give states flex
states & geared to do this

LIHEAP

OR

plug into regular grant

~~was~~ supposed to be spent by Oct 1, but could spill into next year (10% only)

$ **won't** be spent quickly

P.R. today, $ oblig'd by Fri, mid next week at latest

~~to~~ do MW only → bring line up to ~~drop~~ get KS, drop down

Q = $100 mil in MW
vs 100 mil, incl. NE

"top 20" gets you MW, NE + KS →

if get KS, Dole, has political appearance

Q_1 = MW only ?
Q_2 = KS (add it)
Q_3 = how best

Q_4 = timing?
cld annce tomw

Op 2 reg grnt + NE
? KS?

* need to tell HHS sep grant for a year; for
Won't be able to say amt. to Chicago

LIHEAP

(Apfel)

Apfel
- where we are on releasing $ to
HHS
are we going to?
& so, when?
when announce?
how much total
how much IL
Chicago

What other states

→ it's a go to release
$ 100 mil
methodological issues re who gets it

if you need a story to frame why gave to who:
Need a formula
(not in MA!)

hope will be in posit to announce today & work out

meeting this pm

(Hale)

Did Hale talk to Mayor?

(KT)

KT - what is PIR doing
↓
we've made offers of asst;
ordered emerg resp team
make offers thru FEMA to states