

From: Cathy Rowe [mailto:cathy.rowe@arkansas.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 25, 2007 3:42 PM
To: Lawson, Katina (ACF)
Cc: Thomas Green
Subject: Approval of LIHEAP Grantee Survey

Below are Arkansas' comments concerning the above subject:

- Arkansas is opposed to an extension of OMB's approval of the LIHEAP Grantee Survey. However, we believe that certain data concerning the program are useful and should be obtained and reported.
- If an extension is granted, Arkansas strongly recommends that the Survey form is revised in such a way which decreases the time and burden placed on states to gather and provide the information requested.

Cathy Rowe, Manger,
LIHEAP Unit
Office if Community Services

From: Genie.Sue Weppner
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2007 6:57 PM
To: Lawson, Katina (ACF)
Subject: FW: LIHEAP Action Transmittal 2007-3

Here is Idaho's response to your questions.

Genie Sue Weppner
Program Manager
Phone: 208-334-5656
Cell: 208-850-8250

"Not finance. Not strategy. Not technology. It is team work that remains the ultimate competitive advantage, both because it is so powerful and so rare."

Patrick Lencioni

New E-mail Address as of January 2, 2007 will be weppnerg@dhw.idaho.gov

From: Christina Zamora [mailto:czamora@capai.org]
Sent: Monday, May 14, 2007 10:49 AM
To: Weppner, Gene Sue - CO 2nd
Cc: 'Mary Chant'
Subject: RE: LIHEAP Action Transmittal 2007-3

Genie Sue,

After reviewing the LIHEAP Grantee Survey that we submitted for PY06, my comments are as follows:

1. I do not feel this collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency. The information provided on this survey is a regurgitation of information, the only new information on the survey is average household benefit information.
2. The burden to collect this information is minimal.
3. The quality of information to be collected is good, the utility is questionable, and the clarity is good.
4. This survey can be incorporated into the LIHEAP State Plan process including coordination of reporting due dates. This would be the most effective. I would also suggest that all agencies (HHS, OMB) coordinate what information they require to understand this program to streamline the request of information.

Christina Zamora

LIHEAP/ WX Coordinator

Community Action Partnership Association of Idaho

5400 W. Franklin Rd., Suite G

Boise, ID 83705

208-375-7382

FAX: 208-342-2078

czamora@capai.org

From: Weppner, Gene Sue - CO 2nd [mailto:WeppnerG@dhw.idaho.gov]

Sent: Friday, May 11, 2007 4:08 PM

To: Mary Chant; Christina Zamora

Cc: Stinger, Marla - Reg6; Terashima, Vicki Jo - CO 9th; Berends, Beverley J. - CO 9th; Mitchell, Rinda - CO 9th; Johnson, Gail - CO 9th; Most, Claudia - CO 9th

Subject: FW: LIHEAP Action Transmittal 2007-3

Please let me know what your comment would be around this survey.

Genie Sue Weppner
Program Manager
Phone: 208-334-5656
Cell: 208-850-8250

"Not finance. Not strategy. Not technology. It is team work that remains the ultimate competitive advantage, both because it is so powerful and so rare."

Patrick Lencioni

New E-mail Address as of January 2, 2007 will be weppnerg@dhw.idaho.gov

From: [Cain, Jim - DOA \[mailto:jim.cain@wisconsin.gov\]](mailto:jim.cain@wisconsin.gov)
Sent: Thursday, May 24, 2007 2:02 PM
To: infocolleciton@acf.hhs.gov
Cc: [Lawson, Katina \(ACF\)](#)
Subject: [Proposed Information Collection Activity; Comment Request](#)

The State of Wisconsin offers the following comments:

The proposed information collection, the Grantee Survey, is essentially unchanged regarding the data to collect and report. Therefore, the State of Wisconsin does not feel the proposed information collection creates a new burden for the State.

- a) Whether the proposed collection information is necessary for the proper performance function of the agency.

The information requested is similar to information the State of Wisconsin uses to manage the Block Grant and is used by the State in managing the grant.

- b) The accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information.

The estimate of the burden appears to be fairly accurate based on our experience, but it is not generous.

- c) The quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected.

Over the years this information has been collected, the questions of quality, consistency of collection and reporting, utility, and clarity of the information have been addressed.

d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information.

The best way to continue to collect this data and minimize the burden of collection is to limit (as has been the case here) the number of changes and additions to the data collected.

Thank you.

Jim Cain, Planner
Division of Energy Services
(608) 267-2736