From: Fitch, Julie A.
Sent: $\quad$ 5/25/2010 2:46:18 PM
To: Cherry, Brian $\mathrm{K}(/ \mathrm{O}=\mathrm{PG} \& E / \mathrm{OU}=\mathrm{CORPORATE} / \mathrm{CN}=$ RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7); Clanon, Paul (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Update on High-Use CARE Customers
Somehow I am not shocked by these numbers! Are there rules that govern your ability to turn these statistics over to law enforcement? I assume so.

I am sure you're right that an energy audit offer would likely be turned down if someone is engaging in illegal activity. Doesn't hurt to offer, I suppose. But otherwise, what are the potential remedies? Do we have the ability to ask for documentation of income level? I didn't think so, unlike on the communications side where we do verify.

Julie

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@PGE.COM]
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 2:26 PM
To: Clanon, Paul; Fitch, Julie A.
Subject: FW: Update on High-Use CARE Customers

Paul/Julie - FYI. We suspect that certain illegal activity may be driving these statistics. Some of the ideas we have are requesting that any CARE customer averaging $50,000 \mathrm{KW}$ should be required to have PG\&E do an energy audit (to reduce consumption) to requalify for the CARE rates. We suspect many, if not all, will decline. Just floating the idea around for you two to consider.

From: Redacted
Sent: Tuesday, May 25, 2010 2:03 PM
To: Dietz, Sidney; Berman, Janice S; Parnell, Renee; Lokey, Felecia K; Warner, Christopher (Law); Redacted ; Keane, Dennis; Singh, Amrit P; Larson, Duane; Bober,
Christopher; Corey, Jana; Walter, Stacy W (Law); Woo, Shirley A (Law); Redacted
Redacted Foley, Beth; Redacted ; Ramaiya, Shilpa R
Subject: Update on High-Use CARE Customers
Just so no one is caught unaware:

As of March 2010, there are 963 CARE customers whose annual usage exceeds $50,000 \mathrm{kWh}$. (This number excludes nonprofit group living facilities). Average use is 10 times the PG\&E average.

Most interesting is how these customers are geographically distributed. Two-thirds are in just 4 counties: Humboldt, Mendocino, Santa Cruz and Sonoma. Humboldt County has the most, at 38 percent, even though it has only 2 percent of all CARE participants. In contrast, Fresno County has $11 \%$ of all CARE participants, but only 2 percent of the high-use CARE customers.

Phil

CARE Customers By Selected County

|  | Pct Over 50K | Pct of All CARE |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| ALAMEDA | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| CONTRA COSTA | $1 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| FRESNO | $2 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| HUMBOLDT | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ |
| KERN | $1 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| MENDOCINO | $\mathbf{9} \%$ | $\mathbf{1 \%}$ |
| SAN FRANCISCO | $1 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| SAN JOAQUIN | $1 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| SANTA CLARA | $1 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| SANTA CRUZ | $5 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 \%}$ |
| SONOMA | $15 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Other Coast/Hills | $3 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Other Central Valley | $18 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Total | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

