

From: Fitch, Julie A.  
Sent: 5/25/2010 2:46:18 PM  
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/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 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:** Quadrini, Philip  
**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 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

	<u>Pct Over 50K</u>	<u>Pct of All CARE</u>
ALAMEDA	5%	10%
CONTRA COSTA	1%	7%
FRESNO	2%	11%
<b>HUMBOLDT</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>2%</b>
KERN	1%	7%
<b>MENDOCINO</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>1%</b>
SAN FRANCISCO	1%	5%
SAN JOAQUIN	1%	6%
SANTA CLARA	1%	10%
<b>SANTA CRUZ</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2%</b>
<b>SONOMA</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4%</b>
Other Coast/Hills	3%	11%
<u>Other Central Valley</u>	<u>18%</u>	<u>25%</u>
Total	100%	100%