

From: Campbell, Michael  
Sent: 3/11/2013 5:51:13 PM  
To: Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Dude, I reared that AL -- I didn't find it terribly clear

If the intention is as you described earlier today, I think we can make some progress. From our discussion I thought I'd misread something obvious – but the conclusion of the Cat Eligibility isn't as clear to me as you'd made it sound (once you get past the “continue to support” clause). I'm looking forward to having a discussion with the IOU folks directly – I'm still optimistic that we can better understand one another and come up with something that satisfies everyone.

You think the AL language is crystal clear and says the IOUs are okay with all the current categorical eligible programs? In particular, the bolded language (after the “ask the Commission”), sure makes it sound like the IOUs are suggesting only three programs would be included for cat eligibility. Is there something I'm missing?

#### Conclusion

In summary, the IOUs continue to support the categorical eligibility and enrollment process. In order to comply with D.12-08-044's directives to retain the categorical eligibility process, and include only those programs that are consistent with the ESA and CARE Programs, the IOUs propose the following updated list of categorical eligible programs for Commission approval:

- CalFresh/Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)
- National School Lunch Program (NSLP)
- Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program.

The IOUs ask the Commission, **as a condition of including the three broadly aligned**

**programs, to**

grant the IOUs the option of income verifying or accepting a categorical eligible program award

letter for customers selected for PEV