

From: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: 3/7/2013 10:54:02 AM
To: 'Khosrowjah, Sepideh' (sepideh.khosrowjah@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Joint AL 4457

Doesn't that proposal seem to address all of the concerns that everyone is raising?

From: Khosrowjah, Sepideh [mailto:sepideh.khosrowjah@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2013 10:51 AM
To: Dietz, Sidney
Subject: Re: Joint AL 4457

Thanks.

From: Dietz, Sidney [mailto:SBD4@pge.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2013 10:49 AM Pacific Standard Time
To: Khosrowjah, Sepideh
Subject: RE: Joint AL 4457

Sepideh –

Here's the language from the advice letter that I was referring to:

As an alternative option, the IOUs propose that the Commission retain the current list of categorical eligible programs, and permit the IOUs to determine whether the customer would be required to provide income documentation, or allow the customer to provide proof of enrollment in one of the categorical program by providing an award letter or some other proof. If the

Commission were to select this option, the IOUs believe the PEV option is necessary to assist with confirming alignment with the legislated income basis of the program, given that certain programs currently listed do not align with either the household unit of measure or the income threshold. As noted above, the IOUs request the Commission to address this condition of the alternative option in the April 1 annual approval letter.

I think this works.

From: Dietz, Sidney
Sent: Thursday, March 07, 2013 10:27 AM
To: Khosrowjah, Sepideh (sepideh.khosrowjah@cpuc.ca.gov)
Subject: Joint AL 4457

Sepideh –

I'm about to try you on the phone.

yours,

sid

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>
