

Redacted

September 6, 2013

President Michael R. Peevey
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: New guidelines for the PG&E CARE program

Dear Mr. Peevey:

I am one of the residents and also the PG&E account holder at [Redacted]
[Redacted]. I am writing on behalf of the owners and residents who for many
years have lived as extended families at the residential houses located at [Redacted]
[Redacted] (account numbers
respectively [Redacted].) We
have recently received notices from PG&E of new guidelines for the CARE program that
place limits on energy usage for each house. These notices also stated that each of these
houses had exceeded these limits for three of the last twelve months and, consequently,
are in danger of losing the protection of the CARE program that had been set up to enable
lower-middle income families such as ours to have affordable electric energy.

We were surprised to receive these letters since we were not given adequate notice of the
new guidelines, with an appropriate time period to bring down our energy consumption.
These guidelines may well require long-term effort and planning, such as, for example,
investing in solar panels. The notices that were recently received, almost after the fact,
force us immediately and drastically to reduce our electrical consumption without having
had the prior knowledge that it was a problem or else face a huge financial hardship.

Research into the background of these new guidelines has revealed that apparently these
energy-usage limits were adopted by the CPUC at the request of PG&E, which was
responding to the criticisms of law enforcement officials that the CARE program was
being abused by indoor marijuana grow operations, particularly in the northern most
areas of the State of California, such as Humboldt County. While we certainly understand
and share the concern for the abuse of this program by such illegal activities, this broad-
based approach has created serious problems for us who are merely living in the lawful
group arrangements that we feel best serves our needs.

The CARE program's income guidelines are adjustable depending on the number of
people in the household, but now set a baseline "normal" usage that applies regardless of

the number of people in the household. This failure of the new guidelines to consider the size of the household in allocating energy usage creates a disparity that disadvantages larger households, such as most of the households for whom I am writing.

Because of the short notice given, along with the unfair, perhaps unintended, result of an effort to respond to a law enforcement problem, as well as the disadvantage for larger households, we earnestly request that the CPUC finds a way to rectify this situation that has put our households on Purson Lane into such jeopardy with possible utility bills that we are unable to pay.

Thank you for your consideration. I hope to hear back from you soon.

Very truly yours,

Redacted

Redacted

cc: Redacted ✓

Senior Manager, Pricing Products
PG&E CARE Program

Redacted

Redacted