

Decision 02-07-033 July 17, 2002

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the
Commission's Proposed Policies and Programs
Governing Low-Income Assistance Programs.

Rulemaking 01-08-027
(Filed August 23, 2001)

**INTERIM DECISION: STATUS OF RAPID DEPLOYMENT, CARE
PENETRATION GOALS, AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT
AND RELATED PROGRAM PLANNING ISSUES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
INTERIM DECISION: STATUS OF RAPID DEPLOYMENT, CARE PENETRATION GOALS, AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT AND RELATED PROGRAM PLANNING ISSUES.....	1
1. Summary.....	2
2. Background and Issues	10
3. Status of Rapid Deployment.....	13
3.1 PG&E.....	15
3.2 SDG&E.....	16
3.3 SCE.....	17
3.4 SoCal.....	18
4. CARE and ULTS Penetration Rates - Methodological Issues	19
5. Interim CARE Penetration Benchmarks.....	26
6. Automatic Enrollment.....	30
6.1 Partner Agencies	30
6.2 Eligibility Requirements	32
6.3 Other State and Utility Data Matching Programs	33
6.4 Impact of Automatic Enrollment on CARE Penetration	35
6.5 Commission Administration and Customer Confidentiality	36
6.6 Recertification of Automatic Enrollment Customers	38
6.7 Monitoring Program Effectiveness.....	39
6.8 Bill Insert	41
6.9 Program Costs and Funding.....	41
6.10 Coordination with ULTS	43
7. Program Planning For 2002 and Beyond.....	45
8. Need for Expedited Consideration.....	48
Findings of Fact.....	53
Conclusions of Law.....	58
ORDER	60
Table 1	Rapid Deployment Program Statistics
Attachment 1	List of Abbreviations/Acronyms
Attachment 2	CARE Enrollment and Drop Off History
Attachment 3	Rapid Deployment Status For PG&E
Attachment 4	Rapid Deployment Status For SCE
Attachment 5	Rapid Deployment Status For SoCal
Attachment 6	Rapid Deployment Status For SDG&E
Attachment 7	Penetration Rate Methodologies

**INTERIM DECISION: STATUS OF RAPID DEPLOYMENT, CARE
PENETRATION GOALS, AUTOMATIC ENROLLMENT
AND RELATED PROGRAM PLANNING ISSUES**

1. Summary¹

By Decision (D.) 01-05-033, issued on May 3, 2001, we adopted a rapid deployment strategy for the low-income assistance programs administered by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCal). Low-income assistance programs consist of direct weatherization and energy efficiency services under the Low-Income Energy Efficiency (LIEE) programs and rate assistance under California Alternative Rates For Energy (CARE). In addition to providing increased funding for CARE and LIEE program activities, D.01-05-033 authorized the following: expanded use of LIEE funds to leverage the programs provided through the Department of Community Services and Development's (DCSD) network of community-based organizations, "capitation fees" to low-income assistance organizations of up to \$12 per CARE enrollee, increased non-English radio and print advertising for CARE and new LIEE measures on a pilot basis (e g., high efficiency air conditioners and water heaters).

We find that the rapid deployment strategy adopted in D.01-05-033 has been successful in substantially increasing the deployment of low-income assistance services to those that have needed it the most during the energy crisis. As of February 2002, PG&E, SCE, SoCal and SDG&E have added approximately

¹ Attachment 1 explains each acronym or other abbreviation that appears in this decision.

420,000 new customers to the CARE program on a net basis since the inception of the rapid deployment in May 2001.² Under the LIEE program, these utilities have collectively weatherized 50,440 homes and have treated a minimum of 50,000 additional homes with other energy efficiency measures during 2001. Given the success of our rapid deployment strategy, we authorize the continuation of the rapid deployment programs adopted in D.01-05-033 until further Commission order. We plan to reexamine rapid deployment programs and budgets for program year (PY) 2003, and make modifications as appropriate, later this year. The utilities filed their applications for PY2003 LIEE and CARE program plans and budgets on July 1, 2002.

By today's decision, we examine more closely the manner in which we measure program achievements in the CARE program. CARE penetration rates represent the number of low-income customers that actually participate in the CARE program, divided by an estimate of the number of customers eligible for the program.

We find the methods currently used by Southwest Gas Company (Southwest) to measure program penetration to be reasonable, without modification. As described in this decision, Southwest independently surveys the household size and income of their universe of customers, and then cross-checks the results with available Census data. Recognizing that this direct survey approach is not practicable in the larger utility service areas, we nonetheless expect PG&E, SoCal, SDG&E and SCE to improve their use of Census survey data, as discussed in this decision.

² These additions to CARE enrollment are net of the decreases in enrollments due to customers moving out of the service territory or failing to re-certify during that period.

In particular, these utilities need to order the special tabulations of 2000 Census data as soon as they are available this fall to update demographic information on the joint relationship between household size and income. We direct the utilities to present the results of this update (i.e., revised numbers of eligible CARE customers) in their January 2003 monthly status report. This will enable us to evaluate the effects of both Census data updates and the automatic enrollment program we adopt today on utility penetration rates in a timely manner. We also direct Energy Division to ensure that Phase 2 of the Needs Assessment Study is designed to obtain income and household size data specific to Avista Utilities' (Avista) service territory for the purpose of estimating the number of CARE eligible homes.

Per Pub. Util. Code § 739.1, as modified by Senate Bill No. 2 from the Second Extraordinary Session (referred to as SBX2 2), we also establish our goal for CARE program penetration. *Simply put, our goal is to reach 100% of low-income customers who are eligible for, and desire to participate in, the CARE program.* The utilities report that over one million low-income customers meet the CARE eligibility criteria but are not currently participating in the program. Our goal is to enroll each and every one of these customers who wants to participate.

We recognize that the utilities will not reach this goal at the same pace, given differences in demographic characteristics and the magnitude of the eligible low-income population within each service territory, as well as differences in where each utility stands today with respect to program penetration. We also recognize that the law of diminishing returns applies to CARE outreach efforts over time, i.e., it becomes increasingly difficult to enroll additional customers, the closer the utility moves towards achieving 100% participation.

In consideration of these factors, we establish minimum benchmarks for PG&E, SDG&E, SoCal, Southwest and Avista for PY2002 as follows:

PG&E—63%, SDG&E—75%, SCE—93%, SoCal—70%, Southwest—89%, Avista—50%. These benchmarks represent substantial improvements over the 2001 penetration rates achieved by these utilities and move each of them at a meaningful pace towards our goal of 100% penetration. At the same time, the benchmark levels we establish today recognize that the pace towards achieving our goal will differ among the utilities for the reasons discussed above.

An additional consideration in establishing Avista's penetration rate benchmark for 2002 is the recognition that Avista's current method for estimating penetration rates is likely to underestimate actual program penetration, as discussed in this decision. We will be able to address this issue for future years when we obtain income and household size data specific to Avista's service territory during Phase 2 of the Needs Assessment Study.

SCE proposed that we adopt a penetration rate goal of 88% for 2002 and beyond, which represents maintaining the rate SCE achieved in 2001. As discussed in this decision, we believe that SCE should improve upon the status quo. In fact, SCE has recently reported that, as of the end of May, its penetration rate is now at 91%. This appears to be at least in part due to the steps that SCE has taken this year to improve its recertification notification process. In this context, a benchmark of 93% for the entire year is a reasonable standard, particularly in light of the impact we expect automatic enrollment (see below) to have on program participation.

The minimum PY2002 benchmarks we adopt today reflect our continued commitment to improving CARE enrollment and participation, consistent with SBX2 2 and the program objectives we have articulated in prior Commission

decisions. We will continue to closely monitor penetration rate performance. We also intend to establish minimum penetration rate benchmarks for future program years. However, the utilities' proposed penetration goals for 2003 and beyond do not reflect the impact of updating their eligible customer base with 2000 Census data when it becomes available this fall. Nor do they reflect the impact that automatic enrollment will have on new CARE enrollments as we implement the program.

We cannot predict at this time the net effect of incorporating these factors into the ratio that produces the utility's penetration rates. This information is likely to affect our thinking on what the appropriate performance benchmarks should be in future years. Therefore, we do not believe it is prudent to establish minimum benchmarks beyond 2002 at this time. As we obtain the information we need over the next few months, we will use it to establish meaningful benchmarks for future years.

To assist us in reaching 100% of the low-income customers that are eligible for CARE, we adopt an automatic enrollment program that will enroll customers of PG&E, SCE, SoCal and SDG&E into CARE when they participate in the following partner agency programs: Medi-Cal and Women, Infants and Children administered through the California Department of Health Services (DHS), Healthy Families administered by the Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (MRMIB), or the Energy Assistance Programs administered by DCSD.

As described in this decision, the Commission will administer the agency data exchange for automatic enrollment, in order to ensure confidentiality of all client information provided through our agency partnerships with DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD. The Commission will serve as a clearinghouse to identify electronic matches between agency and utility customer records, by comparing

non-CARE data provided by the utilities with client information from the DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD programs. Once a match is made, the Commission will forward the customer's name and address to the utility for provisional enrollment.³ CARE customers, whether enrolled by traditional means or through participation in a partner agency program will receive the CARE discount for two years, and may recertify either through new or continued participation in our partner agency programs or through the utility's automatic two-year recertification process.

The utilities and the Commission will incur one-time and ongoing costs for program start-up and implementation, which may be offset by reductions in traditional outreach administrative costs. Subsidy costs will also be incurred as we enroll the majority of eligible customers into CARE during the first few months of the program. Subsidy costs will vary depending on the number of enrollments. We authorize the utilities to track costs related to automatic enrollment in a memorandum account or in an existing CARE balancing account, as appropriate, pending our determinations in Application (A.) 02-04-031 et al.

We are moving forward with automatic enrollment on an expedited schedule. The Commission's Executive Director will begin immediate efforts to obtain partnership agreements with DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD. As soon as practicable after these agreements are finalized, the Assigned Commissioner will issue a ruling outlining additional implementation tasks and a schedule for completing them. Within 30 days from the effective date of this decision, the

³ If the customer does not contact the utility to cancel provisional enrollment, the customer will be automatically enrolled in CARE and will receive the CARE discount effective the next billing cycle.

Assigned Commissioner will issue a ruling setting forth the text for a bill insert to provide customers with advance information about the automatic enrollment program. Energy Division, in consultation with the Public Advisor's Office, will prepare the bill insert language for the Assigned Commissioner's consideration.

We direct the utilities to submit names and addresses of customers who are not enrolled in CARE to the Commission on a monthly basis, beginning 90 days from today.⁴ The utilities are also expected to track those customers who are automatically enrolled in CARE, and report on the number of customers successfully matched, enrolled and re-certified. This information and actual program expenditure amounts should be included in the utilities' monthly rapid deployment reports until further notice. We further direct each utility to file annual status reports on the automatic enrollment program. This information will allow us to track the number of new enrollees and evaluate the contribution of automatic enrollment to our penetration goals.

Due to the disparities between Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS) and CARE described in this decision, we do not include ULTS in the automatic enrollment program we adopt today. In particular, the record in this proceeding raises concerns over the extent to which ineligible customers may currently be enrolled in ULTS. However, we direct the Low Income Oversight Board (LIOB) to solicit public input and develop recommendations for coordinated customer outreach between the ULTS and CARE programs. The LIOB report is due within 120 days from the date of this decision, with comments due 30 days thereafter. We also refer Energy Division's

⁴ The frequency and content of this submittal may be modified by the Assigned Commissioner, as appropriate.

recommendations for improvement to ULTS penetration rate calculations and eligibility verification to the Assigned Commissioner in the ULTS proceeding, Rulemaking (R.) 98-09-005.

Today's decision also describes the program planning process we envision for the remainder of 2002 and beyond. The utilities report that there is sufficient SBX1 5 and program carryover funding to continue LIEE rapid deployment activities through the end of the year without any modifications to authorized funding levels or ratemaking. In contrast, CARE program costs will greatly exceed the amounts currently authorized in rates and remaining from SBX1 5 appropriations as we continue rapid deployment through 2002. Accordingly, we have directed the utilities to file separate applications to address the funding of CARE rapid deployment activities, and associated ratemaking treatment, through December 31, 2002.⁵ We will consider these applications by subsequent Commission decision.

Finally, as outlined in the Assigned Commissioner ruling dated February 27, 2002, we have initiated a planning process to consider program design improvements for PY2003. As part of this review, we may need to reassess program budgets and funding levels, particularly for CARE outreach efforts, in light of the automatic enrollment program we adopt today. The utilities shall augment their PY2003 CARE program plans within 30 days from the effective date of this decision with a proposed scope of study for evaluating the results of automatic enrollment, and associated budget.

⁵ See A.02-04-031, A.02-04-034, A.02-04-035, A.02-04-036, consolidated by ruling dated April 26, 2002.

2. Background and Issues

PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal currently collect approximately \$140 million per year to fund the CARE program and \$60 million per year for LIEE services through the PGC. In D.01-05-033, the Commission augmented these funding levels in order to rapidly deploy CARE and LIEE programs during the energy crisis.⁶ LIEE budgets were augmented by funds available from prior year unexpended LIEE budgets and funds appropriated by Senate Bill (SB) 5 from the First Extraordinary Session (referred to as SB X1 5). Funding for CARE administrative costs and rate subsidies were also augmented by the one-time SBX1 5 appropriations.⁷ The Commission directed that rapid deployment of these programs continue “until further Commission order,” and required PG&E, SDG&E, SCE and SoCal to file monthly status reports on the results of these efforts. The Commission also articulated its expectation that rapid deployment would need to continue “through the end of 2001 and perhaps well into 2002.”⁸

Consistent with that direction, the Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) scheduled status conferences to monitor rapid

⁶ Rapid deployment programs and activities for the smaller and multi-jurisdictional utilities are being addressed by the Commission separately. See, for example, D.01-08-065. However, we do address today the CARE penetration goal proposals submitted by Avista Utilities and Gas Company in this proceeding.

⁷ SBX1 5 provided a one-time increase to LIEE program of \$20 million. The statute also authorized another \$50 million for appliance replacement and other energy efficiency measures, of which the Commission allocated \$25 million to further supplement LIEE funding during the energy crisis. In addition, SBX1 5 provided a one-time appropriation of \$100 million to supplement the funding collected in rates for CARE discounts and outreach efforts. However, approximately \$84 million of this CARE program augmentation was subsequently rescinded by the Governor in his November Budget Revisions.

⁸ D.01-05-033, p. 67; Ordering Paragraphs 17 and 19.

deployment activities and program accomplishments. These were held on July 11, 2001 (San Francisco), August 28, 2001 (Los Angeles) and February 8, 2002 (San Francisco).

In order to explore ways to further increase participation in these programs, the Assigned Commissioner issued a ruling on June 14, 2001 requesting comments on the issue of “automatic enrollment,” i.e., automatically enrolling customers into CARE or LIEE when they enroll in other low-income assistance programs, such as food stamps or Medi-Cal. Comments were filed on June 29, 2001 by AARP,⁹ jointly by Bay Area Poverty Resource Council and Community Resource Project, Inc., by DCSD, Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) and jointly by SDG&E, SoCal, PG&E and SCE. Reply comments were filed on July 5, 2001 by AARP and jointly by SDG&E, SoCal, PG&E and SCE.

On October 8, 2001, the Governor signed SBX2 2 into law. Among other things, SBX2 2 modifies Pub. Util. Code § 739.1 to require that the Commission take certain steps to improve CARE enrollment and participation, “including comparing information from CARE and the [ULTS] program to determine the most effective means of using that information to increase CARE enrollment through automatic enrollment of ULTS customers who are eligible for the CARE program, and identify customer privacy issues and alternative mechanisms for outreach to potential enrollees.” SBX2 2 also requires that the Commission establish penetration goals for the CARE program. By ruling dated November 20, 2001, the Assigned Commissioner requested parties to this proceeding and the ULTS proceeding R.98-09-005 to respond to CARE

⁹ Formerly the American Association of Retired Persons, this organization now refers to itself exclusively as “AARP”.

enrollment issues and other requirements of the statute. The Assigned Commissioner also directed Energy Division to hold workshops on penetration rates for CARE and ULTS.¹⁰ In particular, he directed Energy Division to develop recommendations on the following:

1. Any methodological issues that need to be addressed to improve the methods currently used by the energy utilities to develop and report penetration rates, in order to ensure consistent and accurate reporting across utilities.
2. How to effectively update current methods to reflect the 2000 Census data.
3. How the methods discussed at the workshop could be used to develop comparable penetration rates under the ULTS program.

Comments on CARE enrollment issues were filed on December 14, 2001 by AARP, Avista, AT&T Communications of California, Inc., ORA, Pacific Bell Telephone Company (Pacific Bell), PG&E, SCE, jointly by SDG&E and SoCal and by Verizon California Inc. (Verizon). Reply comments were filed by AARP, Latino Issues Forum and Greenlining Institute (LIF/G), SCE, SDG&E/SoCal and Verizon.

PG&E, SDG&E, SCE, SoCal, Avista and Southwest filed proposals to establish penetration goals for their CARE programs on December 19, 2001. LIF/G filed joint comments on the utility proposals on January 3, 2002, and SCE filed a reply to those comments on January 10, 2002. Supplemental comments on how penetration goals could be developed to address differences in program

¹⁰ Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Scheduling Workshops on Penetration Rates for CARE and ULTS Programs, January 14, 2002.

penetration among different demographic groups were filed on February 19, 2002 by PG&E, SCE, SDG&E/SoCal and ORA.

Energy Division held workshops on CARE and ULTS penetration rates on February 6 and March 6, 2002. Energy Division's workshop report was issued on April 2, 2002. Comments were filed on April 19, 2002 jointly by Pacific Bell/Verizon, SCE, SDG&E/SoCal and ORA. Reply comments were filed on April 29, 2002 by Pacific Bell/Verizon, SCE, ORA, and LIF/G.

In today's decision, we briefly summarize the status of rapid deployment efforts to date. Based on the workshop report and comments, we discuss the methods currently used to develop penetration rates for the CARE and ULTS programs, and identify areas for further improvement. Within this context, we establish our longer term goal for CARE program participation, adopt minimum benchmarks for CARE penetration rates between now and 2005, and adopt an automatic enrollment program for CARE. Finally, we briefly outline the program planning process we envision for CARE and LIEE in the coming months. In that discussion, we present estimates of the amount of funding that is currently collected via the PGC, available from prior year carryovers and remaining from SBX1 5 appropriations for low-income assistance programs during 2002.

3. Status of Rapid Deployment

In the following sections, we briefly summarize the status of rapid deployment efforts for low-income assistance programs, by utility.¹¹ More

¹¹ Source: Reporter's Transcript (RT): Status Conference On Rapid Deployment Of Low-Income Assistance Programs, February 8, 2002 and the January 22, 2002 Monthly Status Reports filed by the utilities in this proceeding.

detailed information is available in Attachments 3 to 6 of this decision. The results described below represent accomplishments since the inception of rapid deployment (initiated in May, 2001 with the issuance of D.01-05-033) through the end of 2001, unless otherwise indicated.

The CARE penetration rates we present in the following sections represent the number of low-income customers that actually participate in the CARE program, divided by an estimate of the number of customers that are eligible for the program. After a customer has been on the program for two years, they are required to re-certify their eligibility by responding to a written inquiry from the utility.¹² No income eligibility documentation is required in the re-certification process. However, if the customer does not respond, they are removed from the CARE rate. The CARE penetration rates reflect the increases in enrollments during the year, as well as the decreases in enrollments due to customers moving out of the service territory or failure to re-certify during that period. Attachment 2 references the sources of this information from the utility's monthly status reports.

We also summarize the status of each utility's capitation agreements. Under these agreements, the utility pays an organization or agency a fee to reimburse them for enrolling eligible CARE participants. This administrative fee (referred to as a "capitation fee") is generally paid on a fixed basis for each successful CARE enrollment.

Our reference below to the number of "treated" homes refers to an income-qualified home that has received any measure or service under the LIEE

¹² Customers who are submetered tenants are requested to recertify annually.

program, including energy education, compact fluorescent lights (CFLs), weatherization and appliances. “Weatherized” homes are a subset of “treated” homes, and are defined as income-qualified homes that have received any weatherization measures (e.g., weatherstripping and caulking) under the LIEE program. Under the LIEE program a treated home must receive all feasible measures for which it qualifies.

Table 1 summarizes the status of LIEE and CARE expenditures and accomplishments during 2001, by utility.

3.1 PG&E

From May thru December 2001, PG&E enrolled approximately 128,000 “net” new customers in the CARE program, that is, new enrollments minus the reductions in existing enrollments due to re-certification efforts during those months. PG&E increased its CARE penetration rate from 41% to 53% during that period. (See Attachment 3.) The increase in enrollment was distributed evenly between urban and rural counties, where program penetration increased by 58% and 56%, respectively.¹³ PG&E attributes this large increase in enrollment to the successful incorporation of strategies identified during the CARE Outreach Pilot, including targeted language-specific advertising, presence at local community events supported by public media partnerships, and the capitation agreements with community-based organizations. As of the end of 2001, PG&E had entered into capitation agreements with approximately 80 different organizations throughout its service territory, split fairly evenly between rural and urban counties.

¹³ RT at 165.

PG&E characterizes 2001 as a transition year for LIEE, in which it was ramping up a new contract for its Energy Partners Program and incorporating the new rapid deployment LIEE measures. It started the year with ten contractors providing weatherization services throughout PG&E's service territory, and after the new bid, the contractor pool increased to 20 during the summer months, with additional contractors added in September. During 2001, PG&E treated approximately 44,000 homes—of which about 30,000 were weatherized, including 3,045 treated with attic insulation. Specific measure installations include: 7,000 efficient refrigerators, 4,000 evaporative coolers, 162,000 CFLs. As of December 31, 2001, PG&E projects that these initiatives have saved 2,955 kilowatts (kW), over 16 million kilowatt-hours (kWh) and 748,873 therms.¹⁴

3.2 SDG&E

From May through December 2001, SDG&E added approximately 11,360 CARE program enrollees on a net basis, increasing its CARE penetration rate from 58% to 63% during that period. (See Attachment 6.) At the end of the year, SDG&E's penetration rate for rural and urban areas was 40% and 64%, respectively.¹⁵ SDG&E primarily works with agencies that have one-to-one contacts with low-income customers, and offers CARE information in conjunction with events targeted to low-income markets, such as those sponsored through churches, community affairs or local agencies. SDG&E currently contracts with eight community-based organizations to enroll

¹⁴ See Table 1 and PG&E's monthly status reports on 2001 year-end results.

¹⁵ SDG&E Status Report, dated January 22, 2002; Tables 14 and 15. See also Table 1.

customers on a capitation fee basis, and expects to contract with three more during 2002.

For its LIEE program, SDG&E reports that it treated 19,679 homes during 2001, of which 10,817 received weatherization measures. Specific measure installations include: 2,833 efficient refrigerators, 2,062 CFLs, 379 efficient air conditioners and 423 water heaters. During the second half of 2001, SDG&E entered into memorandums of understanding with six San Diego-based organizations to leverage low income assistance programs offered through DCSD. These organizations will continue their participation during 2002 to increase these leveraging efforts, including bulk purchasing arrangements, exchange of customer information, referral systems and outreach activities. As of December 31, 2001, SDG&E estimates that its LIEE program has produced savings of 1,655 kW, approximately 5.9 million kWh and 233,041 therms.¹⁶

3.3 SCE

SCE enrolled approximately 124,240 new CARE participants on a net basis between May and December 2001. During that period, SCE increased its CARE penetration rate from 73% to 88%. (See Attachment 4.) SCE reports CARE penetration rates of 71% and 90% for rural and urban areas, respectively.¹⁷ SCE attributes its success in building CARE enrollment to a multi-channel outreach effort that includes the capitation program, targeted and ethnic media advertising, direct mailers as well as outreach activities through faith-based organizations, county agencies, and other organizations. During 2001, SCE put

¹⁶ *Ibid.* Table 5.

¹⁷ SCE Status Report, dated January 22, 2002; Tables 14 and 15.

in place agreements with 65 organizations to increase CARE enrollment through capitation fee arrangements.

During 2001, SCE weatherized 1,246 homes and installed the following measures: 685 central air conditioner systems, 240 window air conditioning units, 9,285 efficient refrigerators and approximately 250,000 CFLs, with an additional 65,832 CFLs installed in porch light fixtures.¹⁸ In addition, SCE installed 3,900 evaporative cooler units. SCE leverages with the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) offered by DCSD by purchasing refrigerators on behalf of both programs, contracting with LIHEAP service providers to deliver measures under both programs, and other methods. As of December 31, 2001, SCE estimates that its rapid deployment efforts have saved approximately 5,890 kW and over 26 million kWh.¹⁹

3.4 SoCal

SoCal reports that it added over 106, 000 new customers to its CARE program on a net basis from May through December 2001. These additions increased SoCal's CARE penetration rates from 56% to 60%. (See Attachment 5.) Program penetration is estimated at 61% for urban and 51% for rural areas within SoCal's service territory.²⁰

SoCal projects an aggressive increase in CARE participation during 2002, as a result of using the additional funds available for marketing and outreach under SBX1 5. It plans to continue community-based outreach, including the continued use of capitation contractors. SoCal reports that one of its capitation

¹⁸ *Ibid.* Table 4.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* Table 5. See also Table 1.

contractor enrolled over 17,000 CARE customers in 2001. SoCal currently has 43 CARE contractors participating in the program and is negotiating contracts with more than 20 other organizations for CARE outreach activities.

SoCal weatherized over 33,000 homes during 2001. Most of SoCal's weatherization contractors are also LIHEAP contractors, and SoCal reports that this has enabled them to significantly leverage funding under both programs. SoCal provided 884 energy-education workshops throughout the service territory and installed 3,200 furnaces and 1,549 efficient water heaters during 2001. As of December 31, 2001, SoCal estimates that its program has saved a total of 746,352 therms and 396,552 kWh.²¹

4. CARE and ULTS Penetration Rates - Methodological Issues

As described above, Energy Division held workshops to examine the methodologies used by the energy and telecommunication companies to calculate the penetration rates for their low-income rate discount programs, CARE and ULTS, respectively. Attachment 7 presents excerpts from the working report summarizing these methodologies, including their similarities and differences.

The most striking revelation from the workshops is that telephone service affordability studies required by the Commission do not produce penetration rates that reflect the number of customers participating in the ULTS rate discount program, relative to the number that are estimated to be eligible. Instead, Verizon and Pacific Bell calculate penetration rates that are designed to monitor

²⁰ SoCal Status Report, dated January 22, 2002; Tables 14 and 15.

²¹ See Table 1.

universal service goals by monitoring how many households have basic phone service. In other words, the penetration rates (in the 94-98% range) that have been submitted to the Commission by telecommunications utilities in the past, and compared with CARE penetration rates by some parties in our low-income assistance proceedings,²² reflect *the percentage of the population that have phones*. Energy utilities, on the other hand, calculate penetration rates that reflect CARE program participation relative to eligibility. The workshops clearly revealed this important definitional difference.

For the purpose of these workshops, Verizon and Pacific Bell arranged to have their consultants apply the survey results from the most recent affordability study to develop a ULTS penetration rate that would be comparable to what the energy utilities calculate. The results indicate that approximately 70% of customers that have phones and are eligible for ULTS actually participate in the program. However, as discussed in the Workshop Report, this statistic may overestimate actual ULTS penetration rates somewhat because the telecommunication utilities do not conduct random verification of their ULTS enrollees (as do the energy utilities).²³

Based on the information presented in workshops, Energy Division recommends improvements to the methods used by PG&E, SDG&E, SCE and

²² For example, LIF/G in their January 3, 2002 comments refer to Verizon's "ULTS penetration rate" as going from 93.8% in 1994 to 96.2% in 2000. (Footnote 5.) However, as discussed in the workshops, these figures do not represent ULTS penetration rates—but rather then number of households that have phones. LIF/G repeats this error in their reply comments on the Workshop Report.

²³ Workshop Report on CARE and ULTS Penetration Rates, April 2, 2002, p. 10.

SoCal for calculating penetration rates.²⁴ In particular, Energy Division recommends that these utilities order the special tabulations of 2000 Census data when they are available (Fall 2002) to update demographic information on the joint relationship between household size and income. An example of this joint relationship would be the number of households with 3 members and household income in the \$15,000 to \$19,000 range. Because CARE income eligibility is based on both household income and size, the utilities must have this information in order to estimate the eligible CARE population.

As described in Attachment 7, the primary source of joint household size and income distribution information is the 1990 Census Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data. The utilities update the 1990 PUMS data in their calculations of penetration rates by using vendor data to update household income and size information individually.²⁵ Then they statistically match these updates to the 1990 Census joint distribution data. By definition, this approach is fundamentally tied to the joint distribution data collected by the 1990 Census.

Per our reporting requirements manual, the utilities are required to update their CARE penetration rates on an annual basis, by June 1 of each year. In response to Energy Division's Workshop Report, the utilities argue that they should not be required to change the manner in which they update the 1990 Census data or be required to order special tabulations of the 2000 Census data. Rather, they prefer to wait to utilize the 2000 Census information on the joint

²⁴ These utilities currently use a consistent methodology that was adopted by the Commission in D.01-03-028.

²⁵ Examples of the Census PUMS data representing the joint distribution of household income and size, and the vendor data that updates income and size data individually, is provided in Attachment S to the Workshop Report.

distribution of household income and size data when the 2000 Census PUMS tables are published during the later half of 2003. They argue that the effort required to make such a change to their calculations of penetration rates at this time would be significant and potentially duplicative of the efforts to be undertaken during Phase 2 of the Needs Assessment Study.

We do not find these arguments persuasive. At whatever point we make the transition to using 2000 Census data as the basis for the joint distribution of household income and size, there will be costs and effort involved. Energy Division estimates that the expense to procure these special tabulations is relatively modest (\$800 to \$1,000 per utility), which none of the utilities refute in their comments. What they do argue is that the special tabulations lack the flexibility and corresponding tables that are published later with the 2000 Census PUMS data, thus increasing the effort and costs of updating the penetration rates. Although the comments are not clear on this point, it appears that the utilities are requesting to wait until their June 1, 2004 annual update to modify the joint distribution of household income and size based on 2000 Census data, i.e., by waiting until the PUMS tables are available later in 2003.

We do not find it acceptable to continue to rely on the joint distribution data from the 1990 Census as a primary source, as the utilities' comments suggest. We need to evaluate the effect of these updates sooner versus later in order to establish meaningful benchmarks for program performance beyond 2002. As discussed below, the penetration goals proposed by the utilities were developed based on 1990 Census data. Monitoring program performance based on a ratio whose denominator may change considerably when recalculated using 2000 Census joint distribution data is simply not a useful exercise, in our view. Moreover, the utilities will need to move ahead in using these special

tabulations for the Needs Assessment Study, given the current timetable for initiating our Phase 2 assessment.²⁶

Accordingly, we direct the utilities to order the special tabulations of 2000 Census data as soon as they are available this fall to update demographic information on the joint relationship between household size and income. The utilities are to present the results of this update (i.e., revised numbers of eligible CARE customers) in their January 2003 monthly status report.

Energy Division also recommends that PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal proceed to complete certain sensitivity tests that were described in the technical workshop materials as currently underway. Specifically, these sensitivity tests involve income smoothing alternatives, variations in small area weighting and an analysis of whether differences between program and Census definitions of household incomes influence eligibility estimates significantly.²⁷ In the interest of time and consistency, Energy Division recommends that the utilities retain their current vendor, AGS, for updating Census data at this time. For similar reasons, Energy Division recommends that the utilities' current methods for classifying rural and urban areas remain unchanged.

In its comments on the workshop report, SCE argues that the utilities should be permitted to reconsider the use of AGS data as the source for current year data on household size and income distributions, and pursue the option of returning to Claritas as the source for future updates. SCE also contends that the current method for classifying rural and urban areas could be improved by using

²⁶ Low Income Needs Assessment Study Phase 1, draft report, pp. 7-8, 7-9.

²⁷ Workshop Report on CARE and ULTS Penetration Rates, April 2, 2002, Attachment S, p. 9.

the Goldsmith method, rather than the Rural Health Council method, and that the utilities should be authorized to make this change. Finally, SCE recommends that the utilities expand their efforts to validate estimates against independent data sources, beyond those already undertaken to date.

We will adopt Energy Division's recommendations at this time. As discussed above, the utilities will be updating their penetration rate estimates with 2000 Census data for their January 2003 status report. To introduce additional methodological refinements between now and then could divert limited resources from this updating task, which we consider to be of highest priority. As part of the PY2003 or subsequent program planning cycles, the utilities may propose additional or alternate validation activities for our consideration. In doing so, the utilities should present a proposed budget for each of the recommended activities.

Moreover, nothing in this record indicates that changes in vendors would be critical to the accuracy of the utilities' current estimates. As Energy Division points out, AGS and Claritas are both well-respected firms and a lot of time and effort went into deciding on AGS as the vendor for updating Census data. With respect to the benefits of the Goldsmith method over the Rural Health Council method, this methodological issue is also being considered in Phase 1 of the Needs Assessment Study, as is SCE's recommendation to evaluate how master-metered households may upwardly bias estimates of household eligibility.²⁸ We will address these recommendations when we address all other Phase 1 issues. Other longer-term refinements to the methodology used by PG&E, SCE,

²⁸ Low-Income Needs Assessment Phase 1 Report (Phase 1), draft issued April 3, 2002, p. 7-12.

SoCal and SDG&E are being considered in the Needs Assessment Study, such as the development of estimates of willingness to participate in CARE. We may direct PG&E, SDG&E, SCE and SoCal to incorporate further changes into their methodology as we consider the Needs Assessment Study reports and recommendations.

Energy Division recommends no changes to the current methodologies utilized by Avista and Southwest to calculate CARE penetration rates. As described in Attachment 7, Avista uses a simplified method of applying Census information to estimate its CARE eligible population. In particular, Avista based its calculation of the eligible population within its service territory on the relationship between El Dorado County and California poverty statistics. This assumption (11%) is likely to overestimate the number of eligible population (thereby underestimating actual program penetration) since it does not reflect the unique characteristics of many of the South Lake Tahoe residences, e.g., as recreational or seasonal homes.

We believe that the manner in which Avista estimates its eligible population needs to be improved. To this end, we direct Energy Division to ensure that Phase 2 of the Needs Assessment Study is designed to obtain income and household size data specific to Avista's service territory for the purpose of estimating the number of CARE eligible homes. This may be done by using current Census data, by arranging for the study consultants to conduct an independent survey, or a combination of both. The utilities currently funding the study will absorb the cost of this additional task, which should be relatively small.

Southwest uses an outside company to survey their universe of customers for economic and demographic data. Their estimates are based on

cross-tabulations of income and household size and are checked against current Census data for reasonableness. We concur with Energy Division that this approach appears reasonable.

With regard to the telecommunication utilities, the Workshop Report notes several areas where improvement in the calculation of ULTS penetration rates and eligibility verification is needed. Energy Division has referred these recommendations to the Assigned Commissioner in the ULTS Proceeding, R.98-09-005, for further consideration.

Based on the record in this proceeding, we find that the CARE penetration rate methodologies currently utilized by PG&E, SDG&E, SCE, SoCal, Avista and Southwest to be reasonable, subject to the improvements noted above.

5. Interim CARE Penetration Benchmarks

As discussed in Section 3, the utilities have dramatically increased the number of CARE enrollments during 2001. However, all parties agree that further improvements in program penetration are needed. The utilities have proposed the following goals for CARE enrollments over the next four years:

	Utility Proposed Penetration Goals					
	PG&E	SCE	SDG&E	SoCal	Avista	Southwest
2002	63%	88.0%	75.0%	70.0%	50.0%	89.0%
2003	74%	88.0%	78.0%	76.0%	57.0%	90.0%
2004	83%	88.0%	82.0%	81.0%	59.0%	92.0%
2005	84%	88.0%	85.0%	85.0%	61.0%	94.0%

In their December 19, 2001 filings the utilities discuss the types of outreach activities they plan to employ to reach these penetration rates, which include the continued use of community outreach contractors, targeted non-English

language media marketing, and bill inserts. More specific information regarding PY2002 CARE outreach activities has been submitted in A.02-02-034 et al.

We note that no party has raised objections to the utility proposals for penetration goals, either in written comments, during public workshops or at the February 8, 2002 status conference. However, we do not believe that these proposals recognize that, fundamentally, the goal for this program should be *to reach 100% of low-income customers who are eligible for, and desire to participate in, the CARE program.* The utilities report that over one million low-income customers meet the CARE eligibility criteria but are not currently participating in the program.²⁹ Our goal is to enroll each and every one of these customers who wants to participate.

We recognize that the utilities will not reach this goal at the same pace, given differences in demographic characteristics and the magnitude of the eligible low-income population within each service territory, as well as differences in where each utility stands today with respect to program penetration. We also recognize that the law of diminishing returns applies to CARE outreach efforts over time, i.e., it becomes increasingly difficult to enroll additional customers, the closer the utility moves towards achieving 100% participation.

In consideration of these factors, we establish minimum benchmarks for PG&E, SDG&E, SoCal, Southwest and Avista for PY2002 at the levels proposed

²⁹ We note that this number, as with all the penetration rate figures presented in this proceeding to date, are based on 1990 Census data for the joint distribution of household size and income. These numbers are likely to change when the utilities update that joint distribution based on 2000 Census information, as required by this decision.

by these utilities in their filings: PG&E—63%, SDG&E—75%, SoCal—70%, Southwest—89%, Avista—50%. These benchmarks represent substantial improvements over the 2001 penetration rates achieved by these utilities and move each of them at a meaningful pace towards our goal of 100% penetration. At the same time, the benchmark levels we establish today recognize that the pace towards achieving our goal will differ among the utilities for the reasons discussed above. An additional consideration in establishing Avista's penetration rate benchmark for 2002 is the recognition that the denominator of the equation (eligible population) is based on a method that is likely to overestimate the number of eligible population (thereby underestimating actual program penetration), as discussed in Section 4. We will consider establishing higher benchmarks for Avista in the future when we obtain income and household size data specific to Avista's service territory during Phase 2 of the Needs Assessment Study.

For SCE, we adopt a minimum PY2002 benchmark of 93% because we believe that SCE should improve on, and not just maintain, its 2001 88% penetration rate. In fact, SCE's has recently reported that, as of the end of May, its penetration rate is now at 91%. This appears to be at least in part due to the steps that SCE has taken this year to improve its recertification notification process, as described in its comments.³⁰ In this context, a benchmark of 93% for the entire year is a reasonable standard, particularly in light of the impact we expect automatic enrollment to have on program participation.

³⁰ SCE Comments on draft decision. pp. 6-7.

The minimum PY2002 benchmarks we adopt today reflect our continued commitment to improving CARE enrollment and participation, consistent with SBX2 2 and the program objectives we have articulated in prior Commission decisions. We will continue to closely monitor penetration rate performance. We also intend to establish minimum penetration rate benchmarks for future program years. However, the utilities' proposed penetration goals for 2003 and beyond do not reflect the impact of updating their eligible customer base with 2000 Census data when it becomes available this fall. Nor does it reflect the impact that automatic enrollment (see below) will have on new CARE enrollments as we implement the program.

We cannot predict at this time the net effect of incorporating these factors into the ratio that produces the utility's penetration rates. This information is likely to affect our thinking on what the appropriate performance benchmarks should be in future years. Therefore, we do not believe it is prudent to establish minimum benchmarks beyond 2002 at this time. As we obtain the information we need over the next few months, we will use it to establish meaningful benchmarks for 2003 and beyond.

The benchmarks may also need to be refined when the results of the Low Income Needs Assessment Study currently underway are available. In addition, they may need to be revisited over time in response to changes in demographics, as suggested at the February 8, 2002 prehearing conference (PHC). Several parties recommended that, in the consideration of CARE penetration goals, we should look at penetration levels in terms of ethnic and elderly demographic groups. The issue was raised out of a concern that the utilities' penetration and outreach efforts might not be in line with changes in demographics over time. By ruling dated May 9, 2002, the Assigned

Commissioner directed that the Needs Assessment Study address this issue, and that it be considered by the LIOB.

6. Automatic Enrollment

We believe automatic enrollment of low-income electricity and natural gas customers into CARE is necessary to achieve our goal of 100% CARE penetration. The utilities report that 1,060,828 households currently qualify for but do not participate in the CARE program.³¹ Many of these households are likely to receive medical, food, or cash assistance from public benefit programs administered by California state agencies. As discussed further below, we adopt a program whereby households that participate in certain public assistance programs are automatically enrolled into CARE.

Automatic enrollment issues we address today include broadening eligibility requirements, preserving the confidentiality of customer information through Commission program administration, obtaining customer consent through provisional enrollment, allocation of costs associated with automatic enrollment, and coordination with ULTS.

6.1 Partner Agencies

Parties identified several public assistance programs with eligibility requirements compatible with the CARE income requirement of 175% or less of federal poverty guidelines. Most of these programs are administered by four departments under the auspices of the California Health and Human Services Agency. DHS administers Medi-Cal and Women, Infants and Children (WIC). California Work Opportunities and Responsibility to Kids (CALWORKS) and

³¹ PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, and SoCal April 2002 Rapid Deployment Reports.

Food Stamps are administered by the Department of Social Services (DSS), Healthy Families by the MRMIB, and the LIHEAP are managed by DCSD.

Several of California's low-income food and medical assistance programs are coordinated so that a client who qualifies for one program automatically qualifies for other programs. For example, participants in CALWORKS and Food Stamps automatically qualify for no-cost Medi-Cal. Up to 60% of WIC clients also receive benefits from Medi-Cal and Food Stamps programs. Healthy Families is a health coverage program for children of low-income wage earners with incomes above the Medi-Cal guidelines, which may disqualify Healthy Families clients from participation in programs with lower income requirements.

Low-income households apply for these programs by completing an application at local county-operated welfare assistance offices. One standard application is used for Medi-Cal and Food Stamps; similar applications are used for Healthy Families and WIC. The applications request information about the number of household members, amount and sources of household income, and household expenses. The applicant must provide proof to support the information. The applicant is informed that the application may be selected for a random quality control review.

LIHEAP applicants undergo a similar process. Low-income utility customers complete an application at selected local government and nonprofit agency locations to qualify for any or all of three LIHEAP programs that provide weatherization and bill payment assistance. The LIHEAP programs also require the applicant to provide proof of income.

We elect to partner with the Medi-Cal, WIC, Healthy Families, and LIHEAP programs for three reasons: 1) program eligibility requirements most closely match the Commission CARE eligibility requirement of 175% or less of

federal poverty guidelines; 2) each agency requires proof of income prior to enrollment; and 3) these programs provide the greatest number of household records with the least amount of duplication.

The majority of potential CARE customers will be automatically enrolled through participation in Medi-Cal, which provides public health insurance to low-income Californians. Maximum allowable income for no-cost Medi-Cal is generally up to 133% of federal poverty guidelines, which is well below the maximum CARE income requirement. Approximately 7.2% of Medi-Cal participants have incomes between 133% and 250% of federal poverty guidelines. The number of clients with incomes between 185% and 250% is about 2.6%.

WIC accepts clients with incomes up to 185% of federal poverty guidelines, or clients who participate in either Medi-Cal or Food Stamps programs. Healthy Families and LIHEAP provide services to clients with incomes up to 250% of federal poverty guidelines.

We recognize there may be client duplication among Medi-Cal and WIC at the lower income ranges, but these programs provide the broadest opportunity to reach customers with incomes between the no-cost Medi-Cal maximum income eligibility of 133% and our CARE income eligibility of up to 175% of federal poverty guidelines.

The Executive Director will begin immediate efforts to obtain partnership agreements with DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD. As soon as practicable after these agreements are finalized, the Assigned Commissioner will issue a ruling outlining additional implementation tasks and a schedule for completing them.

6.2 Eligibility Requirements

Currently, low-income households qualify for CARE if they meet certain income and household size criteria, based on 175% of the federal poverty

guidelines. To implement automatic enrollment, we find it necessary to broaden CARE's eligibility requirements so that low-income customers qualify for CARE *either* if the household meets the current CARE eligibility criteria, *or* when the household participates in one of our automatic enrollment partner programs. We recognize that automatic enrollment of Medi-Cal, WIC, Healthy Families, and LIHEAP clientele could result in CARE enrollment of customers whose incomes exceed the Commission's income eligibility requirement. However, we believe this number is insignificant compared to the number of eligible customers with incomes within the CARE requirement.

6.3 Other State and Utility Data Matching Programs

Parties indicate that other states are implementing automatic enrollment, citing programs in Texas, Idaho, Oregon, New York, Vermont, Montana, and Massachusetts. At least two states adopted legislation requiring social service agencies to either simultaneously enroll low-income customers in utility discount programs, or transmit customer eligibility information to either the utility or the state utility regulatory agency. Other states formed cooperative partnerships between social service agencies, the utilities, and the regulatory agency to facilitate provision of low-income services. The utilities point out that although automatic enrollment programs are underway in other states, most notably New York and Texas, specific data on cost, participation levels and operations is not generally available. The utilities recommend obtaining further information to compare the automatic enrollment experiences in other states.

The state of Texas has authorized two automatic enrollment efforts. In 1998, the Public Utilities Commission of Texas (PUCT) implemented an automatic enrollment program to enroll Texas Department of Human Services (TDHS) clients into a bill discount program for low-income users of local

telephone service. DHS periodically transmits the names and telephone numbers of its clientele to the local telephone companies. To date, at least one telephone company, Verizon, has enrolled over 20,000 of its customers from 97,222³² customer records provided by DHS.

In January 2002, the PUCT simultaneously implemented a discount program for low-income electric customers and an automatic enrollment program to accelerate customer participation. Customers who receive certain public benefits from the TDHS are automatically enrolled in the electric bill discount program.³³ The automatic enrollment program is administered under the auspices of the PUCT. The administrator matches a DHS client's address with utility meter addresses obtained from the entity that manages Texas' transmission grid, the Electricity Reliability Council of Texas (ERCOT). In anticipation of automatic enrollment and electric restructure in Texas, ERCOT standardized the service addresses of all meters within its service territory. ERCOT, DHS, the program administrator, the utilities, and electric service providers signed agreements to protect customer confidentiality.

Preliminary data obtained by Energy Division from the PUCT energy program administrator indicates that to date, out of 623,000 households receiving public benefits and served by participating electric service providers and utilities, approximately 460,000 households were successfully identified for

³² Verizon serves approximately 17% of the state. Energy Division estimates that 17%, or 266,000 out of 1.56 million TDHS clients, are likely to be served by Verizon. Energy Division converted 266,000 individual clients to 97,222 households, assuming 2.74 individuals per Texas household per 2001 US Census data: <http://quickfacts.census.gov.qfd/48000.html>.

³³ DHS programs include Medicaid and Food Stamps.

automatic enrollment with their energy service provider. Due to the success of the electric automatic enrollment program, the PUCT plans to shift operation of the telephone discount automatic enrollment program from the telephone companies to the PUCT administrator.

SCE and SoCal are conducting a joint CARE automatic enrollment project. Between December 2001 and March 2002 SCE and SoCal exchanged the names and addresses of new CARE customers in their respective service areas. SoCal provided SCE with the names and addresses of 72,049 new CARE customers. Approximately 18,031 customers were outside of SCE's service territory. Of the remaining 54,018 customers, SCE matched 37,071 customers. About 20,626 customers already received the CARE discount; the remaining 16,445 were enrolled in CARE.

SCE compared its customer records with SoCal records at one of three levels of customer information:

- Level 1 – Customer's first and last names and service address
- Level 2 – Customer's last name and service address
- Level 3 – Service address

SCE automatically enrolled matches made at Levels 1 and 2 into CARE. A letter and CARE application were mailed to Level 3 households.

6.4 Impact of Automatic Enrollment on CARE Penetration

It is impossible to provide reliable estimates of the impact of automatic enrollment on CARE penetration levels at this time. However, we note that in 2001, approximately 5.5 million individuals, or 1.9 million households participated in Medi-Cal, WIC, Healthy Families and LIHEAP. Up to 80% of

these households are served by at least one investor-owned utility.³⁴ Although a portion of these households may already be enrolled in CARE, the potential for automatic enrollment to dramatically increase CARE enrollments is evident.

Based on the experience in other states, we expect to enroll the majority of CARE-eligible households through automatic enrollment during the initial two months of clearinghouse operation. We expect subsequent annual automatic enrollment levels to decrease and level out over time. The status reports we discuss in Section 6.7 below will allow us to track the number of new enrollees and the contribution of this program to CARE penetration levels.

6.5 Commission Administration and Customer Confidentiality

The Commission, rather than the utilities, will administer the agency data exchange for automatic enrollment. Commission administration is necessary to ensure confidentiality of all client information provided through our agency partnerships with DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD. Commission administration will allow the partner agencies to comply with state and federal legal requirements associated with preserving client confidentiality. It also affords low-income consumers greater opportunity to maximize their participation in beneficial public assistance programs.

DHS maintains client information in one central location, the Medi-Cal Eligibility Database System (MEDS). California's fifty-eight counties provide client information to MEDS from each county's individual data system. Client records for the Healthy Families program are also stored in MEDS. MEDS is accustomed to frequent data exchange and transfer functions.

³⁴ California Energy Commission website
http://energy.ca.gov/electricity/utility_sales.html.

DCSD currently utilizes a database to administer the CARE program for Avista, Pacific Power and Light Company, Sierra Pacific, and CARE-comparable low-income discount programs for municipal utilities. DCSD also makes direct assistance payments to all the investor-owned utilities on the customer's behalf. Similar to MEDS, the DCSD database is capable of data merging and transfer applications.

The Commission will act as a clearinghouse to identify electronic matches between agency and utility customer records. The clearinghouse will compare the names and addresses of customers currently not receiving CARE with client information from Medic-Cal, WIC, Healthy Families, and LIHEAP. A reasonable match of customer name and address must be made between agency and utility customer information prior to enrollment. We adopt the approach used in the data exchange program between SoCal Gas and SCE: the customer's last name and address must match to achieve enrollment status.

Once a match is made, a notification and consent procedure similar to that proposed by AARP will be applied. The Commission will forward the customer's name and address to the utility for provisional enrollment. The utility will contact the customer by mail. The mailing will inform the customer of the benefits of the CARE program and how to contact the utility for additional information. The customer will have 30 days to notify the utility if the customer does not wish to receive the CARE discount. If the customer does not contact the utility to cancel provisional enrollment, the customer will be automatically enrolled in CARE and will receive the CARE discount effective the next billing cycle.

As in the SCE/SoCal automatic enrollment project, we expect some addresses-only matches between utility and partner agency records. If the

clearinghouse achieves an address-only match between agency and utility records, the utility will be alerted to mail a CARE application and a letter inviting the household to apply for CARE.

Beginning 90 days of the effective date of this decision, the utilities will submit the names and addresses of customers currently not receiving CARE to the Commission on a monthly basis. After the initial months of automatic enrollment, it may be practicable to decrease the frequency of submissions, or to require the utilities to submit the names of both CARE and non-CARE customers. The Assigned Commissioner may modify the frequency and content of the utility data submissions, as appropriate. We clarify, as requested by the utilities in their comments, that these submissions do not need to include the names of customers who are not eligible for CARE by reason of their rate class. Energy Division will conduct meetings with the utilities and our partner agencies to develop data transfer and matching protocols.

6.6 Recertification of Automatic Enrollment Customers

Currently, CARE customers receive a discount for two years. After two years on the program, customers are required to recertify their eligibility. The utility automatically contacts the customer for recertification. AARP and the utilities recommend a one-year recertification period to ensure continued eligibility of customers who are automatically enrolled versus those customers who applied to CARE via other mechanisms. AARP points out that many social services programs require annual certification, and that information obtained from more frequent certification could assist the Commission with monitoring the effectiveness of the automatic enrollment program. AARP suggests modifying the partner agencies' applications to allow customers to apply for

CARE, Medi-Cal, Healthy Families, or other public benefit programs simultaneously.

At this time, we decline to adopt a two-tier recertification process. We believe the eligibility screening performed by DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD provides a level of scrutiny that equals or exceeds the utilities' screening process. Further, we anticipate that the automatic enrollment program will allow us to move towards the goal of recertifying a majority of CARE customers through this electronic, paperless process. Accordingly, whether enrolled through traditional or automatic means, CARE customers will receive the CARE discount for two years, and may recertify through either new or continued participation in our partner agency programs or through the utility's automatic two-year recertification process. We will consider refinements to the utilities' traditional recertification process as we proceed with the implementation of automatic enrollment.

We believe AARP's suggestion to modify the applications of DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD to allow customers to apply for CARE when they apply for other public benefit programs has merit. We will refer this issue to the Assigned Commissioner for further consideration as an implementation task.

6.7 Monitoring Program Effectiveness

To gauge program effectiveness, parties suggest the Commission receive reports on the number of successful and failed matches and confirm customer eligibility through a random post-enrollment verification process.

We believe random verification of customers whose eligibility has been thoroughly established by our partner agencies would be duplicative, thereby adding unnecessary administrative costs to the automatic enrollment program. Moreover, this additional step for customers who have already been income-

qualified could result in qualified low-income customers dropping out of the CARE program unnecessarily. The utilities should exclude automatic enrollment customers from the random post-enrollment verification.

We will direct the utilities to track those customers who are automatically enrolled in CARE, and report on the number of customers successfully matched, enrolled, and recertified. This information should be included in their monthly rapid deployment reports until further notice by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner.

We recognize the need to assess the contribution of automatic enrollment towards achieving our objectives of enrolling all eligible low-income customers into CARE. To this end, we direct the utilities to file annual status reports on automatic enrollment until further order by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner. The Energy Division shall work with the respondent utilities to develop format, content, and filing dates for the annual status reports. This information will allow us to track the number of new enrollees and evaluate the contribution of automatic enrollment to our penetration goals. We direct the utilities to include in their PY2003 CARE program plans (due July 1, 2002) a proposed scope of study for evaluation of the first twelve months of automatic enrollment, and associated budget.

As we move forward with CARE automatic enrollment, we expect that Energy Division, LIOB, utilities and interested parties may identify additional program and implementation issues that need to be addressed. We delegate to the Assigned Commissioner the task of prioritizing and clarifying these issues by ruling, if and when such a need arises.

6.8 Bill Insert

Utility customers should be provided with advance information about the automatic enrollment program directly from the Commission. The most logical method to accomplish this is with a bill insert. The bill insert should state that the Legislature has authorized the Commission to establish CARE penetration goals and to examine methods to enhance CARE enrollment. The bill insert should state that the Commission has selected automatic enrollment as an effective way to achieve its' CARE enrollment goals. The insert should advise customers that if they participate in Medi-Cal, WIC, Healthy Families, or LIHEAP programs, they are eligible for CARE, may be automatically enrolled in CARE, and may receive a letter from the utility informing them of their provisional enrollment in CARE. The bill insert will explain the benefits of CARE. We delegate the task of preparing this bill insert to the Energy Division, in consultation with the utilities and the Public Advisor's Office. The bill insert shall be prepared and approved by way of a ruling from the Assigned Commissioner no later than 30 days from the effective date of this decision.

6.9 Program Costs and Funding

The utilities and the Commission will incur one-time and ongoing costs for program start-up and implementation. The utilities will also incur subsidy costs due to the increase in CARE enrollment.

Parties identified general automatic enrollment cost categories; none of the parties provided estimates on specific costs to implement automatic enrollment.

The utilities each provided subsidy and administrative costs incurred in PY2001 for CARE program activities in their respective May 1, 2002 Annual CARE Progress Reports. Administrative costs include categories for outreach, processing, certification verification, billing system programming, measurement

and evaluation, regulatory compliance, CPUC staff funding, and other unspecified administrative costs. All utilities provided annual and average-per-person rate discount costs. PG&E also included electric surcharge exemption costs.

We note that several of the reported administrative cost subcategories are likely to decrease once the automatic enrollment program is underway. As more customers are enrolled via automatic enrollment, the utilities will not sustain current cost levels for many activities associated with traditional CARE enrollments, such as extensive outreach, CARE application processing, and random post-enrollment verification.

Pending Commission action on the utilities’ applications for PY2002 CARE program ratemaking treatment (A.02-04-031 et al.), we authorize the utilities to track costs related to automatic enrollment in a memorandum account or in an existing CARE balancing account, as appropriate. These costs include the CARE discount, administrative costs, and the Commission’s clearinghouse activities. Commission clearinghouse costs will be allocated in proportion to each utility’s currently estimated eligible, unenrolled CARE population, as follows:

Utility	Estimated Eligible Unenrolled CARE Population	Percentage of Total Eligible Unenrolled CARE Population
SCE	96,729	9%
PG&E	494,030	47%
SDG&E	75,100	7%
SoCalGas	394,969	37%
Total	1,060,828	100%

Increased costs related to the 1-cent and 3-cent surcharge exemption will be tracked consistent with procedures adopted by the Commission in the PY2002 CARE ratemaking proceeding.

In its comments on the draft decision, ORA recommends that we review preliminary cost estimates associated with implementing automatic enrollment for reasonableness in the upcoming program planning process for 2003.³⁵ That process was initiated by the filing of utility applications on July 1, 2002. However, in all likelihood, our program review for 2003 will not be completed before automatic enrollment is well underway and costs are already incurred. Given this timing issue, ORA's recommendation is simply not workable. Nor are we persuaded that such a review would be useful, since there will continue to be considerable uncertainty with respect to program costs until we gain more experience with actual program implementation. Nonetheless, we will need to track utility expenditures on automatic enrollment carefully as we implement this new program over the next few months. The utilities should work with Energy Division in developing an appropriate format for reporting program expenditure information, and include it in the monthly rapid deployment reports until further notice by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner. We expect the annual status reports to detail actual program expenditures as well. In addition, the evaluation study discussed in Section 6.7 should consider those costs in assessing the effectiveness of automatic enrollment during the first twelve months of implementation.

6.10 Coordination with ULTS

Pursuant to PU Code Section 739.1 (c), the Commission is examining methods to improve CARE enrollment and participation, determine the most

³⁵ Comments of ORA on the Draft Interim Opinion, June 10, 2002, p. 2.

effective means of using CARE and ULTS information to increase CARE enrollment, and ensure that a ULTS customer consents prior to enrollment.

In D. 01-05-033, we declined to adopt automatic enrollment of ULTS customers into CARE, noting the differences in eligibility criteria among the programs: “For example, multiple customers within a household may qualify for ULTS. In contrast, under the CARE program, income from all members of the home is considered to determine eligibility.”³⁶ We recognized the need to explore further coordination and leveraging strategies between ULTS and CARE, and directed Energy Division to schedule and facilitate meetings with energy and telephone utilities.

Through these meetings, and through written comments, parties and meeting participants have identified issues which merit further consideration prior to adopting an automatic enrollment program with ULTS in the near-term.

A recent study mandated by the Commission in D.91-07-056 estimates that 30% of ULTS participants are not eligible for ULTS. The study estimates that an additional 12% may or may not be eligible. To support its findings, the study estimates that while approximately 2.13 million households are ULTS-eligible, approximately 3.5 million customers participate in ULTS. The study notes that “self-certification may no longer be sufficient, and consideration might be given to approaches used in other states that tie ULTS qualifications to other social service benefits programs.”³⁷

We believe the ULTS study results and the disparities between ULTS and CARE merit further attention before including ULTS. At a minimum, we do not

³⁶ D.01-05-033, p. 42.

include ULTS in the automatic enrollment program adopted today. We defer further consideration of ULTS participation in the automatic enrollment program until the Commission determines the extent to which ineligible customers are enrolled in ULTS, and whether to revise the telephone utilities' self-certification and post-enrollment verification procedures.

Coordination of other types of customer outreach strategies between the ULTS and CARE programs should commence without delay. We direct the LIOB and interested parties to develop recommendations for targeted outreach to specific telephone utility service areas. We will leave it to the LIOB to hold public meetings on this issue, and to report their recommendations within 120 days from the effective date of this decision in the form of a report to the Commission. Comments are due 30 days thereafter. LIOB's report should summarize the positions of parties and participants in the public meetings, present the pros and cons of options considered and discuss the rationale for LIOB's recommendations.

7. Program Planning For 2002 and Beyond

The parties to this proceeding are unanimous in their support of continuing rapid deployment efforts through PY2002.³⁸ We concur. Rapid deployment has successfully ramped up during 2001, consistent with our objectives. As of February 2002, PG&E, SCE, SoCal and SDG&E have collectively added approximately 420,000 new customers to the CARE program on a net basis since the inception of rapid deployment in May 2001. (See Attachment 2.)

³⁷ Fields Research Affordability Study, Customer Survey Volume I, p.30.

³⁸ See PHC statements and RT dated February 8, 2002; Assigned Commissioner's Ruling dated February 27, 2002.

Under the LIEE program, these utilities have collectively weatherized 50,440 homes during 2001. The utilities report that, conservatively, an additional 50,000 homes were treated with additional energy efficiency measures in 2001.³⁹

We believe it is reasonable to build on this momentum during 2002 rather than disrupting this progress by making major program modifications. In the meantime, we need to examine the ratemaking implications of continuing with CARE rapid deployment through 2002 in a separate, ratemaking proceeding.

During the February 8, 2002 PHC, ORA raised the issue of whether the utilities will have sufficient LIEE funding to cover rapid deployment costs during PY2002. The utilities have responded in the affirmative. A summary of their estimates of available LIEE program funding is presented below:

Funding Availability--PY2002 LIEE (in millions of dollars)			
	PGC "Base" Funds Currently in Rates	Carryover and SBX1 5 Funds	Total
PG&E	\$29	\$33	\$62
SDG&E	\$5	\$9	\$14
SCE	\$7	\$9	\$16
SoCal	\$19	\$15	\$34

³⁹ See Table 1. The number of total homes treated by weatherization or other energy efficiency measures (appliances, compact fluorescent lights, etc.) is conservatively estimated at 101,563. This figure divides SCE's number of treated homes by three to take account of the potential double counting described in the footnote to Table 1. Total homes weatherized during 2001 is 50,440, leaving a balance of 51,123 that were treated with non-weatherization measures.

These funds were authorized by the Commission in D.01-05-033. Accordingly, we do not need to modify current funding levels or further address ratemaking issues in order to continue LIEE rapid deployment through December 31, 2002.

In contrast, the utilities project that CARE program costs during PY2002 will greatly exceed the amounts currently authorized in rates and remaining from SBX1 5 appropriations, assuming the continuation of rapid deployment. Actual CARE costs are increasing relative to collections for a combination of reasons, including: (1) the increase in number of eligible participants due to the change in eligibility requirements in 2001, (2) increase from 15% to 20% to the CARE rate discount in 2001 and (3) increased outreach efforts implemented under rapid deployment.⁴⁰ PG&E projects that its CARE outreach expenditures for 2002 will exceed authorized administrative costs by approximately \$4.5 million, and that shortfalls in CARE rate subsidy costs will range from \$49 to \$121 million, depending on the ratemaking treatment of the CARE surcharge exemptions.⁴¹ SCE projects a range of \$33.6 to \$111.4 million in budget shortfalls for CARE rate subsidies, depending on the ratemaking treatment for the CARE surcharge exemptions. SDG&E and SoCal also project significant shortfalls

⁴⁰ By D.01-06-010, the Commission increased the CARE discount from 15% to 20% and raised the income eligibility thresholds for CARE and LIEE from 150% to 175% of the federal poverty guidelines.

⁴¹ The \$121 million reflects PG&E's assumption that the exemption of CARE program participants from the 1-cent and 3-cent 2001 electric rate increases will be recovered through the CARE PGC collections. The \$49 million assumes that only the CARE discount from rates that do not include those increases would be so recovered. The Commission will address this ratemaking issue as part of the separate CARE applications. See PG&E's March 14, 2002 response to request for information and their March 26, 2002 supplemental response in this proceeding.

between estimated program costs and collections, albeit of lesser magnitudes than PG&E and SCE.⁴²

Therefore, implementation of our policy to continue CARE rapid deployment efforts through 2002, which incorporates the automatic enrollment program we adopt today, needs to be further examined in a ratemaking proceeding. By ruling dated March 29, 2002, the Assigned Commissioner directed the utilities to submit ratemaking applications with proposals for CARE administrative activities and budgets for 2002, along with estimated rate subsidy costs and their proposed ratemaking treatment of anticipated shortfalls. The applications (A.02-04-031 et al.) were filed on April 18, 2002. We will consider them in a subsequent Commission decision.

Finally, as discussed in the Assigned Commissioner's ruling, dated February 27, 2002, we have initiated a planning process to consider program design improvements for PY2003. Per that ruling, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal filed applications for their PY2003 LIEE and CARE programs and proposed funding levels on July 1, 2002. As part of the review of these applications, we will need to assess program budgets and funding levels, particularly for CARE outreach efforts, in light of the automatic enrollment program we adopt today.

8. Need for Expedited Consideration

Rule 77.7(f)(9) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure provides in relevant part that:

⁴² See SCE, SDG&E and SoCal's March 14, 2002 response to request for information and SCE's March 26, 2002 supplemental response in this proceeding.

“...the Commission may reduce or waive the period for public comment under this rule...for a decision where the Commission determines, on the motion of the party or on its own motion, that public necessity requires reduction or waiver of the 30-day period for public review and comment. For purposes of this subsection, “public necessity” refers to circumstances in which the public interest in the Commission adopting a decision before expiration of the 30-day review and comment period clearly outweighs the public interest in having the full 30-day period for review and comment. “Public necessity” includes, without limitation, circumstances where failure to adopt a decision before expiration of the 30-day review and comment period...would cause significant harm to public health or welfare. When acting pursuant to this subsection, the Commission will provide such reduced period for public review and comment as is consistent with the public necessity requiring reduction or waiver.”

We balance the public interest in quickly addressing these low-income assistance matters against the public interest in having a full 30-day comment cycle on the decision draft. We conclude that the former outweighs the latter. A reduced period for review and comment balances the need for parties' input with the need for timely action. Comments were filed by AARP, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E/SoCal, ORA, Roseville Telephone Company (Roseville) and by a group of small local exchange companies on June 10, 2002.⁴³ Reply comments were filed by AARP, SCE, SDG&E/SoCal and Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum and the LIOB on June 17, 2002.

In response to these comments, we make minor corrections and clarifications to the decision language, as well as the substantive changes

⁴³ Calaveras, Cal-Ore, Ducor, Evans, Foresthill, Happy Valley, Hornitos, Kerman, Pinnacles, Ponderosa, Sierra, Siskiyou, Volcano and Winterhaven Telephone Companies filed joint comments.

discussed below. We note that Roseville and the small local exchange companies primarily comment on issues that we have referred to the ULTS proceeding, R.98-09-005, such as eligibility verification. We encourage these parties to participate actively in that proceeding to make their views known.

In its comments, SCE states that it “believes the intent of the Draft Opinion also applies the categorical eligibility concept to the utilities Low Income Energy Efficiency (LIEE) programs.”⁴⁴ SCE is mistaken. In effect, SCE is proposing that we eliminate our current requirements that LIEE utility contractors obtain and retain income documentation before enrolling customers into that program. We established that requirement in D.01-03-028 after careful consideration of various viewpoints and concerns.⁴⁵ We have also expressed reservations about automatic enrollment of CARE eligible customers into LIEE because of the significant differences in income documentation requirements for these two programs.⁴⁶ Nothing in today’s decision is intended to extend automatic enrollment to the LIEE program or modify our prior orders regarding income documentation for LIEE. Once we have gained experience with automatic enrollment on the CARE side, we may consider SCE’s proposal in a subsequent program planning cycle, where we can revisit the issues and concerns that are specific to categorical eligibility in LIEE. In the mean time, as SDG&E/SoCal points out in its comments, the customers enrolled in CARE as a result of automatic enrollment may serve as an excellent source of leads for the LIEE program.

⁴⁴ SCE Comments on Draft Interim Opinion, June 10, 2002, p. 8.

⁴⁵ See D.01-03-028, pp. 12-15.

⁴⁶ See D.01-05-033, p. 43, footnote 36.

ORA recommends in its comments that we perform a reasonableness review of rapid deployment program budgets in the upcoming PY2003 program planning cycle, because the program cost estimates presented in the draft decision were very preliminary. For the reasons discussed in this decision, we do not adopt this recommendation. However, in response to ORA's comments, we do remove the estimates of costs presented in the draft decision in recognition that the cost impacts of the program are extremely uncertain at this time.

In addition, in response to parties' comments on the impact of automatic enrollment on administrative budgets and overall program efficiency in reaching eligible customers, we clarify our expectation that the utilities will not sustain current cost levels for many activities associated with traditional CARE enrollments once automatic enrollment is up and running.

In their comments, several parties express concerns over the drop-off levels that some utilities are currently experiencing in the CARE program, and suggest ways that the automatic enrollment recertification process might address this issue. In response, we add language that articulates our goal of creating effective ways to recertify CARE customers through the electronic, paperless process available to us through the automatic enrollment program.

The major substantive changes to the draft decision relate to our selection of meaningful benchmarks for penetration rates. In its comments, SCE requests the Commission to recognize that, until the effects of automatic enrollment and updated Census data are known, the 4-year benchmarks proposed in the draft decision may not be realistic and may therefore need to be revised for future

years.⁴⁷ PG&E also expresses concern that the future calculation of eligible population may be adjusted upwards—without revisiting the benchmark percentages for program penetration rates at the same time.⁴⁸

In order to address this issue effectively, we modify the draft decision in two ways: First, instead of establishing penetration rate benchmarks for each of the years from 2002 through 2005, we establish a benchmark for each utility only for PY2002. In doing so, we adopt a benchmark for SCE that reflects the fact that SCE has already (as of May 2002) substantially exceeded its 2001 penetration rate of 88%. Second, we require the utilities to present their updated information on eligible CARE customers based on the 2000 Census joint distribution data in a timely fashion. In this way, we will be able to consider the impacts of the Census data updates and of automatic enrollment on penetration rates as we establish meaningful benchmarks for future years. Finally, we note that several parties and the LIOB identify issues that may need to be addressed in greater detail as we proceed with program implementation, such as how to identify for recertification purposes those customers who no longer participate in the partner programs through which they became automatically eligible for CARE. As discussed in today's decision, the Assigned Commissioner will identify further implementation tasks for the program, with a reasonable timetable for resolving the most critical path issues first.

⁴⁷ SCE Comments on Draft Decision, p. 7.

⁴⁸ PG&E Comments on Draft Decision, p.

Findings of Fact

1. As of February 2002, the rapid deployment efforts of SDG&E, SCE, PG&E and SoCal resulted in approximately 420,000 new customers being enrolled in the CARE program, net of decreases in enrollment due to customers moving out of the service area or failing to recertify.

2. Rapid deployment during 2001 increased the number of homes weatherized under the LIEE program in PG&E, SDG&E, SCE and SoCal's service territories by more than 50,000, and at least another 50,000 were provided other energy efficiency measures during the year, such as efficient refrigerators, air conditioners or compact fluorescent lights.

3. The penetration rates regularly calculated by the telecommunications utilities (e.g., Verizon and Pacific Bell) measure the number of households that have basic phone service, rather than the penetration rate for the ULTS program. Data presented during workshops indicates that the penetration rate for the ULTS program (i.e., the number of program participants relative to the number that are eligible) is approximately 70%.

4. As discussed in this decision, SCE, SDG&E, PG&E and SoCal's methodology for calculating penetration rates would be improved by completing certain sensitivity tests currently underway, and by updating the 1990 Census data on household size and income relationships with the 2000 Census data when it becomes available in fall, 2002. Introducing additional methodological refinements at this time could divert limited resources from this updating task. Some of the refinements proposed by the utilities during workshops overlap with the recommendations presented in the Phase 1 report of the Needs Assessment Study, which are currently under consideration by the Commission.

5. Avista utilizes a simplified method of applying Census information that may overestimate its eligible CARE population.

6. Southwest Gas utilizes a method of estimating CARE eligible population that cross-checks independent survey information against current Census data.

7. The calculation and reporting of ULTS penetration rates by the telecommunications utilities could be improved in several ways, as discussed in Energy Division's workshop report. These improvements should be considered in the ULTS proceeding, R. 98-09-005.

8. Over one million low-income customers are eligible for, but do not participate in, the CARE program.

9. The utilities' proposed penetration rates do not acknowledge that the fundamental goal of the program should be to reach 100% of low-income customers that are eligible for, and desire to participate in, the CARE program.

10. Utilities will not reach this goal at the same pace, given differences in demographic characteristics and the magnitude of the eligible low-income population within each service territory, as well as differences in where each utility stands today with respect to program penetration.

11. The law of diminishing returns applies to CARE outreach efforts over time, i.e., it becomes increasingly difficult to enroll additional customers, the closer the utility moves towards achieving 100% participation.

12. Penetration rate benchmarks for PY2002 of 63% for PG&E, 75% for SDG&E, 70% for SoCal, 89% for Southwest and 50% for Avista represent substantial improvements over the 2001 penetration rates achieved by these utilities and moves each of them at a meaningful pace towards our goal of 100% penetration. At the same time, these benchmark levels recognize that the pace towards achieving our goal will differ among the utilities for the reasons

discussed in this decision. Avista's penetration rate benchmark for 2002 recognizes that the denominator of the equation (eligible population) is based on a method that is likely to overestimate the number of eligible population, thereby underestimating actual program penetration).

13. Setting SCE's 2002 benchmark at the level recommended by SCE (88%) represents a expectation that SCE cannot improve upon its 2001 performance, despite the fact that SCE reports a penetration rate of 91% as of May, 2002. A benchmark of 93% for the entire year is a reasonable standard for SCE, for the reasons discussed in this decision.

14. It is prudent to base post 2002 performance benchmarks on penetration rate information that incorporates 2000 Census data on joint household income and size, which will be available in special tabulations this fall. They should also reflect the impact of automatic enrollment on program participation. The utilities proposed penetration goals for 2003 and beyond do not incorporate either of these factors, and their net impact on utility penetration rates are uncertain at this time.

15. Within 30 days from the effective date of this decision, the utilities shall augment their 2003 CARE program plans (filed on July 1, 2002) a proposed scope of study for evaluating the results of automatic enrollment, and associated budget.

16. The CARE penetration benchmarks adopted today may need to be further refined in future program planning cycles when the results of the Low Income Needs Assessment Study currently underway are available.

17. Achieving the 100% penetration rate goal described in this decision is expected to increase CARE rate subsidy costs, depending on the number of new customers enrolled through the program. The utilities and the Commission will

incur one-time and ongoing costs for program start-up and implementation, which may be offset by reductions in traditional outreach costs and other administrative costs.

18. Automatic enrollment of low-income customers into CARE is a necessary component of a strategy to achieve the program penetration goal described in this decision.

19. Automatic enrollment has been implemented in other states, including Texas, Idaho, Oregon, New York, Vermont, Montana and Massachusetts. Under the Texas program, preliminary data indicates that 460,000 out of 623,000 households receiving public benefits from social programs were successfully identified for automatic enrollment with their energy service provider.

20. The Medi-Cal and WIC programs administered by DHS, the Healthy Families program administered by MRMIB, and the Energy Assistance Programs administered by DCSD (“partner programs”) share certain characteristics that make them prime candidates for partnership in the automatic enrollment program. These are: 1) their program eligibility requirements most closely match the Commission-adopted CARE eligibility requirement of 175% of the federal poverty guidelines; 2) each agency requires proof of income prior to enrollment, and 3) these programs provide the greatest number of household records with the least amount of duplication.

21. The majority of potential CARE customers will be automatically enrolled through participation in Medi-Cal. The maximum allowable income for no-cost Medi-Cal is generally up to 133% of federal poverty guidelines. The number of clients with incomes between 133% and 250% of federal poverty guidelines is approximately 7.2%. The number between 185% and 250% is about 2.6%.

22. The number of households that are eligible for the partner programs and whose income might exceed the Commission's current income eligibility requirements for CARE is insignificant compared to the number of eligible customers with incomes within the CARE requirement.

23. As discussed in this decision, CARE eligibility requirements need to be broadened to implement the automatic enrollment program we adopt today.

24. The potential for automatic enrollment to dramatically increase CARE enrollments is evident: In 2001, approximately 5.5 million individuals, or 3.4 million households participated in Medi-Cal, WIC, Healthy Families and LIHEAP. Up to 80% of these households are served by at least one investor-owned utility.

25. Based on the experience in other states, the majority of new CARE enrollments through automatic enrollment are likely to occur during the initial two months of clearinghouse operation. Subsequent annual automatic enrollment is expected to decrease and level out over time.

26. The eligibility screening process performed by DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD for their programs equal or exceeds the utilities' screening process for CARE. Therefore, a two-tier recertification process is not warranted.

27. Commission administration of the automatic enrollment program, as described in this decision, is necessary to ensure confidentiality of all client information provided through the agency partnerships with DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD.

28. The monitoring and evaluation reports described in this decision are needed to track the effectiveness of the automatic enrollment program we adopt today.

29. Random verification of customers whose eligibility has been established under the partner programs could result in qualified low-income customers dropping out of the CARE program unnecessarily, and would increase administrative costs needlessly.

30. A bill insert is the most logical method to provide all utility customers with advance information about the Commission's automatic enrollment program.

31. The phone utilities do not currently conduct any post-enrollment verification of customer eligibility under the ULTS program. A recent study mandated by the Commission indicates that 30% of ULTS participants are not eligible for the program, and an additional 12% may or may not be eligible.

32. Based on the estimates presented in this proceeding, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal will have sufficient LIEE funding from PGC collections, carryovers and one-time SBX1 5 funds to cover rapid deployment costs during PY2002.

33. PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal project significant shortfalls in funding from current rates and SBX1 5 one-time appropriations to cover CARE rapid deployment costs through 2002.

Conclusions of Law

1. The rapid deployment programs adopted for SCE, SDG&E, SDG&E and SoCal in D.01-05-033 should continue until further Commission order.

As discussed in this decision, the ratemaking implications of continuing rapid deployment of CARE during 2002 is being addressed in a separate ratemaking proceeding.

2. The penetration rate methodologies used by the energy utilities are reasonable, subject to the modifications and updates described in this decision.

3. The penetration rate benchmarks adopted today are reasonable and should be adopted. They acknowledge the differences among utilities, and at the same time reflect our commitment to move at a meaningful pace towards 100% CARE penetration.

4. The automatic enrollment program described in this decision is reasonable and should be adopted. With the implementation of automatic enrollment, low-income customers should be eligible to participate in CARE under the current CARE income/household size guidelines *or* if the household participates in Medi-Cal, Healthy Families, WIC or one of the three energy assistance programs administered by DCSD.

5. For the reasons discussed in this decision, the utilities should exclude automatic enrollment customers from their random post-enrollment verification process.

6. Partnering with the ULTS program under automatic enrollment should be deferred until the Commission determines the extent to which ineligible customers are enrolled in ULTS, and whether to revise the telephone utilities' self-certification and post-enrollment verification procedures. As discussed in this decision, coordination of other types of customer outreach strategies between ULTS and CARE programs should proceed without delay.

7. The Commission clearinghouse costs under automatic enrollment should be allocated in proportion to each utility's estimated eligible unenrolled CARE population. The utilities should track all other costs associated with the program (e.g., subsidy costs and utility administrative costs) in a memorandum account or in their CARE balancing account, as appropriate, pending Commission action on A.02-04-031 et al.

8. In order to move forward with automatic enrollment as expeditiously as possible, this order should be effective today.

9. The period for public review and comment on the draft decision should be reduced, pursuant to Rule 77.7(f)(9).

INTERIM ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The method currently used by Southwest Gas Company (Southwest) to estimate California Alternate Rates For Energy (CARE) penetration rates, as described in its February 1, 2002 pre-workshop comments in this proceeding, is approved without modification.

2. As discussed in this decision, Energy Division shall ensure that the CARE Needs Assessment Study is designed to obtain income and household size data specific to Avista Utilities' (Avista) service territory for the purpose of estimating the number of CARE eligible homes. This data shall be used to update Avista's penetration rates and to evaluate Avista's achievement of the CARE penetration benchmarks set forth in this decision.

3. Energy Division shall work with Avista and Southwest Gas to develop a consistent format for reporting CARE penetration on an annual basis. Avista and Southwest Gas shall submit this information in the annual CARE reports required by Decision (D.) 89-07-062.

4. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCal), collectively referred to as "the utilities", shall make the following improvements to the methodology adopted in D.01-03-028 for calculating CARE penetration rates:

- a. Complete sensitivity tests on smoothing techniques, variations in small area weighting methods and an analysis of whether differences between program and Census definitions of household income influence eligibility estimates significantly.
- b. Order and utilize the special tabulations of 2000 Census data as soon as they are available in Fall, 2002 to update CARE penetration rates.

The utilities shall jointly file report on the results of the tests/analyses required under (a) above, and any proposed refinements to methodology, no later than November 1, 2002. As described in this decision, they shall update the number of eligible customers in their service territories using the 2000 Census data required under (b) above with their January, 2003 status report. The report should present a calculation of penetration rates that reflects this updated information and the new enrollments due to automatic enrollment, to date.

5. The goal of the Commission is to reach 100% of low-income customers who are eligible for, and desire to participate in, the CARE program. To this end, we establish the following PY2002 minimum benchmarks for program penetration, by utility: PG&E-63%, SDG&E-75%, SCE-93%, SoCal-70%, Southwest-89% and Avista-50%.

6. The automatic enrollment program for CARE described in this decision is adopted. Under this program, customers of PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal shall be enrolled into CARE when they participate in any of the following programs:

- a. Medi-Cal, administered by the California Department of Health Services (DHS);
- b. Healthy Families, administered by Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board (MRMIB);
- c. Woman, Infants and Children administered by DHS, and
- d. Energy Assistance Programs administered by the Department of Community Services and Development (DCSD).

With the implementation of automatic enrollment, low-income customers shall be eligible to participate in CARE if they meet the current CARE income/household size criteria *or* if the household participates in any one of the programs listed above.

7. The Executive Director shall begin immediate efforts to obtain automatic enrollment partnership agreements with DHS, MRMIB, and DCSD. As soon as practicable after these interagency agreements are finalized, the Assigned Commissioner will issue a ruling outlining additional implementation tasks and the schedule for completing these tasks.

8. The Commission shall serve as the clearinghouse to identify electronic matches between partner agency and utility customer records, as described in this decision. Beginning 90 days from the effective date of this decision, the utilities shall submit the names and addresses of customers currently not receiving CARE to the Commission on a monthly basis. The frequency and content of these data submissions may be modified by the Assigned Commissioner, as appropriate. These submissions should not include the names of customers who are not eligible for CARE by reason of their rate class. Energy Division shall conduct meetings with these utilities to develop data transfer and matching protocols.

9. The utilities shall track customers who are automatically enrolled in CARE under the program and report on the number of customers successfully matched, enrolled and recertified. As discussed in this decision, the utilities shall also submit expenditure information on automatic enrollment. The utilities shall work with Energy Division in developing an appropriate format for reporting this information, and shall include it in the monthly rapid deployment reports until further notice by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner.

10. The utilities shall file annual status reports on automatic enrollment until further notice by the Commission or Assigned Commissioner. The Energy Division shall work with the utilities to develop the format, content and filing dates for these reports. The utilities shall include in their 2003 CARE program plans (due July 1, 2002), a scope of study for evaluating the results of the first 12 months of the automatic enrollment program, and an associated budget.

11. The utilities shall provide utility customers with advance information about the Commission's automatic enrollment program via a bill insert, as described in this decision. The utilities shall begin immediately to work with the Energy Division in developing the appropriate text and be prepared to include the insert in bills upon approval. We delegate to the Assigned Commissioner the review and approval of the bill insert text. Within 30 days from the date of this decision, the Assigned Commissioner shall issue a ruling setting forth the approved text.

12. The Assigned Commissioner shall prioritize and clarify by ruling any additional implementation issues that may need to be addressed over time as the Commission gains experience with CARE automatic enrollment.

13. The costs of the Commission clearinghouse function shall be reimbursed by PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal in proportion to each utility's currently estimated eligible, unenrolled CARE population, as follows:

SCE:	9%
PG&E:	47%
SDG&E:	7%
SoCal:	37%

14. Pending Commission action on Applications (A.) 02-04-031 et al., the utilities shall track all costs related to automatic enrollment in a memorandum

account or in an existing CARE balancing account, as appropriate. These include the 20% CARE rate subsidy costs, utility administrative costs, and the Commission's clearinghouse costs.

15. As discussed in this decision, the Low Income Oversight Board (LIOB) shall hold public meetings for targeted outreach to specific telephone utility service areas for the purpose of coordinating customer outreach between CARE and Universal Lifeline Telephone Service (ULTS). LIOB shall report its recommendations within 120 days from the effective date of this decision in the form of a report to the Commission. Comments are due 30 days thereafter. LIOB's report shall summarize the positions of parties and participants in the public meetings, present the pros and cons of options considered, and discuss the rationale for LIOB's recommendations.

16. Energy Division's recommendations for improvement to ULTS penetration rate calculations and eligibility verification, as presented in the April 2, 2002 Workshop Report on CARE and ULTS Penetration Rates, shall be considered in the ULTS proceeding, R.98-09-005.

17. Within 30 days from the effective date of this decision, PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCal shall augment their PY2003 CARE program plans filed in A.02-04-031 et al. with a proposed scope of study for evaluating the results of automatic enrollment, and associated budget.

18. The Assigned Commissioner may, for good cause, modify the due dates set forth in this decision.

19. All reports and other submittals required by this decision shall be filed at the Commission's Docket Office and served electronically on all appearances and the state service list in this proceeding. U.S. mail service of the comments is optional, except that one hard copy of each document shall be mailed to Judge

Meg Gottstein at the State Office Building, Room 5044, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, 94102. In addition, if there is no electronic mail address available, the electronic mail is returned to the sender, or the recipient informs the sender of an inability to open the document, the sender shall immediately arrange for alternate service (regular U.S. mail shall be the default, unless another means—such as overnight delivery—is mutually agreed upon.) Current service lists for this proceeding are available on the Commission's web page, www.cpuc.ca.gov.

This order is effective today.

Dated July 17, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

LORETTA M. LYNCH
President
HENRY M. DUQUE
CARL W. WOOD
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
Commissioners

[Attachment 1 to D0207033](#)

[Attachment 7 to D0207033](#)

[Attachment 3-6 to D0207033](#)

[Table 1 to D0207033](#)