



**TWELFTH ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT TO THE
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
CALIFORNIA ALTERNATE RATES FOR ENERGY (CARE)
JANUARY 1, 2000 - DECEMBER 31, 2000**

**PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
CARE PROGRAM
MAIL CODE BOB1P
PO Box 770000**

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
(415) 973-2931

CARE Residential Program

I. Participant Information

A. Provide the total number of residential CARE customers, including sub-metered tenants, by month, by energy source, for the reporting period.

TABLE 1A				
Residential CARE Program Gas Customers by Month				
2000	Individually Metered	Sub-Metered	Total CARE Participation	Percentage Change
January	286,070	8,732	294,802	2.44%
February	292,643	8,647	301,290	2.20%
March	296,276	8,600	304,876	1.19%
April	301,568	8,585	310,153	1.73%
May	303,665	8,593	312,258	0.68%
June	304,878	8,610	313,488	0.39%
July	306,362	8,631	314,993	0.48%
August	309,970	8,729	318,699	1.18%
September	313,625	8,737	322,362	1.15%
October	318,594	8,821	327,415	1.57%
November	324,004	8,969	332,973	1.70%
December	329,772	9,073	338,845	1.76%

TABLE 1B				
Residential CARE Program Electric Customers by Month				
2000	Individually Metered	Sub-Metered	Total CARE Participation	Percentage Change
January	245,789	8,700	254,489	1.51%
February	252,903	8,632	261,535	2.77%
March	251,402	8,603	260,005	-0.59%
April	253,023	8,572	261,595	0.61%
May	257,565	8,574	266,139	1.74%
June	260,471	8,608	269,079	1.10%
July	267,956	8,628	276,584	2.79%
August	273,016	8,738	281,754	1.87%
September	277,734	8,743	286,477	1.68%
October	282,474	8,850	291,324	1.69%
November	288,666	8,997	297,663	2.18%
December	294,287	9,061	303,348	1.91%

1. Explain any monthly variance of 5% or more in the number of participants.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) had no variances to report during this reporting period.

B. Describe the methodology, sources of data, and key computations used to estimate the utility's CARE penetration rates by energy source.

1. Describe how the estimates of current demographic CARE-eligibility rates, by energy source for the pre-June 1st and post-June 1st periods, were derived.

PG&E has not completed the transition to demographic estimation by energy source during this reporting period. Therefore, the information is could only be applied to "households" within each county, and not by commodity. Once the Joint Utility Contract for developing the demographic criteria for all counties has been completed, PG&E will be able to apply the information to electric only accounts, gas only accounts and dual commodity accounts to obtain a more accurate representation of the eligibility for the service territory.

The data used in this report was derived using Public Use Micro data (PUMs) purchased from the US Bureau of the Census (most currently available based on the 1990 census). The records contain samples of housing units, with information on the characteristics of each housing unit and the people in it. Using the 5 percent sample, a database that identifies subdivisions such as counties within the states (PUMAs), the household income information converted to 2000 dollars was applied to each household within the county. For each county, the percentage of households meeting the CARE income requirements was multiplied by the total households (residential accounts).

2. Describe how the estimates of current CARE-eligible meters were derived. Explain how total residential meters were adjusted to reflect CARE-eligible meters (including sub-metered tenants) and CARE-ineligible meters (i.e., master meters are not sub-metered or other residential meter configurations that do not provide residential service.)

No attempt was made during this reporting period to extract the non-eligible meter types within the demographic areas. PG&E has chosen to wait until the final criteria has been developed through the Joint Utility Contract before attempting to derive this information by rate schedule and meter types. Therefore, the information is applied to all residential meter types by county, regardless of eligibility under the CARE rate restrictions.

3. Discuss how the estimates of current CARE-eligible households were developed.

For the purpose of this reporting period, the percentage of estimated eligible population for each county was multiplied by the total number of residential accounts within each county.

4. Describe how current CARE customers were counted.

PG&E used the month-end closing information on accounts billed by rate schedule to determine the total number of customer accounts by commodity that were receiving CARE discounts each month. For example, an account must have billed during the recorded month in order for that account to count as a CARE participant. No attempt was made during this period to differentiate between single-commodity gas and electric participants versus those customers receiving CARE on one account with both gas and electric commodities.

5. Discuss how the elements above were used to derive the utility's CARE participation rates by energy source.

During this transition period, no attempt was made to derive the utility’s participation rate by energy source. However, using the demographic information for “households”, and assuming that each separate account equates to a household, PG&E can derive a participation rate by household. Once the Joint Contract work has been completed, the information will then be available to apply by commodity.

C. Provide the total number of CARE residential customers, CARE-eligible households, and CARE participation rates, by energy source, by quarter.

During this reporting period, information was not collected by separate commodity. Therefore, the information displayed here reflects total households only.

Table 2.4			
CARE Residential Penetration Rate			
Households			
2000 Quarter Ending	CARE Residential Households	CARE Eligible Households	CARE Household Penetration Rate
March 31, 2000	737,635	307,405	41.67%
June 30, 2000	737,635	318,547	43.18%
September 30, 2000	737,635	328,840	44.58%
December 31, 2000	737,635	350,194	47.48%

CARE Sub-Metered Participants (Tenants of Qualifying Master-Meter Customers)

D. Provide the estimates of current demographic CARE-eligibility rates by energy source at year-end.

No demographic CARE-eligibility rates have been derived by energy source for the reporting period.

E. Provide the estimates of current CARE-eligible sub-metered tenants of master-meter customers by energy source at year-end.

By applying the percentage of total households that are income-eligible (not taking into account in-eligible meters), 15.42% of the population may be eligible for CARE. There are a total of 87,216 Gas sub-metered tenants and 105,193 Electric commodity sub-metered tenants. Applying the percentage of households eligible translates that 13,449 Gas and 16,220 Electric tenants may be eligible for CARE.

F. Provide the current CARE sub-metered tenant counts by energy source at year-end.

9,073 Gas commodity tenants and 9,061 Electric commodity tenants were receiving a CARE discount by year-end.

G. Provide the current CARE sub-metered penetration rates by energy source at year-end.

67.37% of the Gas tenants have signed for CARE and 55.94% of the Electric tenants have signed for CARE, as of year-end.

H. Discuss any problems encountered during the reporting period administering the CARE program for sub-metered tenants and/or master-meter customers.

During the 2000 program year, PG&E began to transition to a year-around re-certification schedule for sub-metered tenants, applying a similar process to these customers as other residential customers. During that time, a number of issues surrounding training came up, requiring an extensive amount of time to work through individual issues for each facility.

For example, in some cases where the billing agents were used to the one-time a year re-certification period (June-September), tenants were dropped prematurely, and without notice from PG&E to do so. PG&E was notified of these issues on a case-by-case basis by the tenants who were no longer receiving their discounts. In some cases, several contacts were necessary between managers, owners and billing agents to correct the problems.

Another problem that continued to be an issue in 2000 was incomplete billing information. In some cases, bills provided to the tenants did not show the CARE discount. Although, after researching the bill statements, in over 90% of these situations the bill was accurately reflecting a CARE discounted bill, because the statement didn't display the actual discount amount, it was impossible for the tenant to verify their receiving the discount on their own. Most of these cases were resolved by providing a breakdown of the bill calculation for the tenant, however few of the facilities corrected their bill statement as a result of our discussions with them.

The number of problems surrounding the refusal of a facility to pass on a discount to tenants held steady again in 2000. There were six cases where discounts were not provided, regardless of PG&E's best efforts to contact and resolve billing and obligatory requirements with the facilities. In five of these cases, the problem was one of turnover in management for the facility. As in the past, extensive training was required to resolve the problem.

However, in one case, it has been brought to our attention that, in spite of our best efforts to resolve the issues, one facility is still choosing to not pass on the discount to their tenants. PG&E has exhausted all options for resolution of the problem and has advised the tenants of their rights under California Public Utility Code.

II. Usage and Bill Information

A. Provide a comparison of CARE and non-CARE residential usage by tier (Baseline and Non-Baseline), excluding usage of residential master-meter customers, by energy source.

Table 3			
Average Monthly Gas / Electric Usage Residential Non-CARE vs. CARE Customers			
Customer	Gas Therms Tier 1	Gas Therms Tier 2	Total
Non-CARE	29.58	15.18	44.76
CARE	27.74	9.88	37.62
Customer	Electric KWh Tier 1	Electric KWh Tier 2	Total
Non-CARE	307.81	227.39	574.89
CARE	317.82	127.80	467.44

B. Provide a comparison of the average monthly bill for CARE and non-CARE residential customers, excluding bills of master-meter residential customers, by energy source.

Table 4		
Average Monthly Gas / Electric Bill Residential Non-CARE vs. CARE Customers (Dollars per Customer)		
Customer	Gas	Electric
Non-CARE	\$37.71	\$61.59
CARE	\$26.65	\$42.22

III. Program Costs

A. Discount Cost

1. State the average monthly CARE discount received, in dollars per CARE customer, by energy source.

The average Gas discount was \$4.92 each month.
The average Electric discount was \$8.46 each month.

2. State the annual subsidy (discount) for all CARE customers by energy source.

The total discount provided Gas customers on CARE was \$20,169,736.60.
The total discount provided Electric customers on CARE was \$27,089,319.28.
Total discounts provided for CARE in 2000 was \$47,259,055.88.

B. Administrative Cost

1. Show the CARE Residential Program's administrative cost by category.

Table 5	
CARE Cost Reporting Annual Costs in Dollars	
Category	Expenditure
Outreach	\$ 545,507.75
Regulatory Compliance	\$ 24,122.29
Processing / Certification / Verification	\$ 813,063.02
Billing System / Programming	\$ 455.48
General Administration	\$ 78,025.98
Measurement & Evaluation	\$ -
LIAB Funding	\$ 53,574.82
Energy Division Staff Funding	\$ 115,815.71
Total Programs Costs	\$ 1,630,565.05

2. Explain what is included in each administrative cost category.

Outreach:

Bill Inserts, Advertising, Applications (printing and mailing), Posters, Brochures, Flyers, Postage, Sub-Meter Outreach, Information Technology technical support and software licensing), Call Center Labor, Staff Labor, Out Bounding Dialing, 800#, and Outreach Pilot.

Regulatory Compliance:

Applications, Advice Filings, Comments and Reply Comments, Hearings, Reports and Studies, Working Group Meetings, Public Input Meetings, and Tariff Revisions.

Processing, Certification and Verification:

Staff Labor, Information Technology (technical support and software licensing), Application Processing, Training, Programming Labor, and Sub-Meter Certification.

Billing System / Programming:

Manual Rebilling, and Programming and Billing Labor.

General Administration:

Office Supplies, Market Research, Program Management Labor, and Information Technology (technical support and software licensing).

Measurement & Evaluation:

Needs Assessment Study, and Customer Satisfaction Survey.

LIAB Funding:

Both past and present funding as invoices are received.

Energy Division Staff Funding:

Both past and present funding as invoices are received.

C. Provide the year-end December 31 balance for the CARE balancing account.

Gas Principal	(\$773,125)
Gas Interest	(\$41,829)
Net Gas Overcollection	(\$814,954)
Electric Principal	(\$11,892,427)
Electric Interest	(\$689,862)
Net Electric Overcollection	(\$12,582,289)

D. Describe which cost categories are recorded to the CARE balancing account and which are included in base rates.

Currently, the following items are recorded in the CARE balancing account:
CARE Discounts

The following items are recorded in base rates:
Outreach, Regulatory Compliance, Processing, Certification and Verification, Billing System / Programming, General Administration, Measurement & Evaluation, LIAB Funding, and Energy Division Staff Funding.

E. Provide a table showing, by customer class, the CARE surcharge paid, the average bill paid, the average bill paid, the percentage of CARE surcharge paid relative to the average bill, the total CARE surcharge collected, and the percentage of total CARE revenues paid.

Table 6A (Gas)					
CARE Surcharge and Revenue Collected by Customer Class					
Customer Class	Average Monthly CARE Surcharge	Average Monthly Bill	CARE Surcharge as Percent of Bill	Total CARE Surcharge Revenue Collected	Percentage of CARE Surcharge Revenue Collected
Residential	\$ 0.1000	\$ 37.71	0.2652%	\$ 4,469,513.00	43%
GNR1	\$ 0.6915	\$ 227.62	0.3038%	\$ 1,731,814.00	17%
GNR2	\$ 45.6087	\$ 11,569.95	0.3942%	\$ 60,167.00	1%
Industrial	\$270,492.4211	\$6,299,457.86	4.2939%	\$ 4,179,153.00	40%

Table 6B (Electric)					
CARE Surcharge and Revenue Collected by Customer Class					
Customer Class	Average Monthly CARE Surcharge	Average Monthly Bill	CARE Surcharge as Percent of Bill	Total CARE Surcharge Revenue Collected	Percentage of CARE Surcharge Revenue Collected
Residential	\$ 0.2464	\$ 61.59	0.4000%	\$11,405,748.00	34%
Agricultural	\$ 1.6709	\$ 410.04	0.4075%	\$ 1,628,925.00	5%
Small Light & Power	\$ 0.6732	\$ 174.39	0.3860%	\$ 3,425,092.00	10%
Med Light & Power	\$ 13.8940	\$ 2,513.84	0.5527%	\$10,144,176.00	30%
Large Light & Power	\$ 479.0285	\$ 32,629.15	1.4681%	\$ 7,212,206.00	21%

IV. Outreach

A. Discuss utility outreach activities and those undertaken by third parties on the utility's behalf.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company used several different methods for notifying customers of the CARE program in 2000. Bill advertising, Point of Display Advertising, Community Outreach and the CARE Outreach Pilot Project were all used to perform outreach for CARE in 2000.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company had four bill inserts advertising CARE in 2000. The first was referral to the CARE program as part of a special January "Spotlight" titled "Your Winter Bill Resource Kit", in which the program was explained and an 800 number was provided for customers to obtain an application.

The next bill insert was used in June, and notified customers of the change of income guidelines for the program. The notice also was printed in four languages and provided 800 numbers to contact Pacific Gas and Electric Company for an application.

The third insert was a fall notification in October, also in four languages, providing information on CARE and how it relates to the upcoming heating season. A return coupon mailed directly to the CARE Processing Center was included with that bill notification.

The final insert was referral to the CARE program as part of a special insert on the gas rate increases that customers were experiencing. The November insert, titled “Natural Gas. Unnatural Prices?” provided the customers an 800 number to contact Pacific Gas and Electric Company for additional information on CARE.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company continued its practice of displaying up to date information on the CARE program in local offices throughout the service territory. This, along with CARE posters in four languages drew interest and allowed for questions regarding the program to be addressed at the local office counter locations.

Community Outreach played a significant role in advertising the CARE program in the service territory in 2000. A number of events were attended by company representatives and CARE we featured at booths located in prominent locations for these events. For example, Pacific Gas and Electric Company again supported the Sixth Annual North Oakland Community Housing and Information Fair sponsored by the Community Development Corporation of Oakland. Three CARE Processing Center employees staffed a booth and provided outreach to 88 customers. Additionally, 57 customers filled out applications at the five-hour event that were brought back to the processing center the following week for certification.

CARE Processing Employees also represented Pacific Gas and Electric Company at the 5th Annual Día de los Muertos Fruitvale Festival sponsored by The Unity Council of Oakland. This all day event resulted in 2,500 applications being distributed as part of an information package customers obtained by coming by the booth.

Throughout the year, Company representatives promoted the program as part of an on-going awareness campaign the was undertaken to “bundle” service programs together when discussing energy related issues in the community. In most cases, applications were made available to attendees of these discussions.

Part of our partnership with the community is an on-going effort to make CARE applications and materials available for distribution through various organizations. The following groups were provided applications on an on-going basis throughout the reporting period.

Organization	City	Applications Distributed
Edwin Blayney Senior Center	Fowler	10
Miranda Villa	San Jose	15
Vietnamese Community Center	San Francisco	20
North of Market Senior Services	San Francisco	30
Valley Mountain Regional Center	Modesto	30
Hank Lopez Community Center	San Jose	50
Sutter Lakeside Home Medical Services	Lakeport	50
Families First	Concord	50
Consumer Credit Counseling Services	Santa Rosa	50
Community Services Department of San Bernardino	San Bernardino	50
Kern County AASD	Bakersfield	60
Homeless Jobs Consortium	Oakland	100
Senior Network Services	Santa Cruz	100
Chinatown Neighborhood Center	San Francisco	200
Passages Adult Resource Center	Chico	200
City of Berkeley Energy Services	Berkeley	250
Human Services Department	Fremont	300
County of San Joaquin, Department on Aging	Stockton	500
The Salvation Army	San Francisco	700

Community Energy Services Corp.	Berkeley	1,000
Contra Costa County Community Services Department	Concord	2,000
First Baptist Head Start	Pittsburg	2200
Total Applications Distributed		7,965

The last major area of change that occurred in the previous reporting period was the commencement of the Outreach Pilot Project. Pacific Gas and Electric Company successfully contracted with eight organizations (two for-profits and six non-profits) to perform CARE education, hard-to-reach enrollment and delivery of the completed applications within a timely basis directly to the CARE Processing Center. The year-end intermediate results of this pilot can be found in a separate area of the report.

Some of the variety of methods used by the contractors have been such approaches as staffing booths at flea markets, doing door to door canvassing in known low-income neighborhoods, marketing CARE as part of a broader energy education class, or as part of a low-income assistance package bundled with other similar services.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company looks forward to evaluating the end results of these pilots and will share valuable ideas for contributing towards future outreach campaigns.

B. Discuss each of the following:

1. Most effective outreach method, including a discussion of how success is measured.

During the reporting period, the most effective method of outreach was the bill-insert with a return coupon to request an application. Pacific Gas and Electric Company used this type of outreach in 4.5 million residential bills during the month of October 2000. The outreach resulted in over 70,000 application requests through the end of the year. Of these 70,000 application requests, approximately 30% of the requests were made by customers already receiving the discount for CARE. This translates to a 1.08% benefit for the effort.

2. How CARE customer data and other relevant program information is shared by the utility with other utilities sharing its service territory.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company borders two utilities in a small geographic location of the service territory. As a result, there is no formal agreement for electronic data exchange of the type developed between Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas companies.

Instead, when customer applications from a bordering service area are identified by the processing, a copy of the application is mailed directly to the processing center for that bordering utility.

3. How CARE customer data and other relevant program information is shared within the utility, for example, between its LIEE and other appropriate low-income programs.

Once quarterly, the entire database of participating CARE customer contact information is uploaded for distribution to the LIEE providers in use for their outreach.

Since the CARE discount is noted directly into the Customer Information System, customer service representatives have knowledge of the special nature of the customer should one phone our call center for assistance. This knowledge comes in handy for handling these calls.

4. Attach a copy of the utility's agreement with CSD. Describe the process for cross-referral of low-income customers between the utility and CSD. Describe how the utility's CARE customer discount information is provided to CSD for inclusion in its federal funds leveraging application.

There currently is no formal written agreement for exchange of leveraging information between Pacific Gas and Electric Company and CSD. However, Pacific Gas and Electric Company has provided assistance in leveraging federal funding through the Home Energy Assistance Program (HEAP) on an annual basis since 1989. The primary information provided to CSD is a monthly breakdown of the total number of participants (residential and sub-metered tenant count) along with the total dollar amount of discount provided that portion of the population during that period.

A secondary source of leveraging occurs through the inclusion of contact information in our application mailings to customers inquiring about CARE. On each application that is delivered to a customer, Pacific Gas and Electric Company has provided a brief description of the assistance available through and contact number for the HEAP program.

Also, as part of our Customer Service Call Center scripting, Service Representatives are instructed to provide information on the HEAP program should a customer contact Pacific Gas and Electric Company regarding any other payment assistance program (including CARE, REACH, Balance Payment Plan, Medical Baseline and Life Support and Energy Partners). Likewise, the CARE Processing Center also provides referral information to customers who may be identified as being in need for additional assistance.

In years' past, CSD has provided Pacific Gas and Electric Company a separate ½ sheet insert to be enclosed with each application mailed to our customers through the automated application request process. That insert has not been available in the past 12 months.

5. Discuss barriers to participation encountered during the reporting period and steps taken to mitigate them.

One of the on-going barriers to enrolling customers for the programs has been language. With the current job market, Pacific Gas and Electric Company has had limited success in attracting the wide variety of second-language speaking representatives the CARE Processing Center has been blessed with in the past. To that end, the CARE Processing Center has contracted with Language Line Services in order to make up the deficiency.

As the Outreach Pilot has taught so far, there are many channels that should be utilized for getting the word out about CARE. Customers don't always turn to the obvious choice to seek assistance, and the ability of the utilities to collaborate with these outside channels is a valuable asset that hopefully will improve with time.

C. Discuss any recommendations to improve cost-effectiveness, processing of applications, or program delivery. Discuss methods investigated or implemented by the utility or third parties under contract to the utility to improve outreach and enrollment services to non-participating households in the prior year. Provide cost-effectiveness assessments, if available.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company has no recommendations at this time for process improvement, or cost-effectiveness assessments.

V. Processing CARE Applications

A. Processing Self-Certification and Self-Re-Certification Applications (Individual and Sub-Metered Customers)

1. Provide the total number of third-party CARE applications received, approved, denied, pending/never completed, or duplicates in the reporting period.

Table 7					
CARE Outreach Pilot					
June 1, 2000 through December 31, 2000					
Entity	CARE Applications Submitted				
	Received	Approved	Denied	Pending/Never Completed	Duplicates
Amador-Tuolumne CAA	131	96	3	15	17
Bo Enterprises	519	460	6	35	18
CAA of Santa Barbara County	82	69	2	9	2
Energy Services - CAB of Santa Cruz, Inc.	616	521	2	70	23
Merced County CAA	285	259	0	5	21
Redwood CAA	242	173	19	47	3
Richard Heath and Associates, Inc.	1,113	979	3	102	29
Sacramento Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.	37	26	1	2	8
Total	3,025	2,583	36	285	121
Percentage	100.00%	85.39%	1.19%	9.42%	4.00%

2. Provide the number of utility CARE self-certification and self-re-certification applications provided, received, approved, denied, pending/never completed, or duplicates for the reporting period.

Table 8						
CARE Self-Certification and Self-Re-Certification Applications						
	Provided	Received	Approved	Denied	Pending/Never Completed	Duplicates
Total	631,978	267,784	223,970	4,755	39,059	90,372
Percentage	100.00%	42.37%	83.64%	1.78%	14.59%	33.75%

3. Provide a table showing the number of customers removed from CARE by month due to the re-certification process.

Table 9			
Residential CARE Program Customers Removed by Month through Re-Certification and Post-Enrollment Verification			
2000	Re-Certification	Post-Enrollment Verification	Total
January	3,029	499	3,528
February	2,413	512	2,925
March	2,915	517	3,432
April	1,635	640	2,275
May	2,566	653	3,219
June	3,486	826	4,312
July	2,752	818	3,570
August	2,033	952	2,985
September	1,462	1,083	2,545
October	1,214	1,178	2,392
November	1,303	1,305	2,608
December	1,007	1,435	2,442
Total	25,815	10,418	36,233

4. Describe the utility's process for re-certifying sub-metered tenants of master-meter customers.

Beginning in 2000, Pacific Gas and Electric Company began requesting re-certification based upon the original certification date for the tenant within each facility. This means that each month, tenants certified one year previously are mailed a new application and a request for re-certification of their eligibility for CARE.

The tenants are provided 90 days to complete their application and return it to Pacific Gas and Electric Company. Tenants failing to return the application within 90 days, or notifying Pacific Gas and Electric Company of ineligibility are removed from the sub-meter CARE listing for the facility at that time, and a revised listing is mailed to the manager / landlord alerting them of the change in the tenant's eligibility.

B. Process Random Post-Enrollment Verification Applications

1. Provide the total number of applications mailed, received, approved, denied, pending/never completed, or duplicates, for the reporting period.

Table 10						
CARE Random Post-Enrollment Verification Applications						
	Population	Sample	Approved	Denied	Pending / Never Completed	Duplicates
Total	237,321	23,297	14,948	640	7,641	4,663
Percentage	100.00%	9.82%	64.16%	2.75%	32.80%	20.02%

2. Provide a table showing the number of customers removed from CARE by month due to the re-certification and/or verification on the utility's behalf.

Table 9			
Residential CARE Program Customers Removed by Month through Re-Certification and Post-Enrollment Verification			
2000	Re-Certification	Post-Enrollment Verification	Total
January	3,029	499	3,528
February	2,413	512	2,925
March	2,915	517	3,432
April	1,635	640	2,275
May	2,566	653	3,219
June	3,486	826	4,312
July	2,752	818	3,570
August	2,033	952	2,985
September	1,462	1,083	2,545
October	1,214	1,178	2,392
November	1,303	1,305	2,608
December	1,007	1,435	2,442
Total	25,815	10,418	36,233

C. Describe any contracts the utility has with third parties to conduct certification, re-certification and/or verification on the utility's behalf. Describe how these third-party efforts compare to the utility's efforts in comparable customer segments, such as hard-to-reach or under-served. Include comparisons of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of comparable customer segments, if available.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company had no third party contracts to perform these duties in 2000. All these functions were performed by the CARE Processing Center within Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

VI. Program Management

A. Discuss issues and/or events that significantly affected program management in the reporting period and how these were addressed.

There were no significant issues to discuss during this reporting period.

CARE Expansion Program

This section covers the non-profit homeless shelters and group living facilities, migrant and farm worker housing centers, qualified privately-owned employee housing, and qualified non-profit housing for agricultural employees.

1. Participant Information

a. Provide the total number of residential and/or commercial facilities by month, by energy source for the reporting period.

Table 11A			
CARE Expansion Program Participating Facilities by Month (Gas)			
2000	CARE Residential Facilities	CARE Commercial Facilities	Total
January	717	235	952
February	714	235	949
March	713	234	947
April	705	235	940
May	703	235	938
June	698	234	932
July	692	237	929
August	691	235	926
September	690	235	925
October	690	236	926
November	687	236	923
December	686	232	918

Table 11B			
CARE Expansion Program Participating Facilities by Month (Electric)			
2000	CARE Residential Facilities	CARE Commercial Facilities	Total
January	753	269	1,022
February	757	270	1,027
March	750	269	1,019
April	743	270	1,013
May	740	270	1,010
June	734	270	1,004
July	727	275	1,002
August	726	272	998
September	723	273	996
October	723	274	997
November	720	273	993
December	715	270	985

i. State the total number of residents (excluding caregivers) for residential facilities, and for commercial facilities, by energy source, at year-end.

17,386 tenants were being provided assistance within the facilities on CARE by December 31, 2000. No information was collected by energy source. The resulting numbers were representative of the total number of residents housed in all facilities, both residential and commercial, and for both energy commodities.

2. Usage Information

a. Provide the average monthly usage by energy source per residential facility and per commercial facility.

Table 12		
CARE Expansion Program Average Monthly Gas / Electric Usage		
Customer	Gas Therms	Electric KWh
Residential Facilities	43.37	1,590.58
Commercial Facilities	510.82	6,395.32

3. Program Costs

a. Administrative Costs

i. Show the CARE Expansion Program's administrative cost by category.

Table 5	
CARE Cost Reporting Annual Costs in Dollars	
Category	Expenditure
Outreach	\$ 10,926.80
Regulatory Compliance	\$ -
Processing / Certification / Verification	\$ 49,987.64
Billing System / Programming	\$ 79.86
General Administration	\$ 13,460.61
Measurement & Evaluation	\$ -
LIAB Funding	\$ -
Energy Division Staff Funding	\$ -
Total Programs Costs	\$ 74,454.91

b. Discount Information

i. State the average annual CARE discount received per residential facility by energy source.

\$67.20 for gas customers and \$332.52 for electric customers.

ii. State the average annual CARE discount received per commercial facility by energy source.

\$704.52 for gas customers and \$1,213.68 for electric customers.

4. Outreach

a. Discuss utility outreach activities and those undertaken by third parties on the utility's behalf.

During the reporting period, Pacific Gas and Electric Company worked with local organizations as well as external relations to further advertise the programs to non-profits and agricultural employee housing facilities. For example, information on the program and eligibility criteria was provided across the service territory for use by both Agricultural Account and Commercial Account Representatives when meeting with their clients. Several leads were provided to the CARE Processing Center through these sources.

A couple of the Outreach Pilot Project contractors bid to perform outreach for non-profit and agricultural employee housing customers, however, no applications had been received from their efforts through the end of this reporting period.

Bill Inserts for CARE were included for all rate schedules, including Industrial and Commercial customers, with the intent of alerting possible CARE eligible of the expanded programs.

b. Discuss each of the following:

i. Most effective outreach method, including a discussion of how success is measured.

Word of mouth continues to be the most effective outreach method available for the expanded programs. Of the leads that were successful, all had heard of the program through another current participant, and had inquired as to the possibility for their own eligibility.

ii. How the CARE facility data and relevant program information is shared by the utility with other utilities sharing its service territory.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company borders two utilities in a small geographic location of the service territory. As a result, there is no formal agreement for electronic data exchange of the type developed between Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas companies.

Instead, when customer applications from a bordering service area are identified by the processing, a copy of the application is mailed directly to the processing center for that bordering utility.

iii. Barriers to participation encountered in the prior year and steps taken to mitigate these, if feasible, or not, if infeasible.

There continues to be confusion over the eligibility criteria for the expanded programs. Often times, customers either don't understand the definitions of "group living facility" or "agricultural employee housing", or refuse to accept the limitations of the program when applying. For example, Pacific Gas and Electric Company received a number of non-profit applications during 2000 that were actually for regular residential end-use. But, because the home represented more than one family, the customer believed that they should apply for the group-living facility program. In each of these cases, the error was found and the customer enrolled in the correct program.

As for the Agricultural Housing program, there also was a misleading belief that, if a customer was an actual farm-worker, they had to enroll in that expanded program. Again, the customers were eligible for the residential programs and correctly enrolled at that time.

c. Discuss any recommendations to improve the cost-effectiveness, processing of applications, or program delivery. Discuss methods investigated or implemented by the utility or third parties on the utility's behalf to improve outreach and enrollment services to non-participating facilities in the prior year. Provide cost-effectiveness assessments, if available.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company has no recommendations at this time for process improvement, or cost-effectiveness assessments.

5. Processing CARE Applications

a. Processing Self-Certification and Self-Re-Certification Applications

i. Provide the total number of third-party CARE Expansion program applications received, approved, denied, pending/never completed, or duplicates.

No Expansion program applications received from third-party sources during the reporting period.

Table 13					
CARE Expansion Program					
CARE Outreach Pilot, Other Outreach, and Utility					
Entity	CARE Applications Sent By Third Parties				
	Received	Approved	Denied	Pending / Never Completed	Duplicates
Amador-Tuolumne CAA	0	0	0	0	0
Bo Enterprises	0	0	0	0	0
CAA of Santa Barbara County	0	0	0	0	0
Energy Services - CAB of Santa Cruz, Inc.	0	0	0	0	0
Merced County CAA	0	0	0	0	0
Redwood CAA	0	0	0	0	0
Richard Heath and Associates, Inc.	0	0	0	0	0
Sacramento Neighborhood Housing Services, Inc.	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	0	0
Percentage	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

ii. Provide the total number of utility CARE Expansion program applications received, approved, denied, pending/never completed, or duplicates for the reporting period.

Table 13					
CARE Expansion Program					
CARE Outreach Pilot, Other Outreach, and Utility					
Entity	CARE Applications Sent By Third Parties				
	Received	Approved	Denied	Pending / Never Completed	Duplicates
Utility	4	3	1	0	0
Total	4	3	1	0	0
Percentage	100%	75%	25%	0%	0%

b. Describe any contracts the utility has with third parties to conduct certification, re-certification and/or verification on the utility's behalf. Describe how these third-party efforts compare to the utility's efforts in comparable customer segments such as hard-to-reach or under-served. Include comparisons of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of comparable customer segments, if available.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company had no third party contracts to perform these duties in 2000. All these functions were performed by the CARE Processing Center within Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

6. Program Management

a. Discuss issues and/or events that significantly affected program management in the reporting period, and how these were addressed.

The greatest challenge that began in 2000 was directly related to the current energy crisis. In late August, the number of applications requested and returned for processing began to climb significantly. For example, throughout 2000, Pacific Gas and Electric Company averaged receipt of 1,124 applications a day, but in the last quarter of 2000, that average jumped to 1,500. The promotions in late fall to notify customers of the gas price increase was the best received so far.

The result of the increased interest in the program was the need to bring in new staff to handle the workload. CARE Processing staffing rose from 17 to 21 employees through the end of 2000, but the budget under which the program continued to operate was remained frozen at 1999 GRC levels. The year-end expenditures rose in excess of \$800,000 over the allocated funding for CARE.

Cost-cutting measures, implemented in 3rd Quarter 2000 did not adversely affect the program. Pulled in one direction to manage costs and pushed by the necessity to provide access to the program to as many eligible customers as possible, the processing infrastructure has held together well. However, additional increases in the workload along with regulatory requirements to process applications in a timely manner will not continue to be accomplished without substantial additional investment in the support and process systems in the near future.