

Appendix A

APPENDIX A
Summary of SMJUs' 2012-2014 Budget Applications

SMJU Proposed ESA Program Budgets 2012-2014				
<i>Utility</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2012-2014 Cycle Total</i>
Alpine	\$22,800	\$26,650	\$28,500	\$77,950
Bear Valley	\$229,625	\$229,625	\$229,625	\$688,875
PacifiCorp	\$450,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$1,450,000
CalPeco	\$206,845	\$213,050	\$219,441	\$639,336
Southwest	\$3,024,847	\$3,390,453	\$3,795,509	\$10,210,809
West Coast	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$3,934,117</i>	<i>\$4,359,778</i>	<i>\$4,773,075</i>	<i>\$13,066,970</i>

SMJU Proposed Number of Homes Treated 2012-2014				
	<i>2012</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2012-2014 Cycle Total</i>
Alpine	22	22	22	66
Bear Valley	212	212	212	636
PacifiCorp	500	500	500	1500
*CalPeco	220	220	220	660
Southwest	3479	3900	4366	11745
West Coast	0	0	0	0
<i>Total</i>	<i>4433</i>	<i>4854</i>	<i>5320</i>	<i>14607</i>

SMJU Proposed CARE Program Budgets 2012-2014				
<i>Utility</i>	<i>2012</i>	<i>2013</i>	<i>2014</i>	<i>2012-2014 Cycle Total</i>
Alpine	\$18,400	\$18,925	\$19,950	\$57,275
Bear Valley	\$253,417	\$258,152	\$262,981	\$774,550
PacifiCorp	\$3,304,529	\$3,437,454	\$3,575,475	\$10,317,458
CalPeco	\$635,880	\$635,880	\$635,880	\$1,907,640
Southwest	\$11,637,359	\$11,902,105	\$12,164,647	\$35,704,111
West Coast	\$8,180	\$8,180	\$8,180	\$24,540
<i>Total</i>	<i>\$15,857,765</i>	<i>\$16,260,696</i>	<i>\$16,667,113</i>	<i>\$48,785,574</i>

(End of Appendix A)

Appendix B

APPENDIX B

April 2013 SMJUs' Workshop Summary

The workshop was scheduled at the parties' request to discuss the implications of D.12-08-044 in the IOUs' CARE/ESA proceeding on their programs and to review the pending 2012-2014 SMJUs' budget applications (which requested a consolidated total of \$61.9 million; \$48.8 million for CARE + \$13.1 million for ESA to treat an estimated 14,607 homes).

Four of the six SMJUs (California Pacific Electric Company, Bear Valley Electric, PacifiCorp, and Southwest Gas) attended and participated in the workshop. Westcoast Gas and Alpine Natural Gas did not attend. ORA also participated during the workshop through its representative.

The workshop covered CARE related issues and directives outlined in D.12-08-044, including high usage customer, capitation fee increase, and categorical enrollment. Representatives from each utility also provided a brief preview of their annual reports which are due to be filed on May 1, 2013.

- High Usage Customers - Each utility indicated that high usage is not an issue of concern in their regions and provided individual supporting statistics. They also shared practices currently in place to address anomalies in gas & electric usage; including post cards, discussions initiated by utility call center or payment center personnel, and meter audits and repair. The utilities also commented that the cost associated with adoption of the high usage policy would likely outweigh the benefits.
- Capitation Fee Increase - The utilities had no objection to the capitation fee increase for CARE enrollments outlined in D.12-08-044 & anticipated minimal impact if applied in their regions.
- Categorical Enrollment - The utilities noted that SMJUs have historically not been required to enroll customers on CARE via categorical enrollment.
- Annual Report Preview - Each SMJU, except PacifiCorp is currently at or above the 90% CARE penetration goal. PacifiCorp explained that its penetration levels are in the mid 70s due to the increase in their income guidelines in

2012 from 175% to 200% of FPG in compliance with Public Utilities Code section 739.1. As a result , the number of homes eligible for the CARE program increased slightly.

The workshop also addressed ESA related issues as outlined in D.12-08-044, including proposed and approved measures, application of policy and installation manuals, coordination efforts with overlapping entities, studies and working group activities.

- ESA program measures & manuals- The utilities requested approval to offer program measures currently authorized and offered by the IOUs in shared service territories and climate zones as outlined in the Statewide Policy and Procedure Manual. The utilities believe that this approach would improve consistency and also assist with meeting 3 Measure Minimum Rule requirements since each of the SMJUs are single fuel utilities.
- Coordination efforts - The utilities briefly described ongoing leveraging activities with overlapping IOUs, SMJUs, Community Based Organizations and the California Department of Community Services and Development in effort to increase efficiency and minimize duplication.
- IOU studies/working group activity-The utilities are aware of the studies and working groups that are currently underway in the IOU proceeding and plan to incorporate key learning, and best practices in future program cycles. The SMJUs do not plan to participate in this activity due to resource and time constraints. Instead, they indicated that they would prefer an annual SMJU only workshop, preferably during the May-June timeframe following submission of their May 1st annual reports.

Most of the SMJUs participating in the workshop noted a need to update their proposed program goals, budgets, or applicable surcharges to minimize under/over collection. The SMJUs confirmed that the continuation of 2011 levels of funding, as authorized in the current bridge funding decision, would sufficiently fund their ESA and CARE Programs for the remainder of the 2012-2014 cycle and to meet programs goals. However, the SMJUs noted a need to update their measure mixes to enable them to treat more homes.

(End of Appendix B)

Appendix C

APPENDIX C

Updates to SMJUs' Applications and 2012-2014 Energy Savings Assistance & California Alternate Rates for Energy Programs Performance Overviews

C-1 - Bear Valley Electric

C-2 - PacifiCorp

C-3 - Liberty Utilities

C-4 - Southwest Gas

C-5 - Alpine Natural Gas

C-6 - West Coast Gas

C-1 Bear Valley

Bear Valley Electric Services' ESA/CARE 2012 Performance Overview

2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2012 Actual	% of Planned
ESA Program Expenses			
\$229,625	\$229,625	\$142,114	62%
ESA Homes Treated			
404	212	190	89%
CARE Program Administrative Expenses			
\$8,520	\$16,675	\$3,417	20%
CARE Subsidies			
\$232,100	\$ 236,742	\$229,122	97%
Sources: D.08-12-019, 2012-2014 Budget Application, and 2012 Annual Report			

Utility Summary

- I. ESA 2012 average cost per home - \$750
- II. 2012 Low Income Program Expenses
 - a. ESA - underspent by approximately 38%
 - b. CARE - underspent admin expenses by approximately 80%; BVES initially proposed to double its admin expenses but has had less trouble than anticipated, therefore is able to meet its goals utilizing 2011 funding levels (Ruling Response, p2)
- III. Position Re: continued Bridge Funding - supports continued bridge funding through 2014 at authorized 2011 funding levels (Ruling Response, p2)
- IV. Commission Action/Guidance Requested - seeks approval of two additional measures (Ruling Response, p3)
 - a. 1999 refrigerators - approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)
 - b. power saving surge protectors - approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)

C-2 PacifiCorp

PacifiCorp's ESA/CARE 2012 Performance Overview

2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2012 Actual	% of Planned
ESA Program Expenses			
\$937,500	\$450,000	\$689,039	153%
ESA Homes Treated			
350	500	325	65%
CARE Program Administrative Expenses			
\$ 95,000 ¹	\$ 110,000	\$65,689	60%
CARE Subsidies			
\$2,862,819 ²	\$3,194,529	\$2,975,094	93%
Total \$2,957,819³			
Sources: D.08-12-019, 2012-2014 Budget Application, and 2012 Annual Report			

Utility Summary

- I. ESA 2012 average cost per home - \$2120
- II. 2012 Low Income Program Expenses
 - a. ESA - PacifiCorp exceed its anticipated 2012 program budget by 53%; however the company experienced a significant over-collection⁴ of ESA program due to ambitious homes treated goals. PacifiCorp anticipates another over collection based on the goal for the number of homes but will monitor progress and can adjust surcharge collections through an advice letter as it has done so in the past. (p2)
 - b. CARE - Administrative budget underspent by approximately 40%.
- III. Position re: Bridge Funding
 - a. Supports bridge funding through 2014, (Ruling Response, p2)

¹ PacifiCorp June 24, 2011 Excel Budget table A-1

² D.08-11-019 authorized amount minus authorized CARE administrative costs (\$2,957,819- \$95,000)

³ D.11-08-019

⁴ PacifiCorp filed advice letter 438-E on April 20, 2011 to suspend its collection of the ESA surcharge due to over collection and subsequently filed advice letter 490-E to reinstate the surcharge effective June 8, 2013.

C-2 PacifiCorp
(continued)

- V. Commission Action/Guidance Requested – PacifiCorp initially requested approval to offer high efficiency washers and furnace clean and tune in its 2011 budget application, however appendix B of PacifiCorp’s Ruling Response seeks approval to offer (Appendix b)
- a. furnace clean and tune measure (SPPM, table 5-1 should be updated to reflect cz 16 for MF &SF, currently not approved in cz 1 or 16, only authorized for IOUs in in CZ#s 4,5, 6,7, 8, 10,14, & 15. –PacifiCorp’s request should be approved in cz 16 only, not cz1.
 - b. 1999 refrigerators – approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)
 - c. PacifiCorp also seeks revision to ESA goals from 500 annually to 200 due to the limited number of electrically heated income eligible untreated homes(Ruling Response, p.5-6)

C-3 Liberty Utilities

Liberty Utilities'⁵ ESA/CARE 2012 Performance Overview

2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2012 Actual	% of Planned
ESA Program Expenses			
\$200,820	\$206,845	\$92,811	45%
ESA Homes Treated			
500	220	352	160%
CARE Administrative Expenses			
\$22,000	\$22,000	\$69,708	317%
CARE Subsidies			
\$596,000	\$613,880	\$675,930	110%
Sources: D.08-12-019, 2012-2014 Budget Application, and 2012 Annual Report			

Utility Summary

- I. ESA 2012 average cost per home - \$263
- II. 2012 Low Income Program Expenses
 - a. ESA - ESA program expenses underspent by approximately 55%.
 - b. CARE - Administrative budget overspent by approximately 217%.
- III. Position re: Bridge Funding
 - a. Supports continued bridge funding at authorized 2011 funding levels(Ruling Response, p.1)
- IV. Commission Action/Guidance Requested - seeks approval of additional measure
 - a. 1999 refrigerators - approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)

⁵ By Advice Letter 28-E submitted on July 15, 2013, California Pacific Electric Company, LLC ("CalPeco") notified the Commission of its formal change in name as of that date to Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC.

C-3 Liberty Utilities
(continued)

- b. Liberty Utilities renews its request for fund shifting authority to carryover unspent funds from the preceding program cycle that the Commission approved in Decision 12-09-026 for the extended bridge period authorized in that decision. Liberty Utilities believes its request is in the public interest as it will provide administrative and budget flexibility that will ensure smoother year to year and cycle to cycle transitions.(Ruling Response, p.2)

C-4 Southwest Gas

Southwest Gas's ESA/CARE 2012 Performance Overview

2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2012 Actual	% of Planned
ESA Program Expenses			
\$3,172,693	\$3,024,847	\$2,104,243	70%
ESA Homes Treated			
3110	3479	1919	55%
CARE Program Administrative Expenses			
\$228,000	\$195,000	\$228,000	117%
CARE Subsidies			
\$8,845,624	\$11,442,359	\$8,845,624	77%
Sources: D.08-12-019, 2012-2014 Budget Application, and 2012 Annual Report			

Utility Summary

- I. ESA 2012 average cost per home - \$1096
- II. 2012 Low Income Program Expenses
 - a. ESA - ESA expenses underspent by approximately 30%, by utilizing bridge funding for the ESA Program, the Company continues to recover more revenue than it can spend. The Commission allows ESA funds to be carried over from previous program years (D.03-03-007). Currently, Southwest Gas' carryover is approximately \$2.7 million. Southwest Gas' 2012-2014 Low-Income Application sought approval of a modified ESA budget amount to eliminate the Company's carryover from the prior budget cycle. While bridge funding does not address this request, the Company believes that, so long as the Commission is aware of the carryover issue, it can be substantively reviewed and addressed at a later date (Ruling Response, p.2)
 - b. CARE - Administrative budget exceeded 2012 planned budget by approximately 17%, but is equivalent to the amount authorized for 2011.

C-4 Southwest Gas
(continued)

III. Position re: Bridge Funding

- a. Supports bridge funding through 2014atauthorized 2011(p.1)

IV. Commission Action/Guidance Requested – seeks approval offer four new measures to assist in meeting the Company’s ESA homes treated goal and reduce the number of homes currently deemed ineligible under the “three measure minimum” or the “modified three measure minimum” standards (Ruling Response, p.2).

- a. high efficiency clothes washers - approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)
- b. furnace clean and tune - (SPPM, table 5-1 should be updated to reflect cz 16 for MF &SF, currently not approved in cz 16, only authorized for IOUs in in CZ#s 4,5, 6,7, 8, 10,14, & 15. - Southwest’s request should be approved in cz #s 14, 15 &16 only.
- c. forced air unit (FAU) standing pilot conversions- approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)
- d. thermostatic shower valves - approved in all CZs for all housing types (SPPM, table 5-1)

C-5 Alpine Natural Gas

Alpine Natural Gas's ESA/CARE 2012 Performance Overview

2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2012 Actual	% Difference
ESA program Expenses			
\$40,975	\$22,800	\$11,730	51%
ESA Homes Treated			
22	22	16	72%
CARE Program Administrative Expenses			
\$3,900.00	\$3,900.00	\$3,900	100%
CARE Subsidies			
12,900.00	\$14,500.00	\$12,469	86%
Sources: D.08-12-019, 2012-2014 Budget Application, and 2012 Annual Report			

Utility Summary

- I. ESA 2012 average cost per home - \$733
- II. 2012 Low Income Program Expenses
 - a. ESA - ESA expenses underspent by approximately 50%.
 - b. CARE - Administrative expenses are equivalent to planned and authorized amounts.
- III. Position re: Bridge Funding
 - a. Supports continued bridge funding through 2014 (Ruling Response, p.2).
- IV. Commission Action/Guidance Requested -
 - a. Alpine did not propose any new ESA program measures
 - b. Alpine believes it's assigned 2011 CARE and ESA participation and funding levels, are beyond the Company's capabilities due to limited number of gas service connections and finite service area. Therefore, the adopted budget levels continue to result in over

C-5 Alpine Natural Gas
(continued)

collection of ESA program funds. As a result Alpine continues to recover more revenue than it is able to spend. (Ruling Response, p.4)

- c. Alpine's 2012-2014 budget application requested guidance regarding use of Installation Standards and Policy & Procedure manuals(2012-2014 Budget application p.13)

C-6 West Coast Gas

West Coast Gas's CARE⁶ 2012 Performance Overview

2011 Authorized	2012 Planned	2012 Actual	% Difference
CARE Program Administrative Expenses			
\$1,180	\$1,180	\$1,108	100%
CARE Subsidies			
\$7,000	\$7,000	\$4,666	67%
Sources: D.08-12-019, 2012-2014 Budget Application, and 2012 Annual Report			

Utility Summary

- I. Average cost per home - n/a
- II. 2012 Low Income Program Expenses
 - a. ESA - West Coast does not offer ESA Program services due.
 - b. CARE -balancing account over collected by \$26,982.14 due to forecasting error based on widely fluctuating natural gas prices. (2012 CARE Annual Report, p.4)
- III. Position re: Bridge Funding
 - a. Supports continued bridge funding through 2014.
- IV. Commission Action/Guidance Requested -

(End of Appendix C)

⁶ West Coast Gas does not offer ESA in its service territory due to the age of its housing stock.

Appendix D

Appendix D

SMJUs' Monthly Budget Summary for CARE and ESA Programs for Remainder of 2012-2014 Program Cycle

	ESA	CARE	Totals
Alpine	\$3,415	\$1,400	\$4,815
Bear Valley	\$19,135	\$22,758	\$41,894
PacifiCorp	\$78,125	\$246,485	\$324,610
California Pacific Electric	\$16,735	\$51,500	\$68,235
Southwest	\$264,391	\$756,135	\$1,020,526
West Coast Gas	\$0	\$672	\$672

(End of Appendix D)

Appendix E

APPENDIX E
2012-2014 SMJUs' ESA Program Measures and Climate Zone Summary

SMJU Existing ESA Program Measures by Climate Zone:	Alpine Natural Gas				Southwest Gas				Bear Valley Electric				PacifiCorp				Liberty Utilities								
	CZ #(s)	SF	MF	MH	Renters	CZ #(s)	SF	MF	MH	Renters	CZ #(s)	SF	MF	MH	Renters	CZ #(s)	SF	MF	MH	Renters	CZ #(s)	SF	MF	MH	Renters
1 Ceiling Insulation	12	x	x		x	14,15,16	x	x		x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x		x
2 Attic Insulation	12	x	x		x	14,15,16	x	x		x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x		x
3 Insulation	12	x	x		x	14,15,16	x	x		x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x		x
4 Floor Insulation						16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x		x
5 Water Heater Pipe Insulation	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
6 Water Heater Insulation/Blankets	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x						16	x	x	x	x
7 Electric Water Heaters	12					n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
8 Caulking	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
9 Weather-Stripping	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
10 Building Envelope Repairs	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
11 Outlet Cover Plate Gaskets	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
12 Low-flow Shower Heads	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
13 Faucet Aerators	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
14 Duct Wrap	12	x		x	x	16	x	x	x	x						1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
15 Duct Sealing/testing	12	x		x	x	14,15,16	x		x	x						1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x		x	x
16 Evaporative Cooler Covers	12					14,15,16	x	x	x	x						1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
17 Storm Windows						16	x	x	x	x											16	x	x	x	x
18 Window Replacement	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
19 Minor Home Repairs ¹	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
20 Refrigerator Replacement for units pre-1992	12					n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
21 CFL's - interior fixtures	12					n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16				
22 CFL's - exterior fixtures	12					n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
23 Air Conditioner Replacement	12					n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16				
24 CFL installation	12					n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
25 Energy Education	12	x	x	x	x	14,15,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
Proposed New Measures 2012-2014:																									
1 High efficiency clothes washers						14,15,16	x	x	x	x															
2 Furnace clean and tune measure						14,15,16	x	x	x	x						1,16	x	x	x	x					
3 Forced air unit (FAU) standing pilot light conversions						14,15,16	x	x	x	x															
4 Thermostatic shower valves						14,15,16	x	x	x	x															
5 Pre-1999 refrigerators						n/a					16	x	x	x	x	1,16	x	x	x	x	16	x	x	x	x
6 Surge protectors						n/a					16	x	x	x	x										
Other Measures																									
1 Microwave oven											16	x	x	x	x										
2 ground refrigerator											16	x	x	x	x										
3 heater /furnace repair											16	x	x	x	x										
4 income verification											16	x	x	x	x										
5 home assessment											16	x	x	x	x										
6 LED Nightlights											16	x	x	x	x										

(End of Appendix E)

Appendix F

APPENDIX F
Small Multijurisdictional Utilities (SMJUs')
Low Income Annual Report Guidelines

CARE Residential Program

I. PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

- A. Number of participating low-income households, including submetered households, by month. The data should be provided in a numerical table and in graph form.
1. Provide an explanation of any variance in the number of participants of 5% or more from the previous month.
 2. Provide an explanation of a variance in the number of participants, calculated as the difference between participation at the beginning of the year compared to the end of the year, of 5% or more.
- B. Provide an updated estimate of potentially eligible households and state source of figures. Questions 2 through 5 should be completed using CARE Table I. B.
1. What is the total number of residential customers.
 2. How many potential CARE eligible households are in your service territory?
 3. What percentage of the customer base for this utility, as defined by the income and household size criteria, is estimated eligible for the CARE discount?
 4. How many CARE participants, including sub-metered tenants, are signed up for CARE , and what percentage is that to the total number of customers eligible for CARE?
 5. Provide the methodology used to estimate the number of eligible households in this utility's service area.

(a) State the source of statistics and, explain any modifications made. For example, modifications to the U.S. census data for undercounts of ethnic groups, such as Hispanics.

Submetered Participants (Master Metered Customers)

- C. How many master metered customers with submetered tenants are in this utility's service territory as of the end of the reporting period?
- D. How many submetered tenants are estimated to be CARE eligible?
- E. How many submetered tenants are participating in CARE as of the end of the reporting period and what is the participation rate as compared to the estimated number eligible?
- F. Discuss any problems encountered during the reporting period in administering CARE for submetered tenants and/or master metered customers.

II. USAGE INFORMATION

- A. Provide tables showing monthly average Tier 1 and Tier 2 consumption for all residential customers (excluding CARE participants) by baseline territory (climate zone) and on a total basis. This information should be provided for summer and winter billing seasons. Do not include master metered consumption.
- B. Provide tables showing monthly average Tier 1 and Tier 2 consumption for CARE participants by baseline territory and on a total basis. Provide this information for summer and winter billing seasons. Do not include master metered consumption.
- C. Provide a graph illustrating average consumption by residential customers (excluding CARE participants) vs. CARE participants for the utility's entire service territory. Do not include master metered consumption.

III. PROGRAM COSTS

- A. Provide a table showing the average monthly bill per residential customer for each baseline territory and for the total service territory.
- B. Provide a table showing the average monthly bill for CARE participants for each baseline territory and for the total service territory.
- C. Provide a table showing the average monthly discount by baseline territory and 12 months ending (end of reporting period) in dollars per CARE participant.
- D. For total CARE administrative costs, compute a table showing administrative costs per participating customer.

- E. Complete Table III. D.2 which gives a breakdown of administrative costs in the following categories: Outreach; General Administration; Processing, Certification and Verification; Billing System Programming; Regulatory Compliance.
1. Provide the amount and a brief explanation of what is included in each of these categories.
 - Outreach
 - General Administration
 - Processing, Certification and Verification
 - Billing System Programming
 - Regulatory Compliance
 2. What are the Billing and General administrative costs incurred for non-CARE residential customers?
- F. Provide balancing account balance (for which balancing account Care – ESA or both as of (end of reporting period). Also provide an explanation for over/undercollection balances. (Give a snapshot in time.)
- G. Describe in detail what costs are recorded in the balancing account(s) and what costs are included directly to base rates.
- H. Provide a table showing the surcharge amount and the percent responsibility for surcharge by customer class.
- I. Provide the annual subsidy (discount) for all CARE participants.
- J. Provide a table showing the percent of total CARE surcharge for each customer class.

IV. OUTREACH

- A. Complete CARE Table IV.A. showing the outreach activities undertaken, the number of customers reached (if known) and the number of applications returned as a result of the particular activity undertaken (if known).
- B. Provide a narrative discussion of the following:
 1. Sharing information in overlapping service territories

2. Sharing information with ESA and other utility programs (i.e. signing up ESA customers not enrolled in CARE or working
 3. Leveraging CARE funds with other utility assistance programs
 4. Participation barriers encountered and steps taken to mitigate them
- C. Describe recommendations for improving outreach, including cost effectiveness and methods for reaching underserved households.

V. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

- A. Provide a table showing the total number of applications received by month, the total approved, the total denied as ineligible, the total returned to applicants as incomplete, and the total of duplicate applications for the reporting period.
- B. Describe any problems encountered during the reporting period with program management efforts.

VI. CERTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION PROCESSES

- A. Provide a table showing the total number of participants asked to recertify their eligibility during the reporting period. The table should show the total recertifications requested, the total recertification applications received, the total recertified, the total denied as ineligible, and the total returned to the participant as incomplete for the reporting period. Include the total number of participants who were removed from the program because they did not return the recertification application.
- B. Provide a table showing the total number of participants asked for income verification during the reporting period. The table should show the total verifications requested, the total verifications received, the total verified, the total denied as ineligible, and the total returned to the participant as incomplete for the reporting period. Include the total number of participants who were removed from the program because they did not respond to a request for income verification.
- C. Describe the process for recertifying submetered tenants of master metered complexes. Discuss any problems between master metered ratepayers and submetered customers that were encountered during the reporting period.
- D. Describe any third-party process used for CARE certification, recertification and verification processes. Describe how these processes

compare with the utility's efforts as far as cost effectiveness and effectiveness in reaching underserved households.

VII. OTHER TOPICS

- A. What significant changes are there from the previous reporting period?
- B. Are there any other comments, recommendations or issues that need to be addressed?

CARE Expanded Program

The CARE Expanded Program is an extension of the residential CARE program that covers non-profit homeless shelters and group living facilities, migrant farmworker housing centers, qualified privately-owned employee housing and qualified non-profit housing for agricultural employees.

I. PARTICIPANT INFORMATION

- A. Number of participating non-profit facilities, by type, by month. The data should be provided in numerical tables and also in graph form as follows:
 - 1. Give the total number of residential facilities and the total number of commercial facilities receiving the Expanded CARE discount.
 - 2. Total number of residents (excluding caregivers) of residential and commercial non-profit Expanded CARE facilities.

II. PROGRAM COSTS

- A. Total Expanded CARE administrative costs. Compute administrative costs per participating facility. Give a breakdown in the following categories: Outreach; General Administration; Processing, Certification and Verification; Billing System Programming; Regulatory Compliance;
 - 1. Provide the amount and a brief explanation of what is included in each of these categories.
 - Outreach
 - General Administration
 - Processing, Certification and Verification
 - Billing System Programming
 - Regulatory Compliance
- B. Provide discount information for the Expanded CARE program.
 - 1. Give the average annual discount per residential facility.
 - 2. Give the average annual discount per commercial facility.

III. OUTREACH

- A. Provide a table showing the outreach activities undertaken, the number of customers reached (if known) and the number of applications returned as a result of the particular activity undertaken (if known).
- B. Provide a narrative discussion of the following:
 - 1. Provide an analysis of the utility's most cost-effective outreach for the group living facilities;
 - 2. Sharing information in overlapping service territories;
 - 3. Participation barriers encountered and steps taken to mitigate them;
 - 4. Public agencies used to solicit potential Expanded CARE facilities;
 - 5. Barriers encountered in identifying or enrolling customers in the Expanded CARE program.

IV. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

- A. Provide a table showing the total number of applications received, the total approved, the total denied as ineligible, the total returned to applicants as incomplete for the reporting period.
- B. State the reasons CARE applications are not approved.
- C. Describe any problems encountered during the reporting period with recertification and verification processes for Expanded CARE.

V. OTHER TOPICS

- A. What significant changes are there from the previous reporting period?
- B. Are there any other comments, recommendations or issues? Analyze the CARE Expansion program, progress over the past 12 months, identify issues that need work, identify areas that need improvements and make suggestions for improvement.

ESA Program

Complete the following tables for the ESA program

- Table VIII.A- Program Expenses
- Table VIII.B- Administrative Expenses
- Table VIII.C – Outreach Activities
- Table VIII.D- Installations and Costs
- Table VIII.E – Energy Savings

(End of Appendix F)

Appendix G

APPENDIX G
2015-2017 Cycle Templates for Application Attachments

ESA -1 - Homes Treated/Weatherized
ESA -2 Program Budget
CARE -1 Program Budget
CARE -2 Estimated Participation

Attachment CARE-2

**PY 2015 - 2017 CARE Estimated Participation
Utility**

	Total Enrolled 12-31-13	Total Enrolled Through May 2014	PY 2014 Estimated Eligible	Estimated Net PY 2014 Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2014 Participation	Estimated PY 2014 Goal Rate	Estimated Net PY 2015 Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2015 Participation	Estimated PY 2015 Goal Rate	Estimated Net PY 2016 Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2016 Participation	Estimated PY 2016 Goal Rate	Estimated Net PY 2017 Enrollments	Estimated Year End PY 2017 Participation	Estimated PY 2017 Goal Rate
(Source)															

(End of Appendix G)