

Decision 12-12-011 December 20, 2012

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of its 2012- 2014 California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Energy Savings Assistance Programs and Budgets.

Application 11-05-017
(Filed May 16, 2011)

And Related Matters.

Application 11-05-018
Application 11-05-019
Application 11-05-020

DECISION ON CONTINUED FUNDING OF THE COMMUNITY HELP AND AWARENESS WITH NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY SERVICES PILOT PROGRAM FROM CALIFORNIA ALTERNATE RATES FOR ENERGY PROGRAM 2012-2014 CYCLE BUDGETS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	Page
DECISION ON CONTINUED FUNDING OF THE COMMUNITY HELP AND AWARENESS WITH NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY SERVICES PILOT PROGRAM FROM CALIFORNIA ALTERNATE RATES FOR ENERGY PROGRAM 2012-2014 CYCLE BUDGETS	1
1. Summary	2
2. Background.....	3
3. Marketing, Education and Outreach Context	5
4. Discussion	8
4.1. Review of CHANGES Pilot Evaluation Report	9
4.2. CHANGES Pilot Funding	13
4.3. CHANGES Contract	15
4.4. Tracking and Monitoring Evaluation Report.....	18
4.5. ME&O Budget Augmentation.....	22
4.6. Alternate or Complementary Funding	22
5. Comments on Proposed Decision	22
6. Assignment of Proceeding	29
Findings of Fact.....	29
Conclusions of Law	33
ORDER	36

DECISION ON CONTINUED FUNDING OF THE COMMUNITY HELP AND AWARENESS WITH NATURAL GAS AND ELECTRICITY SERVICES PILOT PROGRAM FROM CALIFORNIA ALTERNATE RATES FOR ENERGY PROGRAM 2012-2014 CYCLE BUDGETS

1. Summary

This decision approves the continued funding for the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services (CHANGES) Pilot Program through the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program at current pilot funding level, of \$60,000 per month, until the end of the CARE Program 2012-2014 Cycle or until alternate or complimentary funding can be put in place, whichever is sooner.

This decision also authorizes and directs Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company (collectively, the Utilities) to work actively and cooperatively with the Commission's Consumer Service and Information Division, the CHANGES Contractor, Self Help for the Elderly, and CHANGES community based organizations, as necessary, to develop pilot program success criteria and to facilitate and improve the tracking, monitoring and oversight of the CHANGES Pilot Program efforts consistent with the directives provided in this decision and Decision 12-08-044. The overall objectives of these collaborative efforts should be to (1) identify and eliminate unnecessarily duplicative efforts between the Utilities' CARE Program marketing, education and outreach activities and the CHANGES Pilot Program activities, (2) improve the Utilities' marketing, outreach and education activities, where appropriate, and (3) ensure the effectiveness of the CHANGES activities, relating to the CARE Program, in furthering CARE Program objectives.

2. Background

On November 19, 2010, the Commission issued Resolution CSID-004 and approved a one-year in-language pilot program referred to as the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services (CHANGES) Pilot Program and authorized the pilot funding through the California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Program budget, and specifically from the 2009-2011 CARE Program budget. The CHANGES Pilot Program launched in February 2011 and began providing energy-related (electric and natural gas) education, resolution of needs and disputes, and outreach services for limited English proficient (LEP) consumers in their preferred languages through an existing statewide network of community based organizations (CBOs).

Since February 2011 and through April 2012, the 22 CHANGES CBOs (CHANGES CBOs) participated in the pilot and were able to achieve, *inter alia*, the following:

- Provided assistance in 30 different languages.
- Helped more than 100 LEP clients apply for the discount energy program for low-income consumers, potentially CARE eligible customers, and assisted hundreds more with applying for financial assistance to help pay their bills.
- Educated 17,900 LEP consumers about energy services and bills to help them lower their energy usage, avoid disconnections, and understand payment arrangements to help them budget for utility bills.
- Assisted 1,947 consumers with needs and disputes to help avoid disconnections.

On November 10, 2011, the Commission issued Resolution CSID-005 and authorized the continued CARE Program funding for the CHANGES Pilot

Program and extended the duration of the CHANGES Pilot Program to allow time for additional data collection and evaluation, as well as time to review and address the appropriateness of continued authorization of CARE Program funding, if any, for the pilot through this current proceeding. In Resolution CSID-005, we authorized and directed the Consumer Service and Information Division (CSID) and the Energy Division to hire an independent consultant to review 12 months of data collected concerning this pilot program to determine its ability to effectively assist the LEP consumers and evaluate the benefits of this pilot's use of CARE funds. A final report based on that evaluation was ordered to be submitted to the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding, by July 15, 2012, for the Commission's review, consideration and decision in the fall of 2012. Under CSID-005, the funding for this pilot was set at a level not to exceed \$60,000 per month from CARE funds, and not to exceed \$720,000 collectively for 2012. CSID-005 did not authorize funding for this pilot beyond December 31, 2012.

On March 9, 2012, both Directors of the Energy Division and CSID submitted, and electronically served, a joint letter pursuant to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 16.6, to the Executive Director, Paul Clanon, of the Commission, and the service list of Rulemaking 10-02-005 and this proceeding, requesting an extension of time for the due date of the final evaluation report ordered in CSID-005 from July 15, 2012 to September 1, 2012.¹

¹ The basis for the joint letter was that the CSID and Energy Division had encountered unforeseen circumstances during the contracting process and the requested additional time was needed to complete the needed evaluation and submit the final evaluation report. On March 12, 2012, the Executive Director, Paul Clanon, granted the requested

Footnote continued on next page

On August 27, 2012, the Commission's Energy Division and CSID submitted the CHANGES Pilot Evaluation Report to the assigned Administrative Law Judge, which was subsequently entered into the record.²

In Decision (D.) 12-08-044, issued on August 30, 2012, we announced our intention "to revisit the issue of continued CARE funding of CHANGES Pilot Program in a subsequent decision in the second phase of this proceeding, expected in the fall 2012 after the independent consultant's final evaluation report is submitted and reviewed."³

3. Marketing, Education and Outreach Context

Since the CHANGES Pilot Program had been funded through the CARE Program's marketing, education and outreach (ME&O) budget, we examine the potential continuation of CHANGES funding within the context of the CARE Program's ME&O policy context, which we summarize below. In the current 2012-2014 CARE Program cycle, we increased the budget for the CBOs to fund their CARE Program enrollment activities. In ordering paragraph (OP) 105 of D.12-08-044, we authorized and increased the limit for CBO CARE capitation fees to \$20 for each CARE enrollment.

In D.12-08-044, we also emphasized and directed Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company (collectively, the Utilities) to focus the ME&O efforts toward strategically reaching the hardest to reach CARE

extension of time for the due date of the final evaluation report ordered in CSID-005 from July 15, 2012 to September 1, 2012.

² Administrative Law Judge's Ruling, dated November 6, 2012.

³ D.12-08-044 at 227-228.

customers and enrolling them during this cycle. Specifically, we encouraged the Utilities to use "... CARE Programs' ME&O strategies that embrace and recognize the importance of community, local, regional, ethnic as well as ethnically-owned media as ways of effectively reaching and penetrating some of the most difficult to reach pockets of the low income communities."⁴

At the same time, we also signaled that the Utilities should anticipate some potential changes to the Commission's overall approach for ME&O:

We direct the IOUs to continue to conduct their current overall [Energy Savings Assistance] [] and CARE Programs' ME&O efforts as directed in this decision but to anticipate and make some ME&O mid-cycle adjustments to participate in and align with the overall statewide ME&O activities resulting from D.12-05-015, the recently issued guidance decision in the general energy efficiency docket, Rulemaking (R.) 09-11-014. We direct the IOUs to file their statewide ME&O applications incorporating low income programs' ME&O issues by August 3, 2012 as ordered in D.12 05-015.

As in prior decisions and rulings, our intent is to move away from separately authorized marketing and outreach programs and budgets for statewide demand response, energy efficiency, the California Solar Initiative, the Self-Generation Incentive Program, and other statewide demand-side program efforts. Under the general heading of Energy Upgrade California, we expect the utilities to craft a coordinated and leveraged approach that can offer separate program referrals depending on the desired actions by the customers. Our intent is to eliminate duplicative and potentially contradictory spending on separate marketing by utility or by program type. To the extent that the utilities still believe that program-specific and/or utility-specific marketing is

⁴ D.12-08-044 at 10.

warranted, they should explain, in any budget proposals, how the narrower marketing budget and approach relates to the general Energy Upgrade California umbrella approach.⁵

In August 2012, the Utilities submitted the ME&O applications⁶ as directed in D.12-05-015. Those applications are under review (Statewide ME&O Proceeding).⁷

Finally, in D.12-08-044, we heightened the Utilities' responsibility and accountability and directed the Utilities to track and report on the progress of all of the outreach efforts in their annual reports, including the submission of reports identifying "specific activities and contracts, actual expense, as well as qualitative and quantitative attributes of resulting enrollment from each effort, to illustrate which efforts result in effective outreach and penetration of the most difficult to reach pockets of the low income communities."⁸ Similarly, in D.12-08-044, we affirmed that:

During the 2012-2014 funding cycle, we are particularly intent on heightening the scrutiny of all pilots, studies and proposals we approve, authorize and evaluate. We also raise the accountability for both the timing and deliverables resulting from the authorized pilots, studies and proposals so that the [Energy Savings Assistance] [] and CARE Programs receive benefits from these initiatives without undue delay.⁹

⁵ D.12-08-044 at 302-303.

⁶ D.12-05-015.

⁷ See Application (A.) 12-08-007, A.12-08-008, A.12-08-009, A.12-08-010 (A.12-08-007 et al.)

⁸ D.12-08-044 at 10.

⁹ *Id.* at 226.

4. Discussion

As we indicated in D.12-08-044 and as part of the second phase of the herein 2012-2014 CARE Program and Budget Proceeding¹⁰, we review “the issue of continued CARE funding of the CHANGES Pilot Program” and the CHANGES Pilot Evaluation Report (Report). As noted above, because the CHANGES Pilot Program had been funded through the CARE Program’s ME&O budget, we review this potential continuation of CHANGES funding within the larger context of the ME&O approach currently under review in the Statewide ME&O Proceeding¹¹ and the recently issued 2012-2014 CARE Program Budget decision, D.12-08-044.

Based on our review, we find that the Report provides adequate justification to continue the funding for the CHANGES Pilot Program through the CARE Program at current pilot funding level until the end of the CARE Program 2012-2014 Cycle or until alternate or complimentary funding¹² can be put in place, whichever is sooner. This continued funding enables the pilot program to continue until the Commission is better informed of the CHANGES Pilot Program’s overall effectiveness as well as potential full funding options and sources.

¹⁰ A.11-05-017 et al.; *see* also Resolution CSID-005.

¹¹ A.12-08-007 et al.

¹² We are informed that CSID is diligently working toward securing and putting in place either long term alternate or complementary funding to continue the CHANGES Pilot Program beyond the funding authorized in this decision.

Our review of the Report also persuades us that the Utilities should be directed to actively work with CSID and the CHANGES Contractor, Self Help for the Elderly (SHE), and the CHANGES CBOs, as necessary, to develop a set of success criteria and to improve the tracking, monitoring and oversight of the CHANGES Pilot Program efforts, consistent with the directives we provide in this decision and D.12-08-044. The overall objectives of these collaborative efforts should be to (1) identify and eliminate unnecessarily duplicative efforts between the Utilities' CARE Program marketing, education and outreach activities and the CHANGES Pilot Program, (2) improve the Utilities' marketing, outreach and education activities, where appropriate, and (3) ensure the effectiveness of the CHANGES activities, relating to the CARE Program, in furthering CARE Program objectives.

4.1. Review of CHANGES Pilot Evaluation Report

The Report, and the therein evaluation, was intended to form the basis or contribute to the consideration of whether the CARE Program should continue to fund the CHANGES Pilot Program. And if so, how much of the CHANGES Pilot Program budget should be funded by CARE Program based on the evaluation of, *inter alia*, (1) added benefits it contribute to the CARE Program by meeting the needs of the CARE population and participants, and (2) its effectiveness and relative benefits of its activities as compared to other current Utilities' ME&O activities in serving the CARE Program population.

In fact, such review and analysis is necessary to aid the Commission's record and future decisions toward improving the Utilities' programs and identifying areas where CHANGES Pilot Program could effectively fill the gaps, where appropriate, to complement the Utilities' CARE Program efforts. Inherent

in this evaluative exercise is the rigorous qualitative evaluation of the Utilities' current CARE Program activities to meet the needs of the LEP consumers.

The Report lays some general foundation to confirm the need for the CHANGES Pilot Program for the California's LEP population. The Report shows that irrespective of what services the CHANGES CBOs are providing, this LEP community is being served by those participating CBOs' and their CHANGES Pilot Program services. However, it is not clear from the report how well this community is being served by the participating CHANGES CBOs and/or the Utilities and how this specific community can be served better.

More importantly, the Report does not provide a meaningful review and analysis regarding whether the Utilities' CARE Program ME&O activities fully serve this population and/or that the CHANGES Pilot Program may be able to fill some gaps. Specifically, the Report provides minimal review of (1) what the Utilities are doing to meet the LEP community's needs; (2) what the CHANGES Pilot Program is doing that is in excess of what the Utilities are doing; (3) what is the added value of the CHANGES Pilot Program activities to the CARE Program; and (4) whether the relative quality of the CHANGES Pilot Program activities (as compared to the Utilities' current authorized activities) is such that it would be prudent to divert CARE ME&O funds by investing in the CHANGES Pilot Program activities in lieu of some of the Utilities' current CARE ME&O activities authorized and budgeted for 2012-2014 program cycle under D.12-08-044.

The Report makes a statistics-based conclusion that a large portion of the LEP population is likely low income. This conclusion seems supported by the participating CHANGES CBOs' clients' self-reported data stating that they are eligible for the CARE Program. However, the Report, presumably due to lack of tracked data, stops short of identifying which portions of those CHANGES

clients enroll in the CARE Program as a result of the contacts with the CHANGES CBOs. In those cases, as to that unknown portion of the CHANGES CBOs' clientele that enroll in the CARE Program, the increased capitation fee we authorized in D.12-08-044 would address CBOs' compensation/funding for their related efforts. Without clearly understanding and distinguishing the CHANGES CBOs' activities, we may be funding an activity that we already funded through the CARE capitation program and reimbursement rates. In essence, this would result in double funding.

Likewise, the Report identifies another similar issue which relates to existing duplicative funding and efforts:

...all of the IOUs have active, ongoing programs that overlap significantly with CHANGES. These include on-going working relationships with the CARE CBOs (which are often supersets of the CHANGES CBOs); attendance at community events; and providing support to the LEP community for business interactions (e.g., bill disputes).¹³

We recognize that there were various challenges in terms of limited records and time as well as budget constraints the consultant faced in producing the Report. We also agree with the Report's finding that the CHANGES Pilot Program evaluation was particularly challenging, in large part, because the pilot currently lacks defined metrics of success or program performance metrics, and therefore aside from the numbers of reported services the CHANGES CBOs report, the consultant was not able to render a meaningful qualitative review and analysis of the participating CHANGES CBOs' activities.

¹³ Report at 29.

We also acknowledge that, in an attempt to supplement the informational gap to provide a qualitative review and analysis of the CHANGES Pilot Program activities, the consultant did conduct some surveys to better understand the CHANGES CBOs' raw data, namely the CHANGES CBOs' self-reported number of services. But in the end, the Report's conclusion was only able to confirm that various services have been provided to LEP community, and the Report was not able to provide more in depth qualitative evaluation and finding on the level, quality or the effectiveness of those services provided by the CHANGES CBOs.

The Report therefore emphasizes that, going forward, success criteria for the CHANGES Pilot Program must be established and improvements must be made to better track the pilot's activities. Ultimately, all such efforts would aid in future evaluation of CHANGES Pilot Program productivity and effectiveness while avoiding unnecessary duplication which can result in wasted ratepayer funds.

At this juncture, what we know is that the CHANGES CBOs provide a variety of much needed services to support the California's LEP community and do so by providing a wide range of programs and services to serve that community. Through their participation in the CHANGES Pilot Program, the participating CHANGES CBOs additionally provide outreach, education, and needs and dispute resolution on "energy-related matters" to LEP consumers in their preferred language.

We recognize that the CHANGES CBOs provide broader range of services as part of the CHANGES Pilot Program, beyond CARE Program related services. That is because, and as noted in the Report, the CHANGES Pilot Program's objective is far broader than that of the CARE Program specific ME&O objective

of educating, outreaching and enrolling the CARE eligible customers and to provide attendant service to prevent service disconnection or disruption.

That said, such a holistic program with broad focus, if effectively implemented, should be commended. The challenge is deciding how to fund such a broadly focused program that meets the multitude of different community, local, state, federal and other programs' objectives. Specifically, how much CARE Program's funding for such a broadly focused program is justified.

4.2. CHANGES Pilot Funding

There is no dispute that there is a need to serve a significant LEP population in California. The ultimate issues for us to resolve are (1) whether the current Utilities' activities authorized in the herein proceeding sufficiently meet that need, and (2) if they do not, what is the justified amount of CARE Program funds that should be set aside for such a program to complement the Utilities' activities relating to the low income LEP population, in this proceeding. Unfortunately, as discussed above in section 4.1 of this decision, we do not have all of the necessary basis to completely resolve these issues.

For the time being, we find there is adequate beneficial connection between the CHANGES Pilot Program activities and the needs of the CARE population, justifying continued funding for now. The CARE Program is the only logical, available and efficient funding source for the CHANGES Pilot Program at this time. We therefore conclude that continued funding of this pilot program is necessary to prevent the pilot's program shutdown which could occur after the current funding expires on December 31, 2012 and that continued CHANGES Pilot Program funding at its current monthly level during the remainder of 2012-2014 CARE Program Cycle is reasonable and justified.

For the 2012-2014 Program, in D.12-08-044, the Utilities were given specific direction for their CARE Program ME&O activities and the budgets necessary to implement them, including significantly increased CARE Program CBOs' capitation fees for each enrolled CARE Program customer. That budget currently does not envision continued CHANGES funding beyond December 31, 2012.

One fiscal option now is to allow CHANGES Pilot Program funding to expire on December 31, 2012, which would shut down the CHANGES Pilot Program. Alternatively, to avoid shutting down the CHANGES Pilot Program after its funding expires on December 31, 2012, another fiscal option would be to authorize continued funding for the CHANGES Pilot Program, beyond December 31, 2012 and through the end of the current budget cycle.

To do the latter, we would have to either (1) increase the 2012-2014 CARE Program Budgets, previously authorized in D.12-08-044, to account for CHANGES Pilot Program funding for the remainder of 2012-2014 cycle, or (2) if we do not increase the 2012-2014 CARE Program Budgets, cut aspects of Utilities' current and authorized CARE Program ME&O 2012-2014 Budgets to redirect those CARE funds to CHANGES Pilot Program to continue CHANGES funding during the remainder of 2012-2014 Budget Cycle.

Under the circumstances, the Report demonstrates an adequate basis to conclude that CHANGES Pilot Program should continue, with ongoing improvements, and satisfactory justification to fund the program through the end of the current CARE Program 2012-2014 cycle at the current pilot funding level.

The Report findings however do not show that relative benefits of the CHANGES Pilot Program justify displacement of, and therefore cuts to, the

current and authorized Utilities' CARE Program ME&O activities. Thus, the logical fiscal option here is to increase the CARE Program ME&O budget to account for the additional CHANGES Pilot Program funding to the end of 2012-2014 cycle, with some additional requirements we set forth in this decision to align CHANGES Pilot Program's compliance with the heightened pilot program scrutiny we outlined in D.12-08-044, namely that:

During the 2012-2014 funding cycle, we are particularly intent on heightening the scrutiny of all pilots, studies and proposals we approve, authorize and evaluate. We also raise the accountability for both the timing and deliverables resulting from the authorized pilots, studies and proposals so that the [Energy Savings Assistance] [] and CARE Programs receive benefits from these initiatives without undue delay.¹⁴

4.3. CHANGES Contract

To avoid any program disruption and to minimize contractual changes, for the time being, the current CHANGES Pilot Program contracting approach will remain largely unchanged during the period of continued funding authorized in this decision. As such, the Utilities are directed to extend their current contracts with the current CHANGES Contractor, the Self Help for the Elderly (SHE), to continue the funding and the existing contractual arrangements, during the remainder of the 2012-2014 Program cycle.

PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E, in their comments, requested ability to revise contracting terms relating to the CHANGES Pilot Program, for the remainder of 2012-2014 cycle. PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E contend the additional data tracking ordered of the Utilities in this decision requires that

¹⁴ *Id.* at 226.

CHANGES administrator, SHE, timely collect from the participating CHANGES CBOs and release such data to the Utilities for timely conveyance of that data to the Commission in the ordered monthly reports.¹⁵ The current contracts do not require the CHANGES administrator, SHE, to timely gather and release such data to the Utilities. This request to revise the terms of the Utilities' contracts with the CHANGES administrator, SHE, in order to require SHE to timely collect and release such data to the Utilities for timely conveyance of that data to the Commission in the ordered monthly reports is reasonable and therefore granted. Accordingly, the Utilities are authorized to revise their respective CHANGES contracts, as reasonably necessary, to effectuate the directives in this decision, including requiring additional data reporting from the CHANGES administrator, SHE.

However, PG&E's proposal to amend its contract(s) to require appropriate reporting from the CHANGES CBOs as a condition of payment is not approved. Instead, as proposed by SDG&E and SoCalGas, SHE should require the CHANGES subcontracting CBOs to track and report the customer data outlined in Section 4.4 of this decision¹⁶ and release them to the Utilities so that the Utilities are enabled to meet the reporting requirements outlined in OP 9 of this decision. Should the Utilities experience lack of compliance from the CHANGES administrator, SHE, or the CHANGES CBOs, the CSID as part of its leadership role shall help timely resolve any noncompliance.

¹⁵ SDG&E and SoCalGas Comment at 4-5; and PG&E Comment at 1-2.

¹⁶ SHE should also collect from the CHANGES CBOs specific utility customer account information to enable the Utilities to conduct analysis, follow up on each customer call transaction, and validate the transaction.

Relating also to the contracting concern, PG&E contends that it awards SHE funding as an annual grant. PG&E requests permission to change the contract terms to instead invoice monthly. While PG&E has experienced no problems with SHE, PG&E believes it is fiscally prudent to require its contractors to invoice for services provided on a regular basis. PG&E contends this monthly invoicing creates an auditable record and facilitates the monthly reporting that is required in OP 9 of this decision. This request is reasonable and therefore granted.

The funding for the contracts with the CHANGES' Contractor for the remainder of 2012-2014 CARE Program Budget Cycle will continue to be split among the Utilities; specifically, 30% from Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 30% from Southern California Edison, 25% from Southern California Gas Company, and 15% from San Diego Gas & Electric Company.

However, as noted in the Report, the Utilities have voiced several significant concerns about the past CHANGES Pilot Program administration, including their concern that they have been disempowered and disconnected to the CHANGES Pilot Program "to oversee the execution of those contracts [and that they had no] ability to ensure that services that were billed to them were actually delivered."¹⁷

Likewise, as noted in the Report, the CHANGES CBOs too note dissatisfaction in their current working relationship with the Utilities' representatives with whom they must work effectively together for the success of their efforts in the long run, including complaints that CHANGES special phone

¹⁷ Report at 30.

numbers were not being answered by the Utilities and the Utilities' promised in-language materials not being delivered.¹⁸

To begin to remedy the above concerns raised by the Utilities as well as the CHANGES CBOs, during the remainder of the 2012-2014 CARE Program Cycle, CSID, the Utilities, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs, as necessary, are directed to actively and cooperatively work together toward more cooperative and effective working relationship between the Utilities and CHANGES CBOs as well as improved record-keeping and reporting process.

CSID should organize, lead and facilitate regular meetings with the Utilities, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs, as necessary, and the CHANGES CBOs, starting no later than 60 days from the issuance of this decision toward facilitating a and promoting cooperation between the Utilities, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs as well as assisting the Utilities, SHE, and the CHNAGES CBOs in complying with the directives set forth in section 4.4 of this decision. Additionally, CSID, the Utilities, and the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, may also meet individually with each CHANGES CBO, when and if deemed necessary by CSID or the Utilities.

4.4. Tracking and Monitoring Evaluation Report

Each Utility is authorized and directed to work actively with CSID, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE and the CHANGES CBOs, to improve the tracking, monitoring and oversight of the CHANGES Pilot Program efforts, consistent with the directives we provide in this decision and D.12-08-044 and with the

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

overall objectives of (1) identifying and eliminating unnecessarily duplicative efforts between the Utilities CARE Program marketing, education and outreach activities and the CHANGES Pilot Program, (2) improving the Utilities' marketing, outreach and education activities where appropriate, and (3) ensuring the effectiveness of the CHANGES activities in furthering CARE Program objectives.

To gather a meaningful set of data for future decision(s) concerning the CHANGES Pilot Program funding in the herein proceeding, within 60 days from the issuance of this decision, the Utilities, and the CHANGES Contractor, SHE are authorized and directed to meet with CSID representatives to work actively to develop a set of pilot program success criteria and a plan for improving the pilot program tracking and reporting (collectively, the Plan).

The Plan, at a minimum, must include pilot program success criteria and specific description and plans on how the Utilities and the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, with the facilitation of CSID, plan to collect, track and report below information:

1. The number of CHANGES one-on-one customer assistance sessions, with:
 - (a) A breakdown of CHANGES participants' self-identified language of preference,
 - (b) Description of the session content identifying service provided (e.g. utility bill assistance, utility bill dispute resolution, and other energy related issues), and
 - (c) Description of each contact made with that customer's utility until a solution is reached.
2. The number of CHANGES group customer assistance sessions, including:
 - (a) Language(s) in which the service was given,

- (b) Description of the session content identifying service provided (e.g. education or information session on energy efficiency, utility bill review, and other energy related issues), and
 - (c) Overall description of session date, length, attendance, and information and literatures provided.
3. Of those customers visiting participating CHANGES CBOs that month (tracked in #1 above),
- (a) The number of customers that are already CARE Program enrollees, and how those CARE enrollees initially enrolled in the CARE Program;
 - (b) The number of customers that enrolled in the CARE program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (c) The number of customers that enrolled in the Family Electric Rate Assistance Program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (d) The number of customers that enrolled in the Medical Baseline Program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (e) The number of customers that were received assistance with bill payment plans (initiated or modified) by the CHANGES CBOs. This may be accomplished by having the CHANGES CBOs use a specific hotline or call in number to call Utilities for this group of customers (see below); and
 - (f) The number of customers that received assistance with utility bill disputes, including bill modification, the CHANGES CBOs. This may be accomplished by having the CHANGES CBOs use a specific hotline or call in number to call the Utilities for this group of customers (see below).

We realize that while some of the above data are already being gathered and may currently be readily available, others may require additional data collection going forward. In addition, some other data may require coordination

between the Utilities, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs in collection and/or access or sharing. Therefore, the Utilities and the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, are directed to meet with CSID representatives to develop the Plan that includes success criteria and a plan for improving the pilot program tracking and reporting, as described above.

The CHANGES Contractor, SHE, should require the CHANGES subcontracting CBOs to track and report on the customer data outlined in this section so that the Utilities would be enabled to meet the reporting requirements outlined in OP 9 of this decision. Should the Utilities experience lack of compliance from the CHANGES administrator, SHE, the CSID as part of its leadership role shall help timely resolve the noncompliance.

Within 60 days from this decision, each Utility is directed to establish a CHANGES-specific 1-800 number, if they do not already have it, to track each instance of CHANGES-directed customer service interactions. Similarly, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, is directed to take necessary actions to ensure that the CHANGES CBOs use these numbers solely for ALL CHANGES related CBO/Utilities/customer interactions and to document and explain any instances when the CHANGES 1-800 number is not utilized.

Beginning from 120 days from the date of this decision, the Utilities are directed to gather, prepare and report (on a monthly basis) in this proceeding, the above set of data consistent with the Plan, including the 1-800 number usage information, and submit them as part of each Utility's monthly report, as ordered in D.12-08-044. If the Utilities are not able to comply with this requirement then the Utilities must explain the reason for non-compliance in the monthly reports.

4.5. ME&O Budget Augmentation

Consistent with this decision and OP 136 of D.12-08-044, the Utilities are directed and authorized to amend the current petitions to modify to augment the 2012-2014 budgets to account for additional budget augmentation for CARE Program 2012-2014 Budget, resulting from the directives in this decision.

4.6. Alternate or Complementary Funding

We are informed and therefore recognize that CSID is diligently working toward securing and putting in place either long term alternate or complementary funding to continue the CHANGES Pilot Program within or outside the CARE proceeding and beyond the funding authorized in this decision, which may include seeking and pursuing Commission budget change proposals and/or any other alternate or complementary funding sources and options, while making improvements to the CHANGES CBOs' process and services. The Commission may further examine the CHANGES Pilot funding in the coming years.

5. Comments on Proposed Decision

The proposed decision of the Administrative Law Judge Kim in this matter was mailed to the parties in accordance with Section 311 of the Public Utilities Code and comments were allowed under Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Opening comments were filed on December 10, 2012 by the Southern California Edison Company (SCE), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) and The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and reply comments were thereafter filed by The Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and The Latino Business Chamber of

Greater Los Angeles (Joint Parties), La Cooperativa Campesina De California, TURN, SCE, SDG&E and SoCalGas.

In general, most of the Parties, including the Utilities, support the proposed decision approving continued CARE Program funding of the CHANGES Pilot Program for the remainder of 2012-2014 CARE Program cycle, with some modifications. Aside from minor clarifications and corrections which have been proposed and made through the decision, we address the following substantive comments and proposed modifications:

- (1) Shifting Management and Administrative Leadership of CHANGES Pilot Program to the Utilities;
- (2) Reducing tracking, monitoring and reporting;
- (3) Contracting; and
- (4) Other miscellaneous comments.

First issue is the proposal to shift management and administrative leadership of the CHANGES Pilot Program to the Utilities. SCE, SoCalGas and SDG&E propose to assume an active management role and administer CHANGES Pilot Program.¹⁹ While SCE, SoCalGas and SDG&E possess vast experience and broad existing network of CBOs that could further support CHANGES Pilot Program toward serving the LEP community, this is not yet the time to entertain a full roll out of this pilot program for the Utilities to administer. As the timing is concerned, the logical next step for this pilot, as ordered in this decision, is to establish the pilot success criteria, develop a related track record, and then determine a full roll out, as appropriate, based thereon. At this juncture, this pilot should continue to remain under CSID's leadership

¹⁹ SCE Opening Comment at 2; and SDG&E and SoCalGas Opening Comment at 2.

and oversight,²⁰ with SHE's administration, to minimize administrative disruption while the remainder of the 2012-2014 could be utilized to focus on developing pilot success criteria, tracking, monitoring and reporting ordered in this decision as well as exploring funding options for the CHANGES Pilot Program within and/or outside the CARE proceeding, as explained in this decision.

Both the opening and reply comment by TURN miss the essence of what is being offered to LEP consumers by CHANGES Pilot Program. In short, TURN's comments emphasize that the CHANGES CBOs "must serve as an advocate for the consumer they [sic] serve, not a 'partner' with the utility,"²¹ and therefore the CHANGES framework necessarily requires "the CHANGES Contractor as the go-between" in order to help "avoid undermining the important advocacy function served by the CHNAGES CBOs."²² We agree with SCE, SDG&E and SoCalGas that CHANGES offer far more than simple adversarial advocacy service to its LEP consumers and offer translation, education, general assistance and other energy-related services. Moreover, as correctly noted by SCE, the Utilities have had a vast experience with their network of CBOs with whom they have developed dynamic, effective and non-adversarial working relationship, which includes advocating for the LEP consumers as well as assisting with

²⁰ As originally envisioned, in Resolution CSID - 004, the Commission directed CSID to administer this pilot program and directed CSID to work with the IOUs to create the program. Since then, the pilot has been overseen by the CSID and administered by the administrative agency, SHE.

²¹ TURN Opening Comment at 6.

²² *Ibid.*

dispute resolution referrals. That said, this issue is not yet untimely. The possibility of whether the CHANGES administration should transfer to the Utilities will be examined at a later time when and if, *inter alia*:

- (1) the pilot's success criteria is developed and deployed;
- (2) the pilot is roll-out ready;
- (3) the Commission's record on the pilot informs this proceeding, as ordered in this decision; and
- (4) once the full array of long term funding options and sources are developed and evaluated.

Second issue concerns SCE's objection that CARE Program "resources [not] be diverted to reporting on CARE-related activities through CHANGES."²³ SCE contends, in its Opening Comment, it is imprudent to divert funding to tracking, monitoring and reporting activities, as ordered in this decision. Instead, SCE contends the focus should be "on enhancing access to LEP customers" and opines that "Longer-term funding strategies are likely to be identified if the program develops a successful track record of delivering CHANGES-related services to LEP customers."²⁴ SDG&E and SoCalGas too echo SCE's objection. Again, as noted above, the logical next step here is to establish the pilot success criteria, develop a related track record, and then determine a full roll out framework and funding, as appropriate, based thereon. At this juncture, this pilot is not yet ready for full roll out and the tracking, monitoring and reporting are timely, reasonable and necessary to establish a sound foundation and direction for the CHANGES Pilot Program. Thus, SCE's and

²³ SCE Opening Comment at 2.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

others' objection to tracking, monitoring and reporting on CARE-related activities is unpersuasive.

The third issue concerns contracting. PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E, in their Opening and Reply Comments, requested ability to revise contracting terms relating to the CHANGES Pilot Program, for the remainder of 2012-2014 cycle. PG&E, SoCalGas and SDG&E contend the additional data tracking ordered of the Utilities in this decision requires that CHANGES administrator, SHE, timely collect from the participating CBOs and release such data to the Utilities for timely conveyance of that data to the Commission in the monthly reports.²⁵ This request is reasonable and therefore granted. Appropriate revisions concerning this and related request for contracting flexibility to comply with the directives in this decision have been made to section 4.3 of this decision.

A few remaining miscellaneous issues are addressed below.

TURN and a few other parties in their Opening and/or Reply Comments raised an issue demonstrating inherent misunderstanding of this decision worth clarifying. In short, some of the parties note confusion and propose that the decision be modified to avoid confusing CHANGES with CARE Program ME&O efforts/activities.²⁶ The decision, in no way, suggests, implies, equates or confuses the two and any such reading is an obvious error. The decision explicitly provides:

²⁵ SDG&E and SoCalGas Opening Comment at 4-5; and PG&E Opening Comment at 1-2.

²⁶ TURN Opening Comment at 1-5; Joint Reply Comment by SDG&E and SoCalGas at 2; and SCE's Reply Comment at 2.

We recognize that the CHANGES CBOs provide broader range of services as part of the CHANGES Pilot Program, beyond CARE Program related services. That is because, and as noted in the Report, the CHANGES Pilot Program's objective is far broader than that of the CARE Program specific ME&O objective of educating, outreaching and enrolling the CARE eligible customers and to provide attendant service to prevent service disconnection or disruption.

That said, such a holistic program with broad focus, if effectively implemented, should be commended. The challenge is deciding how to fund such a broadly focused program that meets the multitude of different community, local, state, federal and other programs' objectives. Specifically, how much CARE Program's funding for such a broadly focused program is justified.²⁷

The decision does not confuse CHANGES Pilot Program and CARE ME&O Program. It recognizes that the two programs have overlapping and potentially complementary elements but do not fully align.²⁸ With that recognition, the decision merely provides temporary and necessary funding and pilot start-up assistance to effectively develop the program framework while ensuring that necessary data gathering occurs in the remainder of 2012-2014 cycle, to inform the record, in the event CSID is not successful in securing full alternative funding and further decision must be made to fund CHANGES Pilot Program at the end of 2012-2014 cycle, in future CARE proceeding. Specifically, this decision recognizes that alternative or complimentary funding search is underway and this decision is a temporary funding decision to avoid shutting

²⁷ See *infra* at 12.

²⁸ See *infra* at 9-11.

down the CHANGES Pilot Program at this time. Ultimately, it is envisioned that the efforts of CSID during the remainder of 2012-2014 cycle, along with the development of success criteria and data tracking will provide the necessary basis for the Commission to render the above key decision, at a later time, if necessary and as appropriate.

Likewise, we are not persuaded by TURN's objection that "Situating the evaluation of CHANGES within the context of the Commission's consideration of improvements to the IOUs' marketing of CARE and ESAP erroneously obscures the multifaceted purpose of CHANGES."²⁹ This decision is not limited solely to "evaluation of CHANGES." We are also not persuaded by PG&E's objection that in terms of program reporting, "several categories pertaining to CARE, Family Energy Rate Assistance (FERA) and Medical Baseline program enrollment are not activities performed under the CHANGES Pilot, and are thus irrelevant to CHANGES."³⁰

What the parties should understand is that this decision serves multiple purposes. First and foremost, this decision provides temporary funding while simultaneously setting the stage to foster success of this pilot and providing directives designed to establish the record for a meaningful future review of how much future CARE funding maybe justified. Meanwhile, it also sets the stage to

²⁹ TURN Opening Comment at 1.

³⁰ PG&E Opening Comment at 2; *see also* SCE Reply Comment at 2.

develop a record and yield other ancillary and longer term benefits designed to better serve either or both CARE population and LEP consumer population.³¹

Finally, several parties have noted a need to clarify some references to CHANGES Contractor's role which has been made throughout the decision. Similarly, several parties pointed out that contract funding split references required some corrections, which too have been made throughout the decision.

6. Assignment of Proceeding

Timothy Alan Simon is the assigned Commissioner and Kimberly H. Kim is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. The CHANGES Pilot Program, initially funded through the CARE Program, launched in February 2011 and began providing energy-related (electric and natural gas) education, resolution of needs and disputes, and outreach services for LEP consumers in their preferred languages through an existing statewide network of CBOs.

2. On November 10, 2011, the Commission issued Resolution CSID-005, authorized the continued CARE Program funding for the CHANGES Pilot Program (a level not to exceed \$60,000 per month from CARE funds), and directed CSID and the Energy Division to hire an independent consultant (a) to review 12 months of data collected concerning this pilot program to determine

³¹ As part of any energy education program CHANGES provide that aims to assist LEP customers who may also have limited knowledge of potential services and offerings to help reduce their energy burden, it is a reasonable metric to determine what types of actual energy education is being offered by CHANGES. Similarly, tracking FERA and Medical Baseline enrollment as part of CHANGES program provides better understanding of the LEP consumer population makeup to better serve that population going forward.

its ability to effectively assist the LEP consumers and evaluate the benefits of this pilot's use of CARE Program funds and (b) prepare and submit a final report (Report).

3. The Report, and the therein evaluation, was intended to form the basis or contribute to the consideration of whether the CARE Program should continue to fund the CHANGES Pilot Program. And if so, how much of the CHANGES Pilot Program budget should be funded by CARE Program based on the evaluation of, *inter alia*, (1) added benefits it contribute to the CARE Program by meeting the needs of the CARE population and participants, and (2) its effectiveness and relative benefits of its activities as compared to other current Utilities' ME&O activities in serving the CARE Program population.

4. Such review and analysis is necessary to aid the Commission's record and future decisions toward improving the Utilities' programs and identifying areas where CHANGES Pilot Program could effectively fill the gaps, where appropriate, to complement the Utilities' CARE Program efforts.

5. In D.12-08-044, issued on August 30, 2012, we announced our intention "to revisit the issue of continued CARE funding of CHANGES Pilot Program in a subsequent decision in the second phase of this proceeding, expected in the fall 2012 after the independent consultant's final evaluation report is submitted and reviewed."

6. On August 27, 2012, the Commission's Energy Division and CSID submitted the Report to the assigned Administrative Law Judge, which was subsequently entered into the record.

7. The Report lays some general foundation to confirm the need for the CHANGES Pilot Program for the California's LEP population and shows that irrespective of what services the CHANGES CBOs are providing to this

community, this LEP community is being served by those participating CBOs' and their CHANGES Pilot Program services.

8. The Report makes a statistics-based conclusion that a large portion of the LEP population is likely low income. This conclusion seems supported by the participating CBOs' clients' self-reported data stating that they are eligible for the CARE Program. The Report does not provide a meaningful review and analysis regarding whether the Utilities' CARE Program ME&O activities fully serve this population and/or that the CHANGES Pilot Program may be able to fill some gaps.

9. The Report provides minimal review of (1) what the Utilities are doing to meet the LEP community's needs; (2) what the CHANGES Pilot Program is doing that is in excess of what the Utilities are doing; (3) what is the added value of the CHANGES Pilot Program activities to the CARE Program; and (4) whether the relative quality of the CHANGES Pilot Program activities (as compared to the Utilities' current authorized activities) is such that it would be prudent to divert CARE ME&O funds by investing in the CHANGES Pilot Program activities in lieu of some of the Utilities' current CARE ME&O activities authorized and budgeted for 2012-2014 program cycle under D.12-08-044.

10. The CHANGES Pilot Program evaluation faced various challenges in terms of limited pilot records and evaluation time and budget as well as having to evaluate a pilot which currently lacks defined success metrics or program performance metrics, which in turn stifled the consultant's ability to render a meaningful qualitative review and analysis of the participating CHANGES CBOs' activities.

11. The Report emphasizes that, going forward, success criteria for the CHANGES Pilot Program must be established and other improvements must be

made to better track the pilot's activities; ultimately, such efforts would aid in future evaluation of CHANGES Pilot Program productivity and effectiveness while avoiding unnecessary duplication which can result in wasted ratepayer funds.

12. The CHANGES CBOs provide a variety of much needed services to support the California's LEP community and do so by providing a wide range of programs and services to serve that community.

13. The CHANGES Pilot Program's objective is far broader than that of the CARE Program specific ME&O objective of educating, outreaching and enrolling the CARE eligible customers and to provide attendant service to prevent service disconnection or disruption.

14. The CHANGES CBOs under this pilot are charged with the broad mission to provide all energy-related services, having to do with all other local, state or federal programs and more.

15. For the 2012-2014 Program, in D.12-08-044, the Utilities were given specific direction for their CARE Program ME&O activities and the budgets necessary to implement them, including significantly increased CARE CBO capitation fees for each enrolled CARE customer.

16. The Utilities' 2012-2014 budgets currently do not envision continued CHANGES funding beyond December 31, 2012.

17. We find there is adequate beneficial connection between the CHANGES Pilot Program activities and the needs of the CARE population, justifying continued funding for the time being.

18. This continued funding is necessary to prevent pilot program shutdown and to enable the pilot program to continue until the Commission is better

informed of the CHANGES' Pilot Program's overall effectiveness as well as full funding options and sources.

19. The Report findings do not show that the relative benefits of the CHANGES Pilot Program justify displacement of, and therefore cuts to, the current and authorized Utilities' ME&O activities.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Report provides adequate justification to continue the funding for the CHANGES Pilot Program through the CARE Program at current pilot funding level until the end of the CARE Program 2012-2014 Cycle or until alternate or complimentary funding can be put in place, whichever is sooner.

2. The Report demonstrates an adequate basis to find that CHANGES Pilot Program should continue, with ongoing improvements, and satisfactory justification to fund the program through the end of the current CARE Program 2012-2014 cycle at the current pilot funding level.

3. The CARE Program is the only logical, available and efficient funding source for the CHANGES Pilot Program at this time.

4. The continued CHANGES Pilot Program funding at its current level is reasonable and justified, and therefore, the Commission should continue CHANGES Pilot Program funding at its current level.

5. During the remainder of the 2012-2014 CARE Program cycle and going forward, success criteria for the CHANGES Pilot Program should be established and improvements should be made to better track the pilot's activities to evaluate productivity and effectiveness.

6. The Utilities should be fully empowered and directed to work actively with CSID, CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs to improve the tracking, monitoring and oversight of the CHANGES Pilot Program efforts,

consistent with the directives and objectives we provide in this decision and D.12-08-044.

7. The overall objectives of these collaborative efforts, for this proceeding during the 2012-2014 cycle, should be to (a) identify and eliminate unnecessarily duplicative efforts between the Utilities CARE Program marketing, education and outreach activities and the CHANGES Pilot Program, (b) improve the Utilities' marketing, outreach and education activities where appropriate, and (c) ensure the effectiveness of the CHANGES activities, relating to the CARE Program, in furthering CARE Program objectives.

8. The Utilities' 2012-2014 CARE Program Budgets, previously authorized in D.12-08-044, should be increased, to allow continued funding of the CHANGES Pilot Program through the end of the current budget cycle.

9. The only logical fiscal option here is to increase the CARE Program ME&O budget to account for the additional CHANGES Pilot Program funding to the end of 2012-2014 cycle, with some additional requirements we set forth in this decision to align CHANGES Pilot Program's compliance with the heightened pilot program scrutiny we outlined in D.12-08-044.

10. To avoid any program disruption and to minimize contractual changes, for the time being, the current CHANGES contracting approach should remain unchanged during the period of continued funding authorized in this decision.

11. The Utilities should be authorized to revise their respective CHANGES contracts, as reasonably necessary, to effectuate the directives in this decision, including requiring additional data reporting from the CHANGES administrator, SHE.

12. PG&E's proposal to amend its contract(s) to require appropriate reporting from the CHANGES CBOs as a condition of payment should not be approved.

13. CHANGES Contractor, SHE, should require the CHANGES subcontracting CBOs to track and report the customer data outlined in Section 4.4 of this decision and release them to the Utilities so that the Utilities are enabled to meet the reporting requirements outlined in OP 9 of this decision.

14. Should the Utilities experience lack of compliance from the CHANGES administrator, SHE, or the CHANGES CBOs, the CSID as part of its leadership role should help timely resolve any noncompliance.

15. PG&E request for permission to change the CHANGES contract terms to instead invoice monthly is reasonable and therefore should be granted.

16. CSID, the Utilities, and the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, should actively and cooperatively work together to develop pilot program success criteria and to facilitate and promote program improvements to the overall CHANGES CBOs' activities, including improvements toward more cooperative and effective working relationship between the Utilities and CHANGES CBOs as well as improved record keeping and reporting process.

17. CSID should organize, lead and facilitate regular meetings with the Utilities, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs, as necessary, starting no later than 60 days from the issuance of this decision toward facilitating a and promoting cooperation between the Utilities and the CHANGES CBOs as well as assisting the Utilities, the CHANGES Contractor, SHE, and the CHANGES CBOs in complying with the directives set forth in this decision.

18. More meaningful set of data should be collected and evaluated based on which we would be better informed to render subsequent decision(s) concerning the CHANGES Pilot Program funding in the herein proceeding.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. We approve the continued funding for the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services Pilot Program through the California Alternate Rates for Energy Program at current pilot funding level (not to exceed \$60,000 per month) until the end of the 2012-2014 CARE Program cycle or until alternate or complimentary funding can be put in place, whichever is sooner.

2. For the continued funding for the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services Pilot Program through the California Alternate Rates for Energy Program during the 2012-2014 Program and Budget Cycle, the current funding split among the Utilities shall continue; specifically, 30% from Pacific Gas and Electric Company, 30% from Southern California Edison, 25% from Southern California Gas Company, and 15% from San Diego Gas and Electric.

3. Effective immediately, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company shall extend their current contracts with the current Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services Pilot Program Contractor, the Self Help for the Elderly, to continue the funding and the existing contractual arrangements, during the remainder of the 2012-2014 Program cycle, with two exceptions:

- A. Contract modifications necessary to comply with this decision is permitted; and
- B. Pacific Gas and Electric Company may modify its contract to require monthly invoicing by the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services Pilot Program Contractor, the Self Help for the Elderly.

3. Within 60 days from the issuance of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, the Commission's Consumer Service and Information Division (CSID), and the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services (CHANGES) Pilot Program Contractor, the Self Help for the Elderly³² shall meet regularly to develop a set of pilot program success criteria and a plan for improving the pilot program tracking and reporting (Plan), which at a minimum includes, specific description and plans on how the Utilities and the CHANGES Contractor, with the facilitation of CSID, plan to collect, track and report below information:

- (a) The number of CHANGES one-on-one customer assistance sessions, with:
 - (i) A breakdown of CHANGES participants' self-identified language of preference,
 - (ii) Description of the session content identifying service provided (e.g. utility bill assistance, utility bill dispute resolution, and other energy related issues), and
 - (iii) Description of each contact made with that customer's utility until a solution is reached.

³² Participation of CHANGES community based organizations is optional in these regular meetings and will be left to the discretion of the CSID.

- (b) The number of CHANGES group customer assistance sessions, including:
 - i. Language(s) in which the service was given,
 - ii. Description of the session content identifying service provided (e.g. education or information session on energy efficiency, utility bill review, and other energy related issues), and
 - iii. Overall description of session date, length, attendance, and information and literatures provided.
- (c) Of those customers visiting participating CHANGES CBOs that month (tracked pursuant to ordering paragraph 4, subsection (a) above):
 - (i) The number of customers that are already CARE Program enrollees, and how those CARE enrollees initially enrolled in the CARE Program;
 - (ii) The number of customers that enrolled in the CARE program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (iii) The number of customers that enrolled in the Family Energy Rate Assistance Program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (iv) The number of customers that enrolled in the Medical Baseline Program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (v) The number of customers that were received assistance with bill payment plans (initiated or modified) by the CHANGES CBOs. This may be accomplished by having the CHANGES CBOs use a specific hotline or call in number to call Utilities for this group of customers; and
 - (vi) The number of customers that received assistance with utility bill disputes, including bill modification, the CHANGES CBOs. This may be accomplished by having the CHANGES CBOs use a specific hotline or call in number to call the Utilities for this group of customers.

4. Within 90 days from the date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company shall submit the set of pilot program success criteria and a plan for improving the pilot program tracking and reporting ordered in this decision for review by the assigned Administrative Law Judge for compliance with this decision.

5. Within 60 days from this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company shall establish a CHANGES specific 1-800 number, if they do not have one already, to track each instance of CHANGES-directed customer service interactions.

6. Within 60 days from the date of this decision, the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services Pilot Program (CHANGES) community based organizations (CBOs) shall use these numbers solely for ALL CHANGES related CBO/Utilities/customer interactions and to document and explain any instances when the CHANGES 1-800 number is not utilized.

7. Effective immediately, the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services (CHANGES) Pilot Program Contractor, the Self Help for the Elderly shall take actions necessary to ensure that the CHANGES subcontracting community based organizations timely track and report the customer data outlined in Section 4.4 of this decision and timely release them to the Utilities so that the Utilities are enabled to meet the reporting requirements outlined in Ordering Paragraph 9 of this decision.

8. The Commission's Consumer Service and Information Division (CSID), as part of its leadership role, shall facilitate and help timely resolve any noncompliance issues, if and when, the Utilities experience lack of compliance

from the Community Help and Awareness with Natural Gas and Electricity Services (CHANGES) Pilot Program Contractor or the CHANGES community based organizations.

9. Beginning from 120 days from the date of this decision, the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company (Utilities) shall gather, prepare and report (on a monthly basis) in this proceeding, the below additional set of data, plus the 1-800 number usage information, and submit them as part of each utility's regular monthly report, as ordered in D.12-08-044; and if the Utilities are not able to comply with this requirement then the Utilities must explain the reason for non-compliance in the monthly reports. The additional set of data are:

- (a) The number of CHANGES one-on-one customer assistance sessions, with:
 - (i) A breakdown of CHANGES participants' self-identified language of preference,
 - (ii) Description of the session content identifying service provided (e.g. utility bill assistance, utility bill dispute resolution, and other energy related issues), and
 - (iii) Description of each contact made with that customer's utility until a solution is reached.
- (b) The number of CHANGES group customer assistance sessions, including:
 - (i) Language(s) in which the service was given,
 - (ii) Description of the session content identifying service provided (e.g. education or information session on energy efficiency, utility bill review, and other energy related issues), and

- (iii) Overall description of session date, length, attendance, and information and literatures provided.
- (c) Of those customers visiting participating CHANGES CBOs that month (tracked pursuant to ordering paragraph 8, subsection (a) above):
 - (i) The number of customers that are already CARE Program enrollees, and how those CARE enrollees initially enrolled in the CARE Program;
 - (ii) The number of customers that enrolled in the CARE program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (iii) The number of customers that enrolled in the Family Energy Rate Assistance Program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (iv) The number of customers that enrolled in the Medical Baseline Program through those CHANGES CBOs' assistance;
 - (v) The number of customers that were received assistance with bill payment plans (initiated or modified) by the CHANGES CBOs. This may be accomplished by having the CHANGES CBOs use a specific hotline or call in number to call Utilities for this group of customers; and
 - (vi) The number of customers that received assistance with utility bill disputes, including bill modification, the CHANGES CBOs. This may be accomplished by having the CHANGES CBOs use a specific hotline or call in number to call the Utilities for this group of customers.

10. Consistent with the directives in Decision 12-08-044, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company may amend, if necessary, the current petitions to modify to augment the 2012-2014 budgets to

account for additional budget augmentation for California Alternative Rates for Energy Program 2012-2014 Budget, resulting from the directives in this decision.

11. Application (A.) 11-05-017, A.11-05-018, A.11-05-019, and A.11-05-020 shall remain open, until the completion of the second phase of the consolidated proceeding.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 20, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON
MICHEL PETER FLORIO
CATHERINE J.K. SANDOVAL
MARK J. FERRON
Commissioners