

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 5/3/2010 8:30:59 AM
To: 'Velasquez, Carlos A.' (carlos.velasquez@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);
Fitch, Julie A. (julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov); Kahlon, Gurbux
(gurbux.kahlon@cpuc.ca.gov); Roscow, Steve (steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: compliance table for Resolution E-4250-E

Hi Carlos,

I'm trying to get some answers to your questions so I'm hoping to be able to call you later this afternoon. I meant to send a follow up email on Friday after I sent the table over regarding your first item. To date, we have not sent the generic rescind letter to four cities in Marin County: Ross, Larkspur, Corte Madera and Novato because the local governments of these four cities have already chosen to opt out of MEA on behalf of their customers. We thought that sending the generic rescind letter telling customers their opt out request cannot be honored because "there is no CCA program in your community in which your account is eligible to participate," while true on a town level, it's not true on a county level, and could confuse recipients of this letter, who are aware of MEA's efforts in Marin County. The intent of the generic rescind letter is to let customers know that they are not opted out, and are—by implication—potentially subject to future CCA enrollment when one becomes eligible. In fact, these specific customers in the cities listed above are opted out; it's just that the city has done it on their behalf. The way the generic letter is composed doesn't make this distinction.

Instead we thought that we could draft a specific letter for the customers of these cities explaining that their local government has already opted out of MEA. We are drafting a letter that we intend to share with you and get your sign off before sending to these customers. We feel by sending this specific letter we avoid confusion among these customers who have already been opted out by their city. As with the other items on your list, which I am still checking out, we will need to follow OP 2D in regards to CCing you once the letters are sent.

On issues 2 and 3 I will get back to you later today.

[Redacted]

From: Velasquez, Carlos A. [mailto:carlos.velasquez@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 6:39 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Fitch, Julie A.; Horner, Trina; Kahlon, Gurbux; Roscow, Steve
Subject: compliance table for Resolution E-4250-E

H [Redacted] - we will need to talk about PG&E's compliance with the OPs included in the compliance table. Can we talk on Monday, May 3rd? I can call you at 2pm – please confirm.

1) OP.2.d regards the “generic” letter that should have already been sent out to all non-MEA customers that opted out prematurely of CCA service. Your note that “PG&E has omitted sending the letter to a subset of customers in Marin County that are not participating in MEA’s program...” is therefore problematic. These customers should have received this letter as of April 21, 2010. This letter will need to be sent out to customers with the Energy Division cc’ed on this letter.

2) Also regarding OP.2.d, the status you indicate is “complete” – however, the Energy Division has not been cc’ed the generic letter that was sent out to all the customers that opted out of the CCA program prematurely throughout PG&Es service territory. If PG&E has already sent this letter out, PG&E will need to send this letter out again and cc the Energy Division on each letter.

3) Ditto for OP.2.f., which regards MEA non-phase one customers that opted out prematurely.

Carlos

703-1124

-----Original Message-----

From: Redacted

Sent: Friday, April 30, 2010 5:12 PM

To: Horner, Trina; Roscow, Steve; Kahlon, Gurbux; Velasquez, Carlos A.

Cc: Fitch, Julie A.

Subject: RE: CCA phone line scripts

Steve, Carlos, Gurbux,

Please find attached a table that lists the compliance items from Resolution E-4250 per the ordering paragraphs. The table provides a snap shot of our compliance requirements along with additional issues raised that PG&E has continued to work to address. We believe that most of the issues that have been raised to date have been addressed.

Please let myself or Trina know if you have any other additional questions.

<<CCA Opt Out_Res E-4250_Compliance Table_4-30-10.xls>>

Redacted

Redacted

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Regulatory Relations

Redacted

Redacted

From: Horner, Trina

Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 4:40 PM

To: 'Roscow, Steve'; Kahlon, Gurbux; 'Velasquez, Carlos A.'

Cc: Redacted; Fitch, Julie A.

Subject: CCA phone line scripts

Steve, Carlos, Gurbux:

As a follow up to my email last night, attached is a draft of the phone line script that PG&E proposes to record for the CCA number on the web site. I know you asked for an end to the ad-hoc approach to the E-4250 compliance items and Carlos' suggestions, and [Redacted] is working today to pull together a comprehensive list of all of those items and the date PG&E complied, will comply, or next steps; he will send that to you no later than tomorrow morning. We were going to wait to send this script to you with that matrix, but as the draft script is ready for review now and can be recorded once we get the green light from you, I wanted to get it to you as soon as possible.

We've tried to incorporate the feedback in the various conversations about the phone recording we've had with Carlos in the last few days. The text in yellow highlights contains the various changes. We're planning for a Monday morning "recording" session of the script with the service that ^{does} such things, so if you have any feedback or need more time to review, please let [Redacted] and me know tomorrow.

The plan is to also record a spanish language version of these words as well, per our discussion with Carlos.

Again, this script will appear on [Redacted] more comprehensive tracking list you'll get tomorrow.

Let us know if you have any questions.

Trina

<< File: IVR for CCA - 042910.doc >>