

TAP Kickoff Meeting 10/5/2010

Date	Oct 05, 2010
Time	1:00pm – 2:30pm (Adjourned at 2:55)
Location	Conf Room 1411 - 245 Market St, San Francisco
Topic	TAP Initial Kickoff Meeting
Attendees	<p>PG&E: Bill Devereaux; Sidney Dietz; Jim Meadows; Darleen DeRosa; Tanya Moniz-Witten (Phone); Reza Jenab (PwC)</p> <p>CPUC-ED: Alope Gupta</p> <p>CPUC DRA: Christopher Danforth; Tom Roberts</p> <p>EnerNex: Erich Gunther (Phone)</p> <p>TURN: Mark Toney</p> <p>Customer Representative: Steve Townsend (Phone)</p>

1. Agenda

No	Details
1.	Introductions
2.	Review of proposed PG&E SmartMeter Technical Advisory Panel Charter
3.	Discussion on on-going meetings and logistics

2. Discussions

No	Details
1.	<p>Bill asked for introductions and roles on the SmartMeter program (SM) and discussed purpose of the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill - Senior Director SM for PG&E • Darleen - Director of SM engagement. Engage with community and customers. • Mark - Executive Director for TURN. Interested in exploring value of this committee to PGE and customers • Tom - DRA • Chirs - DRA • Alope - ED - oversight of AMI deployment • Jim - SM Director for PG&E • Sid - Regulatory Relations for PG&E • Steve (PG&E Customer in Bakersfield) - Representative for consumer group • Erich - Chairman and CTO for EnerNex - industry expertise across US on AMI • Tanya Moniz-Witten - Chief of Staff representing Greg Kiraly, VP SmartMeter Operations for PG&E • Reza Jenab (PricewaterhouseCoopers consultant) - assisting SmartMeter PMO for PG&E <p>Bill discussed how PG&E has modeled TAP similar to other utilities (SDGE) and has attempted to have representatives from various stakeholders for AMI within the State of California. Felecia Lokey, Senior Director for PG&E Customer Engagement will be participating as part on this panel as well and we will continue to leverage other experts within PG&E on various topics such as demand response, customer engagements. Group agreed that the team currently represents a diverse mix of representatives.</p> <p>Chris asked how far the scope of the panel will go in terms of future pricing plans /</p>

TAP Kickoff Meeting 10/5/2010

	dynamic pricing. It is one of the fundamental questions to consider as part of the overall scope and charter for the group.
2.	<p>We leveraged the SDGE charter in developing the TAP charter for PG&E to outline how we continue and complete the SmartMeter program going forward. SM has had its challenges and we would like to leverage the model of having a key stakeholder advisory panel to discuss and prepare for critical areas remaining in the program.</p> <p>Bill briefly introduced and presented key areas for the panel to consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meter deployment: suburban deployment vs. urban area challenges. Even with today's deployment numbers there will be unique and new challenges with San Francisco and other urban areas coming up; special classes of customers for billing; Solar Net metering, etc. 2. We have been working with vendors to develop technology solutions for difficult RF connectivity locations in urban areas. Especially given that we use two separate technologies, one for gas and one for electric solutions. Not a unique challenge to PG&E but for RF networks in general so PG&E is leveraging the larger body of knowledge in existence for these types of challenges. 3. Need to address in more detail within future meetings in coming weeks to discuss various aspects of each area. We expect to set a rapid set of meetings to get through these various topics and familiarize the board rather quickly. 4. SM operations and billing. DRA could offer input for practices around handling complaints and it will be added as a separate scope item in the charter. 5. Presentation and delivery of usage information. What are good practices for distributing such data? Development and rollout of in-home channels. 6. Transition to time-based rates. Today typically customers are billed as they were in meter-reader era. We need to get input as we transition to interval billed methodology. Need to minimize the impact to the customers from this sort of change. Mark proposed that changes should be piloted and tested prior to being proposed. Some discussions may lead more towards how rate changes and rate design policies should be introduced and adopted by CPUC not related to how PG&E executes and implements those policies. The focus is intended to be on how PG&E rolls out changes to the customer population. 7. Currently this charter is set for the period of time through 2012 when the SM program completes but this committee could continue past that point. 8. Customer Privacy. Discuss the requirements and implementation for Legislation and SM proceedings dealing with privacy rules. 9. Data security topics not to address details of cyber security but rather implications of transmitting usage data and availability of data 10. Customer outreach plans have evolved form the initial rollout phase and minimal predeployment information and advertising. Discuss how best to address unique areas and challenges as we move forward. 11. Future integration with Demand Response and distribution of automation. Current deployment is the initial foundation blocks for future programs yet to be introduced. How do we start to build other technologies on top of foundational elements to address known challenges in the near future? 12. Additional suggestions for topics of interest from TURN. 1. PG&E should produce a document on the plans to address the deficiencies identified in the Structural report. 2. Remote shutoff policies and practices if done judiciously

TAP Kickoff Meeting 10/5/2010

	<p>will not be viewed as negative impact but otherwise may result in negative reactions.</p> <p>13. DRA agrees with the items and reiterates the need for PG&E to address the plans for Structure report best practice deficiency findings.</p> <p>14. Chris also asked how we operate this committee - do we hold quarterly meetings or monthly and could we cover the SC reports in each, could we cover topics such as how contingency has been utilized? Could we cover some of the more critical topics introduced in each Steering Committee deck?</p> <p>15. PG&E brought up a couple of additional potential items: 1. Few customers that have specifically asked not to have SmartMeters™. 2. Specific locations and areas that have been found to be extremely problematic for SmartMeter deployment. How do we manage through this given that we need to have 100% coverage?</p> <p>16. ED and DRA - concerns over TAP providing a joint written annual feedback. If there is a desire to do so, TAP members should individually write back to PG&E. Aloke suggested that it would be advisable to avoid that challenge given what he has observed at SDGE.</p> <p>17. Erich suggested that it may be advisable to have sections where all parties reach consensus and other areas where individuals represent their organizations views. PG&E will incorporate a section that includes items where consensus was reached and will also incorporate other individual organizations' views as necessary in the annual report.</p>
<p>3.</p>	<p>1. Feedback on topics of interest for meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setup a TAP meeting to cover PG&E response and action plan to Structure report and findings • Session on remote connect/disconnect capabilities from a technology perspective. Excluding mechanics of proceedings, etc. • Session on how to communicate transition to interval rate billing and changes between anchor billing, interval billing, etc. • Session on Home Area Network. • Session on current plan to complete deployment and replacing meters. • Session on customer outreach plan <p>2. PG&E will plan on last week of October for a follow up session to cover Program basics, Program Overview, Statistics of where we are (SC and Semi-Annual reports) plus Structure report response and action plans. We will need more than 1-1/2 hour block of time to cover.</p> <p>3. Going forward, it was suggested to have monthly meetings to cover the suggested areas.</p> <p>4. TURN would not support the TAP meetings being open to public. ED recommends having an open and closed session for the meeting format similar to SDGE. Could consider having meeting material open to public but not have public attendance. PG&E will take this input in suggesting a format going forward.</p>

3. Action Items

TAP Kickoff Meeting 10/5/2010

No	Details	Owner	Due
1.	Setup rapid set of meetings for deep dives into the various topics of discussion and bring group up to speed.	Bill	Monthly
2.	Add to scope an item on practices for dealing with handling customer complaints.	Bill	10/15/2010
3.	Email Bill any additional thoughts on scope	All	10/15/2010
4.	Provide Input on Charter document	All	10/15/2010
5.	Provide additional topics of interest for future sessions	All	10/15/2010
6.	Next TAP session: SM Program statistics & PG&E action plan and response to the Structure Report	Bill	Oct 25 Wk