

From: Roberts, Thomas
Sent: 10/13/2010 3:28:37 PM
To: Danforth, Christopher (christopher.danforth@cpuc.ca.gov); Jenab, Reza (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=RXJS)
Cc: Nwamu, Chonda (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=CJN3); Meadows, James L (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J7M2); Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); Devereaux, William (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WFD4); Redacted
Redacted
Redacted

Bcc:

Subject: RE: Supplemental questions regarding data request DRA_A0712009_072110

Ok thanks thanks for the clarification. Then in the response to the supplement, can you verify the relationship between the figures in answers 1 and 2. It sounds like the total meters installed for each meter type is the sum of the two tables, that the figures in answer 2 are what has been removed, and that those DCSI and Hex in answer 1 will be replaced, but regardless, please clarify.

Thanks,
Tom

From: Jenab, Reza [mailto:RxJs@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2010 2:34 PM
To: Roberts, Thomas; Danforth, Christopher
Cc: Devereaux, William; Meadows, James L; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Dietz, Sidney; Redacted
Redacted
Subject: RE: Supplemental questions regarding data request DRA_A0712009_072110

Hi Tom,

We will treat these as supplemental requests to the DR and get back to you with responses in a Supplemental DR form. There is no need to resubmit.

As a clarification, please note that the response to the original question 1 provides the number of meters deployed and currently installed in the field (e.g. there are 1733 HEX meters remaining in the field). Response to question 2 provides how many have been removed and replaced (e.g. there have been 144,824 HEX meters removed and replaced to date).

Reza

From: Roberts, Thomas [mailto:thomas.roberts@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2010 2:17 PM
To: Jenab, Reza; Danforth, Christopher
Cc: Devereaux, William; Meadows, James L; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Dietz, Sidney; Redacted
Redacted

Subject: Supplemental questions regarding data request DRA_A0712009_072110

Reza and team,

Thanks for the detailed response to our data requests. After reviewing the responses, I have the following follow-up questions regarding the first one referred to as DRA_A0712009_072110:

1. The response to question 1 indicates that 1,733 “Hex” meters have been installed. In contrast, the response to questions 2 indicates that 144,824 Hex meters will be switched to SSN meters. Please explain this apparent contradiction and/or provide updated data.
2. PG&E’s AMI transition plan dated June 12, 2008 indicates that 200k Hex electric meters without HAN would be installed, followed by 400k Hex meters with HAN.
 - a. How many Hex electric meters without HAN has PG&E purchased, or is under contract to purchase?
 - b. How many Hex electric meters with HAN has PG&E purchased, or is under contract to purchase?
 - c. Provide a summary of the number and type (HAN or not) of Hex electric meters installed, consistent with the response to question 1 above, and why the actual deployment deviated from the June 2008 AMI transition plan?
3. PG&E’s AMI transition plan dated June 12, 2008 indicates that 242k DCSI meters would be installed. In contrast the response to question 1 indicated 130,222 DCSI meters have been installed. Please explain this apparent contradiction and/or provide updated data. Alternatively, explain why the actual deployment deviated from the June 2008 AMI transition plan.
4. Is it correct to state that all meters on the SSN network were installed with HAN capability?
5. Does full activation of HAN capabilities in SSN meters require field visits after installation, or can activation be handled remotely?

I could pose these questions as a new data request, but would like to treat them as a supplement if p submitted.

Thanks,
Tom

From: Jenab, Reza [mailto:RxJs@pge.com]

Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 1:15 PM

To: Roberts, Thomas; Danforth, Christopher

Cc: Devereaux, William; Meadows, James L; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Dietz, Sidney; [Redacted]

[Redacted]

Subject: RE: Second DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Good afternoon Tom,
Attached please find PG&E's responses to the two sets of DRA DRs that you had transmitted. Please note that we have numbered them 23 and 24.

- DR 23 has two attachments: The first attachment is transmitted with this email. I will send the second attachment in three parts, with emails immediately following this transmittal. This is due to the size of the second attachment, which contains excerpts of previously submitted Steering Committee reports.
- DR 24 has confidential pricing information and please note that it is being submitted under the CPUC code section 583.

Please let me know if you have any questions

Thank you,

Reza

Number at PG&E 415 973 5058

<<SmartMeterProgram-Upgrade_DR_DRA_024-Q01-06.doc>> <<SmartMeterProgram-Upgrade_DR_DRA_023-Q01-11.doc>> <<SmartMeterProgram-Upgrade_DR_DRA_023-Q01-11-Attachment-01.xls>>

Reza Jenab
PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (pwc.com)
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4004
Telephone: +1 415 498 7703
Facsimile: +1 813 741 4720
Mobile: +1 925 528 9660
Capital Projects & Infrastructure
reza.jenab@us.pwc.com

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

From: Jenab, Reza
Sent: Monday, October 04, 2010 8:08 AM
To: 'Roberts, Thomas'; Devereaux, William; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: Danforth, Christopher; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Meadows, James L
Subject: RE: Second DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Good morning Tom. We are making progress through the various questions but at this point I would not anticipate being able to send you the response back until Wednesday. If we complete the document sooner than that I will be sure to let you know and transmit the response.

Thank you for your patience. Please let me know if you have any questions Reza
415 973 5058

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

From: Roberts, Thomas [<mailto:thomas.roberts@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 2:26 PM
To: Jenab, Reza; Devereaux, William; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: Danforth, Christopher; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Meadows, James L
Subject: RE: Second DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Thank you Reza, I look forward to PG&E's responses.

Tom

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

From: Jenab, Reza [<mailto:RxJs@pge.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 29, 2010 1:29 PM
To: Roberts, Thomas; Devereaux, William; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: Danforth, Christopher; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Meadows, James L
Subject: RE: Second DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Hi Tom,

We have been gathering the information required to respond to both of these sets of DRs. We anticipate to respond back to you by Monday.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks
Reza
cell 925 528 9660

From: Roberts, Thomas [<mailto:thomas.roberts@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wed 9/22/2010 9:41 AM
To: Devereaux, William; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: Danforth, Christopher; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Jenab, Reza; Meadows, James L
Subject: Second DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Bill,

Attached is a second data request on AMI deployment. As before, please confirm receipt of the attached data request and contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you,
Tom

From: Devereaux, William [<mailto:WFD4@pge.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2010 3:52 PM
To: Roberts, Thomas; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: Danforth, Christopher; Nwamu, Chonda (Law); Jenab, Reza; Meadows, James L

Subject: RE: DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Tom,

Thanks for the note. I have received the Data Request. I will get back to you in the next day to confirm that we can have a complete response to you by your requested due date.

Thanks,
Bill

From: Roberts, Thomas [<mailto:thomas.roberts@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 21, 2010 2:51 PM
To: Devereaux, William; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: Danforth, Christopher; Roberts, Thomas
Subject: DR regarding SmartMeter deployment

Mr. Devereaux:

Please confirm receipt of the attached data request and contact me if you have any questions.

Best regards,
Tom Roberts

Senior Utility Engineer

(415) 703-5278

tcr@cpuc.ca.gov

California Public Utilities Commission

Division of Ratepayer Advocates

Electricity Pricing and Customer Programs

P Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail