

From: Kaneshiro, Bruce  
Sent: 11/22/2010 9:33:10 AM  
To: Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Sid- I just picked up the voicemail that you left around 2 pm on Friday afternoon. Sorry for not responding but I had to leave the office at that time for the rest of the day.

Perhaps my email below may have resolved the issue that you were calling about, but if not let me know. I can call you later today if needed.

Bruce

**From:** Dietz, Sidney [mailto:SBD4@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2010 5:20 PM  
**To:** Kaneshiro, Bruce  
**Cc:** Gupta, Alope; Roscow, Steve  
**Subject:** RE: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Bruce --

Thanks for the clarification. This is consistent with what I thought you meant, so we're on the same page about the suggestion. I think that once we have a bit more data about the approach, we should talk about it again.

yours,

sid

**From:** Kaneshiro, Bruce [mailto:bruce.kaneshiro@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2010 1:45 PM  
**To:** Dietz, Sidney  
**Cc:** Gupta, Alope; Roscow, Steve  
**Subject:** RE: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Sid- Steve alerted me to the fact that my email this morning may be misinterpreted with regard to the billing adjustment. What I meant to say is that the customer's historical demand (prior to SM deployment) should be used by PG&E for the bill credit if in fact that results in a bill credit that is larger than what the customer would receive with PG&E's 11.8% and 37.5% adjustments. If a customer's historical demand does not increase the amount of bill credit, then PG&E would then use the proposed adjustment factor for that customer. This would be applicable to both groups.

Hope this helps clarify our view.

Bruce

**From:** Kaneshiro, Bruce  
**Sent:** Friday, November 19, 2010 9:06 AM  
**To:** 'Dietz, Sidney'  
**Cc:** Gupta, Alope; Roscow, Steve  
**Subject:** RE: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Sid- thanks for the update on the patch. Please keep us apprised of the situation.

Regarding your question, we are recommending that the historical demand adjustment be applied to both groups.

Bruce

**From:** Dietz, Sidney [mailto:SBD4@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2010 5:17 PM  
**To:** Kaneshiro, Bruce  
**Cc:** Gupta, Alope; Roscow, Steve  
**Subject:** Re: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Sorry, thumb keyboard. The patch went out to ten meters last night. Five more planned on Mon.

++++++

Bruce --

Thanks for the note and for the speedy consult.

I have a question -- do you mean for the credit to be the larger of the two possibilities for both the 95% group and the 5%? We were thinking that such an approach would be applied to the 5% group only.

The patch went out last night, and we have three or four days to wait to check these before starting with a new group. But so far it looks good.

I agree on the TAP and am working on it.

I just got Steve's second data request on this issue, and have the team working on it.

yours,

sid

-----  
Do I seem terse? Blame the thumb keyboard.

**From:** Kaneshiro, Bruce [mailto:bruce.kaneshiro@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 18, 2010 11:34 AM  
**To:** Dietz, Sidney  
**Cc:** Gupta, Alope <aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov>; Roscow, Steve <steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Sid-

We have briefed Julie Fitch about all of the issues that were discussed in our last meeting with you regarding the commercial smart meter problems. She agrees with the suggestion we provided to you on Monday: that in addition to the adjustments proposed by PG&E, PG&E should also review the customer's demand prior to smart meter installation. If the customer's past demand is still lower than the adjusted demand, PG&E should make a second adjustment so that the adjusted demand for a bill credit is no higher than the historical demand. Julie will likely be contacting upper PG&E management about this.

Julie also feels strongly that PG&E should inform its TAP about the issue. Alope will be contacting Jim Meadows to discuss this further.

Steve is developing another data request regarding the billing adjustment. That should be coming your way later today.

Can you provide us an update as to how the patch deployment is going? I recall that PG&E was installing in on Monday night for 5 accounts.

Let us know if you have any questions,

Bruce

**From:** Dietz, Sidney [mailto:SBD4@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2010 4:23 PM  
**To:** Roscow, Steve  
**Cc:** Kaneshiro, Bruce; Gupta, Alope  
**Subject:** Re: PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Steve --

Thanks for the note, we will respond quickly.

yours,

sid

-----  
Do I seem terse? Blame the thumb keyboard.

**From:** Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 16, 2010 04:09 PM  
**To:** Dietz, Sidney  
**Cc:** Kaneshiro, Bruce <bruce.kaneshiro@cpuc.ca.gov>; Gupta, Alope <aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov>  
**Subject:** PG&E SmartMeters: Energy Division Data Request

Sid,

Thanks again for coming in to brief ED staff yesterday. In order to better focus our discussions about PG&E's proposed accounting for the Smartmeter bill credits and illustrate the actual net impact of the credits, please respond to the data request below. The short due date is meant to accommodate PG&E's request for a quick turnaround from ED staff, so just let us know if you need additional time.

#### **DATA REQUEST**

Please respond to the request below by COB Friday, November 19<sup>th</sup>:

In a meeting with Energy Division staff on November 15, 2010, PG&E presented material related to "The Demand Function in Commercial/Industrial SmartMeters", including a proposal to provide customers affected by inaccurate demand charge billing with bill credits totaling approximately \$4.390 million (sum of \$3.84 million and \$.550 million).

- 1 Please provide a set of accounting workpapers that show how PG&E proposes to account for these bill credits. The workpapers should be formatted in the same format and level of detail as what would eventually be provided to the Commission in PG&E's monthly "Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) Activity Report".
- 2 Please provide an alternate set of workpapers, formatted in the same manner as for question 1, showing how PG&E would account for these bill credits by reducing revenues to PG&E shareholders, in the event PG&E were directed to do so by the California Public Utilities Commission.

**END OF REQUEST**

*Steve Roscow*

*Program and Project Supervisor*

*CPUC Energy Division*

*415-703-1189*