

From: Dawn Weisz
Sent: 12/17/2010 5:44:19 PM
To: Velasquez, Carlos A. (carlos.velasquez@cpuc.ca.gov); Roscow, Steve (steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=EBJ1);
Redacted; Mike
Campbell (MCampbell@sfwater.org)
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Energy Division Material Meeting with MCE/CPUC/PG&E


Steve and Carlos,

I am forwarding you one additional reporting item for part A of the legislative report with a cc. to Erik and Sebastien. I have also included an updated table of contents that reflected this addition, Attachment 1.11.

Let me know if you have any questions about any of these items or if you need additional information.

Thanks very much,

Dawn



Dawn Weisz

Interim Director

Marin Energy Authority

781 Lincoln Ave., Suite 320

San Rafael, CA 94901

415-464-6020

MarinCleanEnergy.com

From: Dawn Weisz [mailto:dweisz@marinenergyauthority.org]

Sent: Monday, December 13, 2010 2:43 PM

To: 'Roscow, Steve'; [Redacted]

Cc: Jamie Tuckey; 'Kirby Dusel'; 'Mike Campbell'; [Redacted]; Elizabeth Rasmussen; 'John Dalessi'; Jordis Weaver; 'Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)'


Subject: RE: Energy Division Material Meeting with MCE/CPUC/PG&E

Steve and Carlos,

I am forwarding you the next three attachments and have cc'd PG&E as well so that they can begin their response on the 5-day turnaround.

Thanks very much,

Dawn



Dawn Weisz

Interim Director

Marin Energy Authority

781 Lincoln Ave., Suite 320

San Rafael, CA 94901

415-464-6020

MarinCleanEnergy.com

From: Dawn Weisz [mailto:dweisz@marinenergyauthority.org]
Sent: Friday, December 10, 2010 1:34 PM
To: 'Roscow, Steve'; 'Velasquez, Carlos A.'
Cc: Jamie Tuckey; 'Kirby Dusel'; 'Mike Campbell'; [Redacted]; Elizabeth Rasmussen; 'John Dalessi'; Jordis Weaver; 'Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel)'
Subject: RE: Energy Division Material Meeting with MCE/CPUC/PG&E


Steve and Carlos,

Thank you very much for pulling together the meeting this week to discuss outstanding issues and reporting requirements. I have attached here our first four submittals under 'part a' described below. I will send you the remaining submittals (approximately 8 more) early next week so that you have as much time as possible to compile the information needed for your final report. I have cc'd Sebastien and Erik here so that they can begin on the response under the 5-day turn-around.

Let me know if you have any questions about any of these or if you would like to discuss.

Thanks very much,

Dawn



Dawn Weisz

Interim Director

Marin Energy Authority

781 Lincoln Ave., Suite 320

San Rafael, CA 94901

415-464-6020

MarinCleanEnergy.com

From: Roscow, Steve [<mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 06, 2010 5:30 PM

To: Dawn Weisz; Redacted Velasquez, Carlos A.

Cc: Jamie Tuckey; Kirby Dusel; Mike Campbell
Subject: Energy Division Material Meeting with MCE/CPUC/PG&E

Dawn, thanks for your list of issues—this will help get us organized for Wednesday, subject to some additional info and material I’ve provided below.

I suggest that we broadly set the agenda as follows:

- 1 Introductions
- 2 Purpose of meeting
 - a. Get started on gather material to meet new Legislative reporting requirement on CCA implementation: review of Energy Division draft material (see background/explanation further down in this note)
 - i. Part a re “timely utility compliance”
 - ii. Part b IOU spending data—standing “data request” is attached
 - iii. Part c Opt-out issues
 - b. Agree to develop and follow a “Code of Conduct”
- 3 Discussion
 - Part 1 Past issues, and how they were resolved
 - Part 2 Currently “open” issues, and how we will resolve them
 - Part 3 Collaboration going forward

Each item in Dawn’s list may fall into one of the 3 parts above

Now, regarding the new legislative reporting requirement, as you may or may not already know, when the Legislature finally agreed on the long-delayed state budget in October, that budget included a new reporting requirement for the CPUC. The reporting requirement is for this fiscal year only, and requires the CPUC to submit quarterly reports to the Legislature regarding its activities related to Community Choice Aggregation: “The report shall include detailed information on the

formal procedures established by the Commission in order to monitor and ensure compliance by electrical corporations with Chapter 838, Statutes of 2002.”

The entire text regarding this new reporting requirement may be found at the link below, at page 39-40 of document found at http://www.lao.ca.gov/reports/2010/supp_report/supp_report_2010.pdf

One of the required elements of the report is “a detailed description of the commission’s process for enabling communities interested in becoming community choice aggregators, communities currently in the process of becoming community choice aggregators, and existing community choice aggregators to obtain timely utility compliance with paragraph (9) of subdivision (c) of Public Utilities Code Section 366.2, which requires the utility to “cooperate fully with any community choice aggregators that investigate, pursue, or implement community choice aggregation programs.”

The CPUC currently does not have in place such a process, so we are setting one up to comply with the requirement. I’m planning to use part of the meeting this Thursday to let both PG&E and MCE folks know how we will be doing this. To that end, I’ve attached some draft material to serve at the basis of our discussion:

- 1 Part a re “timely utility compliance”
- 2 Part b IOU spending data—standing “data request” is attached
- 3 Part c Opt-out issues

As part of the report due January 31, 2011, Energy Division intends to report on the implementation issues that the Commission has participated in resolving so far. This first quarterly report will thus be relatively large, compared to the next 3 quarterly reports that we will need to prepare. To draft material for the first report, I will need to review with both PG&E and MCE folks the steps that were taken to resolve a number of issues. As part of this, I will be confirming that each issue is, in fact, resolved.

Finally, responding to Sebastien’s question from last week, the attendees from CPUC will be Carlos and myself. We’ll plan on showing up at 77 Beale lobby unless we hear otherwise.

Steve Roscow

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189

From: Dawn Weisz [mailto:dweisz@marinenergyauthority.org]

Sent: Friday, December 03, 2010 8:30 PM

To: [Redacted] Roscow, Steve; Velasquez, Carlos A.

Cc: Jamie Tuckey; Kirby Dusel; Mike Campbell

Subject: Meeting with CPUC/PG&E

Steve and Sebastien,

In response to your request for a list of issues that need to be resolved I am forwarding you the following overview. This is a 'high level' list that is intended to address programs in a more comprehensive way rather than through a piece-meal, after-the fact approach.


As you will see, much of these respond to issues that came up after our CCA program was launched, and they are not addressed by the Utility service agreement (Marin's or CCSF's) or by any specific CPUC enforcement mechanisms. Resolving them as soon as possible and in advance of our Phase II roll-out and CCSF's start date should provide needed relief to all parties. We are open to adjustments and additions through our dialogue and through input by CCSF.

- Bill display must differentiate between generation and non-generation electric charges wherever electric charges are shown on any part of the bill (unless otherwise agreed to by both parties)
- Bill display must not show bundled rate factors for CCA (unbundled) customers; bill must display correct component charges (generation, transmission, distribution)
- All bills must be provided to customers within 7 days of charges being provided by CCA. Bills that are late in going out to customers will result in interest accruing to the CCA for the amount of outstanding charges (consider using methodology in SF's service agreement?) This would address late billing/summary billing issues.

- All usage data (867 file) much be transmitted to CCA with adequate time to for the CCA to respond within the ‘billing window’ for the customer. If usage data is not transmitted in this timeframe it will result in a fee payable to the CCA in the amount of the missing customer revenue. (This would address missing 867 usage file issues which, for example, affected over 550 MEA customers on 11/21.)
- No electric *generation* charges from PG&E can be included on a CCA customer bill. Violation of this rule would result in damages due to customer in the amount of the overcharge plus interest. If the affected customer chooses to opt out of the CCA program during or after violation of this rule, damages will also be paid to the CCA in the amount of lost customer revenue for a three year period.
- A dedicated CCA-team should be established for PG&E’s call-center to address T&D or PG&E-related customer questions in any CCA jurisdiction.
- PG&E should provide information to CCA upon request of all data and identifying fields that are relevant to the calculation of utility charges, including but not limited to data on which customers are CARE customers.
- A qualified, consistent liaisons needs to be designated by PG&E to interface with CCA from the technical/operations, IT/billing, and legal team and resolve issues in a timely manner as described below.
- A monthly report should be prepared by PG&E covering issues raised by MEA and the status of their resolution. MEA shall have the opportunity to provide comments on the report and have its comments included in the final report submitted to the CPUC’s Energy Division.

Thanks very much. We look forward to seeing you on Tuesday.

Dawn



Dawn Weisz

Interim Director

Marin Energy Authority

781 Lincoln Ave., Suite 320

San Rafael, CA 94901

415-464-6020; www.marinenergyauthority.org