

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 12/23/2010 10:58:52 AM
To: 'Roscow, Steve' (steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=EBJ1);
Clanon, Paul (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov); Dawn Weisz
(dweisz@marinenergyauthority.org); [Redacted]
[Redacted] Bottorff, Thomas E
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TEB3); Fitch, Julie A.
(julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov); Kahlon, Gurbux (gurbux.kahlon@cpuc.ca.gov); Carlos
Velasquez (carlos.velasquez@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Updates on Legislatively required CPUC reporting

Steve - let me try and be more clear. Yes, you have our commitment to fully cooperate. As to your question to Tom, let me respond by stating that we are adequately staffed to respond as necessary.

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 23, 2010 10:56 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Cc: Roscow, Steve; [Redacted] Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel); Dawn Weisz; Clanon, Paul; Fitch, Julie A.; Kahlon, Gurbux; Bottorff, Thomas E; Carlos Velasquez
Subject: Re: Updates on Legislatively required CPUC reporting

Brian, that's what concerns me--the legislative mandate is full cooperation not an invitation to reactively label requests for cooperation as "disputes"--again I am just citing to the PU Code and what it requires of PG&E.

And to Mr Bottorff: could you describe for us how you are ensuring that PG&E is adequately staffing these implementation activities?

On Dec 23, 2010, at 9:14 AM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

Yes, but we are happy to engage in both.

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 23, 2010 9:12 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Cc: Roscow, Steve; [Redacted] Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel); Dawn Weisz; Clanon, Paul; Fitch, Julie A.; Kahlon, Gurbux; Bottorff, Thomas E; Carlos Velasquez
Subject: Re: Updates on Legislatively required CPUC reporting

(adding Carlos, who I left off inadvertently yesterday)

Brian, thanks for the reply--I just want to clarify that this process was set up to achieve "full cooperation" not dispute resolution, so that is the commitment we seek from you all at PG&E--agreed?

On Dec 23, 2010, at 9:00 AM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

Steve - thanks for the update. As I previously committed, we will work diligently to amicably resolve any disputes we have over CCA implementation.

From: Roscow, Steve [<mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 22, 2010 5:33 PM
To: [Redacted] Jacobson, Erik B (RegRel); Dawn Weisz
Cc: Clanon, Paul; Fitch, Julie A.; Kahlon, Gurbux; Cherry, Brian K; Bottorff, Thomas E
Subject: CCA: Updates on Legislatively required CPUC reporting

Hello [Redacted] Eric, and Dawn:

I'm providing some updates after speaking separately yesterday with [Redacted] and Dawn, and also looping in some senior folks at PG&E and the CPUC so that they are aware of our progress on these issues.

(adding Paul Clanon, Julie Fitch, Gurbux Kahlon, Brian Cherry and Tom Bottorff (covering for Helen Burt?) to this note)

First, to recap for the higher-ups, at our face-to-face meeting at PG&E on December 8th, Energy Division previewed the types of information it will be seeking in order to comply with the legislative reporting process regarding CCA formation. The meeting was very productive and collaborative, and PG&E and Marin agreed to get started using a standardized reporting form regarding IOU "full cooperation" with CCAs, which Energy Division had developed and shared at the meeting. Energy Division will also be sending formal data requests to each electric IOU, seeking information about CCA-related spending and recent "opt-out" statistics.

The rest of this note will solely discuss the standardized reporting form regarding IOU “full cooperation” with CCAs.

To date, Marin has now submitted 12 discrete items to PG&E. I’ve attached a summary table that we will be using to track PG&E responses and Energy Division follow-up. I’ll note here that many of these items were first raised in the summer shortly after Marin got up and running, and some go back even further to the springtime this year. So, originally, Energy Division had asked for a quick, 5-business-day turnaround on each item, but that has proved impractical due to the number Marin submitted to start this off, plus the holidays. So, the attached summary table calculates a 5-day turnaround, and the typical 10-business-day turnaround that is used for “data requests”. (I would also note that these are not actually “data requests”, but I gather from [Redacted] that PG&E is sort of set up internally to turn things around on this timeline) And yet, even that time frame may not be enough, this first time out, so I’ve requested that [Redacted] provide his realistic due dates for each of the 12 items, with the understanding that “realistic” needs to be cognizant of the January 31st due date for this Report to the Legislature. [Redacted] can do that by inserting his dates into the attached template and re-circulating it.

With that, the other purpose of this note is for ED staff (myself and Carlos) to make sure this entire effort is on the radar screen of senior management at both PG&E and the CPUC. At our meeting on the 8th, I heard what were frankly some worrisome statements from the PG&E folks, namely that senior management at PG&E is not staffing this project very aggressively: that Marin is a small entity and needs to compete with other priorities at PG&E, and that therefore some of the solutions requested by Marin would take a long time to implement. To me, this could be construed by the Legislature as another means of falling short of the requirement in PU 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”. Also, one of the dangers of Marin providing a discrete list of the 12 items that are most important to its implementation progress is that they are also providing PG&E with a list of items where foot-dragging will be most effective in harming Marin’s operations. I’m hoping that now that this effort is part of a report that is going to the Legislature, we won’t have that concern any longer.

So, to conclude, I hope Tom and Brian will affirm that staffing at PG&E will be consistent with the requirements of PU Code Section 366.2, and

that Marin's list of issues will be used to improve the situation between PG&E and Marin, not make it worse.

Finally, I'd like to thank Redacted Eric and Dawn and their supporting staffers for their collaborative efforts so far.

Steve

Steve Roscow

Program and Project Supervisor

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189