

Attachment 1: Reporting form for [Part (a) Process]

Part (a): Process for existing and prospective CCAs 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.”

PART 1 (to be completed by CCA)

Submitted by:

Name	Jordis Weaver
Title	Administrative Associate
Phone	415.464.6021
e-mail	jweaver@marinenergyauthority.org

Please identify the specific matter on which the utility is not considered to be cooperating fully (add lines or pages as needed):

PG&E double-billing MCE customers by charging them for PG&E generation twice.

Please provide a detailed description of the issue (add lines or pages as needed):

AB117 provides that when a customer switches to CCA service their generation will be supplied by the CCA party and the distribution utility will cease charging the customer for generation. After MCE began service to customers in May, 2010 it came to our attention that some customers, specifically those who were on a Balanced Payment Plan (BPP) with PG&E, were continuing to be charged for generation from PG&E. These PG&E generation charges were being levied on customers in addition to the generation charges from MCE. This resulted in the customer being double-charged for generation. This also resulted in calls from customers concerned about the sharp increase in their bill since MCE service began, and it resulted in many customers opting out of the MCE program.

As described in the section below the CPUC Energy Division staff requested that PG&E correct this issue in late August and PG&E has stated that it is resolved. However, the methodology being used by PG&E to bill BPP customers has not been made available to MCE to verify resolution of the issue. Below is an MCE call center log from mid-October indicating that the issue has actually not been resolved:

10/12/10 8:00 am – Customer spoke with a PG&E CSR supervisor at the Sacramento call center and was told that if they were not with MCE they would have had a BPP of \$600 but since they were with MCE their BPP amount was \$1000. He stated that the PG&E

transmission and distribution portions of the bill are still not balanced and that the payment amount varies month to month. Customer was also told that when his BPP is recalculated the past due balances are added in and used towards the calculations. The customer is very upset that this is still not resolved and has been attempting to correct since May, 2010.

This call-center log was sent to PG&E and the response from PG&E was as follows:

*"This customers' BPP is \$582, not \$1000 which is stated in the attachment. The confusion is coming in because the customer is being billed BPP + Sub SA charges. The payoff balance was included in the recalculation to avoid putting this customer in debt. This will be eliminated when the BPP amount can automatically be calculated by the system when there are just 12 months of T&D charges."*

The customer call and the response from PG&E both demonstrate that there is no clarity on how or if the BPP issue has been resolved. PG&E has been asked to provide some evidence of the correct methodology actually being used to bill BPP customers.

Please describe the lack of full cooperation (add lines or pages as needed):

This issue was brought to PG&E's attention after customer billing began in June, 2010. Initially, PG&E representative responded by stating that the double charges were not occurring. MCE and MCE's data manager worked with PG&E representatives by receiving copies of bills directly from customers, and walking PG&E representatives through the issue. After several weeks PG&E representatives acknowledged the issue but did not express a willingness to resolve the issue.

MCE requested that at a minimum, BPP customers could call PG&E and request that their BPP amount be recalculated without the generation charges on a going forward basis. PG&E agreed to do this for customers if they called in and stated that it would be effective on the customers' next bill.

PG&E was not willing to proactively make the fix for all BPP customers, however. Many weeks went by with customers continuing to be double-charged for generation and many customers choosing to opt out because of this issue.

MCE attempted to engage the CPUC Energy Division staff to help resolve the issue for several weeks and ultimately was able to scheduling a meeting with PG&E representatives, MCE and CPUC Energy Division staff in late August, 2010. At the meeting Energy Division staff insisted that PG&E resolve the issue within 5 days and notify all parties regarding their plan for resolving the issue within 48 hours.

PG&E resolved the issue as directed by the Energy Division staff and it appears that the double charges are no longer occurring on the BPP customer bills.

MCE requested that PG&E provide evidence of the correct billing process (their described methodology and three randomly selected customer bills) to ensure that

The BPP program uses 12 months of usage costs plus any outstanding balance to determine the appropriate payment level. PG&E's billing system will review the current BPP every four months to determine if the amount needs to change up or down based on usage. Thus, bundled customers on BPP who joined MCE initially continued to make payments based on their previously estimated consumption characteristics. However, these customers were not "double-charged" since their payments went towards satisfying their consolidated bill obligation.

To remedy the situation, PG&E performed a manual recomputation of 385 impacted customers, which was subsequently provided to the Energy Division (Steve Roscow and Carlos Velasquez) via e-mail on November 15, 2010. Because of privacy concerns per PG&E Electric Rule 9.M and CPUC Decision No. 90-12-121, PG&E wasn't able to provide this information directly to MCE. It was PG&E's impression that the Energy Division would validate the recomputation based on input from MCE.

Please provide the date-specific timeline that the IOU will follow in order to accomplish the solution (add lines or pages as needed):

PG&E's understanding is that this issue has been addressed.

Names of utility personnel responsible for providing [and implementing] the solution

Name	Title	Phone Number	e-mail
Redacted	Sr. Account Mngr.	Redacted	

customers are now being charged correctly. PG&E was not willing to provide this information and sited 'confidentiality' concerns. Although they were willing to provide this information to the CPUC Energy Division, it was unclear if the Energy Division would have the capacity to review the bills and methodology for accuracy.

This verification of correct methodology being used for BPP customers is still outstanding.

Please list the personnel at the utility with whom the community choice aggregator is working:

Name	Title	Phone Number	e-mail
Redacted	PG&E   Energy Solutions & Service	Redacted	
	PG&E   Energy Solutions & Service		