

From: Dietz, Sidney  
Sent: 1/4/2011 2:38:06 PM  
To: 'Zafar, Marzia' (marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: FW: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

fyi

**From:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2011 2:33 PM  
**To:** Dietz, Sidney  
**Subject:** FW: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

FYI - As background. lavern

**From:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2011 1:24 PM  
**To:** Lokey, Felecia K  
**Subject:** RE: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

My plesaure. Happy New Year! Lavern

**From:** Lokey, Felecia K  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2011 12:54 PM  
**To:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Cc:** Christensen, Robin M; Redacted  
**Subject:** RE: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

Thank you so much! I appreciate it.

**From:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 04, 2011 12:07 PM  
**To:** Lokey, Felecia K  
**Cc:** Christensen, Robin M; Redacted  
**Subject:** RE: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

Felecia:

The baseline allotment for this rate is based upon how many residential units are served at this

premise. During Customer Relations' conversation with [Redacted] in November 2009, [Redacted] advised that there were 8 units served by 1 meter at this premise in the past. However, according to the customer, the city changed its legal code to only allow 3 residences on this property, so there are currently only 3 residences at this property.

Records was unable to identify what happened in July 2009 to cause us to reduce the baseline at this premise from 8 to 1, and there are no notes in CC&B indicating who made this change or why. However, the baseline was increased from 1 up to 3 in January 2010 because we confirmed that there are 3 residential units at this premise.

Please let me know if you need more information. Thanks, Lavern

**From:** Lokey, Felecia K  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 3:17 PM  
**To:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Cc:** Christensen, Robin M; [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

Thank you so much. One question - why were the residential baselines reduced from 8 to 1 and then back up to three?

**From:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 3:13 PM  
**To:** Lokey, Felecia K  
**Cc:** Christensen, Robin M; [Redacted]  
**Subject:** FW: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

Hi Felecia:

Please see the results of the research performed today on this account. Please let me know if additional information is needed. I think this provide a good overview of the account. Lavern

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2011 2:09 PM  
**To:** Mitchell, Lavern  
**Subject:** RE: 5107000602 - Quick and Dirty

Hi Lavern,

Customer Relations spoke with this customer in November 2009 to address her concern regarding an increase in the cost of her bill.

Her usage was higher on the SmartMeter, however she also had a reduction in her baseline after a SmartMeter was installed, and there are 3 residences being served by 1 meter at this premise all of which affected the cost of her bills.

The customer is no longer on service at this premise and the usage decreased dramatically once she moved out. This indicates it was not a meter error which caused her high usage.

Customer Concern:

1. The customer says that her bills increased in cost from \$500.00 per month to \$2,000.00 the month after a SmartMeter was installed at her premise.
2. The customer says she had to move because she couldn't pay the utility bills.

**Account # 5107000602**

**Name**

**Address**

Account History:

- On 2/8/08 customer started service at this premise.
- On 2/24/10 customer stopped service at this premise.
- Customer left an unpaid \$9,476.53 owing bill at
- This address has EM Master Metered Multifamily rate and several residential buildings are served by one meter.
- On 3/30/09 a gas SmartMeter module and electric SmartMeter were installed at this premise.
- The customer's electric usage increased slightly starting in January 2009 prior to when a SmartMeter was installed.
- However, the electric usage has been much higher on the SmartMeter, especially from July-October 2009 (3,841-4,886 kwh per month).
- **In July 2009 the customer's residential baseline allotments were changed from 8 to 1 in PG&E's billing system.**
- For 3 billing periods from 7/14/09-10/21/09 the customer was not billed for electric usage, only gas usage.
- On 10/23/09 the customer was sent a 3 month delayed electric bill for \$5,400.15.
- On 1/7/10 the customer's electric charges were re-billed from 6/12/09-11/10/09 to increase the residential baseline allotments up to 3 since there are three residential units at this premise.
- The 1/7/10 adjustment created a credit adjustment of \$1,205.52 on this account.
- The customer did not make any payments on this account after 10/14/09.
- Account went into Write-off on 8/31/10 with an owing balance of \$9,476.53.

**\*\*The baseline allotment for this rate is based upon how many residential units are served at this premise. During Customer Relations' conversation with [Redacted] in November 2009, [Redacted] advised that there were 8 units served by 1 meter at this premise in the past. However, according to the customer, the city changed it's legal code to only allow 3 residences on this property, so there are currently only 3 residences at this property.**

**Records was unable to identify what happened in July 2009 to cause us to reduce the baseline at this premise from 8 to 1, and there are no notes in CC&B indicating who made this change or why. However, the baseline was increased from 1 up to 3 in January 2010 because we confirmed that there are 3 residential units at this premise.**

Resolution:

- On 11/24/09 Customer Relations spoke to the customer and explained that her baseline allotment had been lowered to 1 which had contributed to the increase in the cost of her bill.
- Customer Relations went over the billing at this premise and apologized for the delayed electric bill.
- Claudia stated that there are 3 units at this premise, she her mom and her sister each live in a unit at this address. She said she didn't know if or when the property zoning had changed from 8 units to 3.
- The customer requested a meter test and we offered to schedule a test at her convenience.
- A payment arrangement was offered to the customer, but she refused to enter into a pay plan.
- Customer was not interested in separately metering the 3 units at this premise.
- From 11/25/09-1/7/10 a Senior Contact Center Representative attempted multiple times to schedule a meter test with [Redacted] however the customer did not schedule a time to test the meter.
- After 2/24/10 [Redacted] was no longer on service at this premise so no meter test was completed.
- After [Redacted] stopped service at this premise electric usage decreased significantly.
- There is another tenant on service currently at this premise.

Thanks,

[Redacted]