

From: Clanon, Paul
Sent: 4/18/2011 9:21:00 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

Ok, tough guy.

On Apr 18, 2011, at 9:19 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

Double nonfat latte with caramel sauce.

From: Clanon, Paul [<mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 08:50 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

Ok. Peet's beverage of choice?

On Apr 18, 2011, at 8:48 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

I will take the bet.

From: Clanon, Paul [<mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 08:46 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

Earlier this evening I asked Aloke to check.

On Apr 18, 2011, at 8:45 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

I might take that bet.

From: Clanon, Paul [<mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 08:33 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

Wanna bet theirs are ok?

On Apr 18, 2011, at 7:36 PM, "Cherry, Brian K"

<BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

I can only imagine. Perhaps there is small comfort in knowing Edison has meters there too ?

From: Clanon, Paul
[mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 07:35 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

Want to hear my opinion on testing of equipment to be deployed in the Central Valley that fails between 110 and 115 degrees?

On Apr 18, 2011, at 7:30 PM,
"Cherry, Brian K"
<BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

Perhaps but that is the absolute high estimate. I'm told it is closer to the low end. We will see....

From: Clanon, Paul
[mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, April 18, 2011 07:27 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

Aloke thinks it might be 500,000.

On Apr 18, 2011, at 7:04 PM, "Cherry, Brian K"
<BKC7@pge.com>
wrote:

Yes.
Sadly.
So
far
we
think
it is a
problem
with
a
very
limited
set
since
error
messages
are
thrown
off.
We
are
replacing
those
1500
meters
and
testing
each
one
along
with
the
manufacturer.
We
believe
these
are
first
generation
meters
and
that
the
number
is
limited.

From:
Clanon,
Paul

[mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent:

Monday,
April
18,
2011
06:57
PM

To:

Cherry,
Brian
K

Subject:

Fwd:
New
problem
found
with
PG&E
SMs
!!

You
know
any
more
about
this?

Begin
forwarded
message:

From:

"Gupta,
Aloke"
<aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov>

Date:

April
18,
2011
5:04:13
PM
PDT

To:

"Kaneshiro,
Bruce"
<bruce.kaneshiro@cpuc.ca.gov>,

"Skala,
Pete"
<pete.skala@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Sterkel,
Merideth
\"Molly\""
<merideth.sterkel@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Fitch,
Julie
A."
<julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Clanon,
Paul"
<paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Meeusen,
Karl"
<karl.meeusen@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Brown,
Carol
A."
<carol.brown@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Ryan,
Nancy"
<nancy.ryan@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Sullivan,
Timothy
J."
<timothy.sullivan@cpuc.ca.gov>
Cc:
"Zafar,
Marzia"
<marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Villarreal,
Christopher"
<christopher.villarreal@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject:
New
problem
found
with
PG&E
SMs
!!

PG&E
has
just
alerted
me
to
a
new
problem
recently
discovered
with
their
smart
meters.
The
bad
news
is
that
this
is
the
worst
case
scenario
in
terms
of
the
location
and
circumstances.

Problem:
Apparently,
a
particular
batch
of
SMs
show
a
sensitivity
to
temperature,
which
ultimately
can
lead
to
inaccurate
usage
readings.
The
faulty

reading occurs only in a narrow band of temperature (approx 100 to 115 estimated). Below and above this, the meter functions properly. This was not discovered in testing because the ANSI requirements are at temperature points outside this band. The meter does not put out an error signal while this faulty condition is active, but the implication

of
that
signal
was
not
understood
until
now
(essentially,
it
was
ignored
before).

Scope:
The
problem
is
with
the
L&G
portion
of
the
meter,
not
Silver
Spring
NIC.
The
affected
batch
is
potentially
upto
500K
meters.
Problem
has
been
found
in
1500
SMs
so
far.
The
faulty
readings
could
potentially
lead
to
about
2%
error

in
the
monthly
bill
(the
actual
impact
during
the
faulty
condition
could
be
8%
or
more).
Because
PG&E
has
a
record
of
the
error
signal,
it
may
be
possible
to
retroactively
reconstruct
the
correct
bill.

Why
is
this
Worst-
Case
Scenario:
The
affected
meters
are
all
in
Center
Valley
(at
least,
so
far)!
They
are

also
Residential!!
And
the
error
leads
to
a
HIGHER
bill
(albeit,
around
2%
higher
is
currently
estimated)!!!

What's
Next:
Much
is
still
not
known.
I
have
asked
PG&E
to
provide
an
update
asap
next
week
as
more
engineering
and
billing
analysis
is
completed
and
corrective
actions
become
clearer.

Aloke
Gupta
**California
Public**

**Utilities
Commission**

O:
415.703.5239
aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov