

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 4/18/2011 9:18:33 PM
To: 'paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov' (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: New problem found with PG&E SMs !!

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 Alope 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
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