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"

<<u>BKC7@pge.com</u>> 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

а

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
РМ
To:
Cherry,
Brian
Κ
Subject:
Fwd:
New
problem
found
with
PG&E
SMs
!!
You
know
any
more
about
this?
Begin
forwarded
message:
       From:
       "Gupta,
       Aloke"
       <aloretic="mailto:square;">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."
<<u>carol.brown@cpuc.ca.gov</u>>,
"Ryan,
Nancy"
<<u>nancy.ryan@cpuc.ca.gov</u>>,
"Sullivan,
Timothy
J."
< timothy.sullivan@cpuc.ca.gov>
Cc:
"Zafar,
Marzia"
<marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov>,
"Villarreal,
Christopher"
<a href="mailto:<a href="mailto:cpuc.ca.gov">christopher.villarreal@cpuc.ca.gov">christopher.villarreal@cpuc.ca.gov</a>
Subject:
New
problem
found
with
PG&E
SMs
!!
```

PG&E has just alerted me to а 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,

а

particular

batch

of

SMs

show

а

sensitivity

to

temperature,

which

ultimately

can

lead

to

inaccurate

usage

readings.

The

faulty

reading occurs only in а 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 а record of the error signal, it may be possible 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 а HIGHER bill (albeit, around 2% higher is currently estimated)!!! What's Next: Much is still

not known. have asked PG&E to provide an update asap next week as more engineering and billing analysis completed and corrective actions become

Aloke Gupta California Public

clearer.

Utilities

Commission

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