

From: Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter)
Sent: 10/21/2011 10:30:53 AM
To: Roberts, Thomas (thomas.roberts@cpuc.ca.gov); Danforth, Christopher (christopher.danforth@cpuc.ca.gov); Gupta, Alope (aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov);
[Redacted]
[Redacted] mtoney@turn.org (mtoney@turn.org);
David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov (David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov);
erich@enernex.com (erich@enernex.com)
Cc: Meadows, James L (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J7M2); Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); [Redacted]
[Redacted] Morey, Candace
(candace.morey@cpuc.ca.gov); Chan, Cherie (cherie.chan@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

Thanks for your thoughts on this issue (and even your joke, Alope!). I have to confess I'm still of the mind that TAP-meetings are not legal conversations. While I have a law degree, and while I previously worked as a lawyer for PG&E, I don't work in that capacity anymore; I work in PG&E's SmartMeter organization. You'll notice that we generally do not have our Law Dept. attend these meetings. Do you have your counsel at the other IOUs' TAPs?

Thanks.

From: Gupta, Alope [mailto:aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2011 3:52 PM
To: Roberts, Thomas; [Redacted] Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter); [Redacted]
Danforth, Christopher; David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov; mtoney@turn.org; erich@enernex.com
Cc: [Redacted] Dietz, Sidney; Meadows, James L; Morey, Candace; Chan, Cherie
Subject: RE: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

Per a recent Supreme Court decision, "lawyers" are considered "persons" too. However, the decision was split 5-4. (sorry, couldn't resist).

Going back to Karen's call for topics, we would like to request an update on

- deployment status / statistics
- HAN implementation plan
- "my account" web portal release/plan
- status of AMI enabled customer programs (Net Metering, PTR, TOU-voluntary, Smart A/C, etc.?)

Our (strong) preference is to table the opt-out topic as that is already being actively discussed in a live proceeding.

Thanks.

Aloke Gupta
California Public Utilities Commission
o: 415.703.5239
e: aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov

From: Roberts, Thomas
Sent: Wed 10/12/2011 3:22 PM
To: [Redacted] Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter); [Redacted]; Gupta, Alope; Danforth, Christopher; 'David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov'; 'mtoney@turn.org'; 'erich@enernex.com'
Cc: [Redacted] Dietz, Sidney; Meadows, James L; Morey, Candace; Chan, Cherie
Subject: RE: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

First, the TAP is now led by a lawyer, Cliff. Second, DRA's attorney, Candace Morey, is an engineer with unique insight on all facets of smart meter programs. Energy is a multidisciplinary subject, and one's title does not necessarily indicate their technical interest or knowledge. I've requested that Candace be invited to TAP meetings primarily because DRA has a small team with other responsibilities: having the option for Chris, Candace, or our newest member Cherie to attend helps us participate while still managing our other workloads.

Tom

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2011 2:40 PM
To: Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter); [Redacted] Gupta, Alope; Danforth, Christopher; Roberts, Thomas; 'David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov'; 'mtoney@turn.org'; 'erich@enernex.com'
Cc: [Redacted] Dietz, Sidney; Meadows, James L
Subject: Re: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

I do not think an attorney would be likely to add significantly to a technology based discussion.

We might be able to have a more free and productive discussion without them.

Is there a rational for including them?

[Redacted]

From: "Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter)" <CJGf@pge.com>

To: [Redacted] "aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov" <'aloke.gupta@cpuc.ca.gov'>; "Danforth, Christopher" <christopher.danforth@cpuc.ca.gov>; "Roberts, Thomas" <thomas.roberts@cpuc.ca.gov>; "David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov" <'David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov'>; "mtoney@turn.org" <'mtoney@turn.org'>; "erich@enernex.com" <'erich@enernex.com'>
Cc: [Redacted] "Dietz, Sidney" <SBD4@pge.com>; "Meadows, James L" <J7M2@pge.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 12, 2011 1:46 PM
Subject: FW: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

At our last TAP meeting, we spent a little bit of time discussing the focus of the TAP and agreed that that would be on the next agenda for additional discussion. In that context, we also touched on the fact that lawyers had started to become a regular part of these meetings. I'm interested in others' views on this, but from my perspective the TAP meetings don't seem like lawyer-meetings. If the point is to talk about technology and solicit input from you about PG&E's technological choices, should we have lawyers in the meetings? Thanks in advance for your thoughts.

We also welcome your thoughts on other agenda items.

Thanks.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, October 06, 2011 5:08 PM
To: Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter)
Subject: FW: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

Cliff,

Please see the closing sentence of Chris' note below where he mentions Candace's availability. At the end of the last TAP meeting, I believe you mentioned that attorneys would not be attending future sessions, with TAP's renewed focus on technology. Consequently, I sent my scheduling note to the original TAP members and did not include Candace or TURN's attorney. Please let me know how to proceed. Thanks. By the way, Chris is on vacation until October 17.

Karen

From: Danforth, Christopher [mailto:christopher.danforth@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 5:49 PM
To: [Redacted]

Cc: Roberts, Thomas; Morey, Candace
Subject: RE: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

Karen, my schedule is pretty clear for that time frame except for a regular management meeting on Wednesday mornings, hearing in an SDG&E case on 11/1, and various meetings in the mornings the rest of the week of 11/1. I will be on vacation the next two weeks, so hopefully the next TAP meeting won't be on 11/17, the day I return. I don't know Tom's or Candace's availability.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, September 28, 2011 12:32 PM
To: [Redacted] Danforth, Christopher; Gupta, Alope ; Roberts, Thomas; 'David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov'; 'mtoney@turn.org'; 'erich@enernex.com'; Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter); Meadows, James L; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting - Scheduling

TAP members:

Thank you all for your responses regarding your availability for the first two weeks of October. Unfortunately, we do not have a quorum and need to try for a later time.

Would you please let me know your availability for the three weeks beginning Monday, October 17 through Friday, November 4?

Thank you for your patience with the scheduling challenges.

[Redacted]

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Friday, September 16, 2011 10:55 AM
To: [Redacted] Danforth, Christopher'; 'ag2@cpuc.ca.gov'; 'Roberts, Thomas'; 'David.Hungerford@energy.ca.gov'; 'mtoney@turn.org'; 'erich@enernex.com'; Gleicher, Cliff (SmartMeter); Meadows, James L; Dietz, Sidney; Forsgard, Karen
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: SmartMeter Technology Advisory Panel Meeting

TAP members:

We hope to schedule the next meeting of the SmartMeter™ Technology Advisory Panel in early October. **Please supply your availability from October 3 through October 14 so that we can schedule the next session.**

Potential agenda items could include continued discussion of technical aspects of opt-out alternatives, the status of PG&E's Net Energy Metering implementation for SmartMeter™ customers, and overall deployment status; your suggested topics are welcome.

Thank you for your input. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Redacted



