

From: Mark Toney
Sent: 2/26/2013 10:48:57 PM
To: Kauss, Kent (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=KWK3)
Bottorff, Thomas E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TEB3);
Cc: Dan Skopec (dskopec@semprautilities.com); Lee Schavrien
(lschavrien@semprautilities.com); Akbar Jazayeri (akbar.jazayeri@sce);
russell.garwacki@sce.com (russell.garwacki@sce.com); Stephanie Chen
(stephaniec@greenlining.org); Samuel S. Kang (samuelk@greenlining.org); Enrique
Gallardo (enriqueg@greenlining.org); Joe Como (joc@cpuc.ca.gov); Michael
Richard (MRichard@aarp.org); Linda Serizawa (lss@cpuc.ca.gov); Mike Campbell
(Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov); Matthew Freedman (matthew@turn.org); Janee
Briesemeister (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org); Lenny Goldberg (lga@cal.net); com'
'Akbar. Jazayeri@sce. (Akbar.Jazayeri@sce.com)

Bcc:

Subject: RE: Follow up

Kent, et al,

The language in the Steinberg bill is meant primarily as a point of departure for further exploration. Let's keep talking.

Mark

On Feb 26, 2013, at 10:43 PM, Kauss, Kent wrote:

> Thanks Mark. We are working on an analysis of what the Steinberg bill would mean for the rate projections going forward so we can have an informed discussion. We will share that info when complete.

>

> I do not believe that it alone will allow us to resolve the issues that we face in our residential rate structure. We do expect rates to increase just north of inflation in the years ahead with all the various cost increases meaning the gap between tiers will not shrink.

>

> Thanks again for the note and willingness to continue to work with us on some reforms.

>

> On Feb 26, 2013, at 5:36 PM, "Mark Toney" <mtoney@turn.org<mailto:mtoney@turn.org>> wrote:

>

> Dear Utility and Consumer Representatives,

>

> I wanted to thank you for attending the February 19 convening of utilities and consumers at the Energy Foundation to explore the potential areas of agreement on key rate reform issues.

>

> While no commitments were made, it appeared that both utilities and consumers expressed a willingness to negotiate on strategies to decrease top tier rates, reduce the number of tiers, redesign the CARE subsidy and formula for increases, net energy metering reforms, default time of use rates, and even a limited version of customer charges. Sure, we may not at the end of the day reach perfect alignment on each and every issue, but it

is important to note that this was a discussion where neither side declared any concern to be an off-topic issue.

>

> In the meantime, I wanted to let you know that SB 743 (Steinberg, Padilla) has been introduced to fix some of the CARE increase issues that were not resolved by SB 695. SB 743 has the potential to serve as a vehicle for broader rate reform should we reach agreements on major rate design policy issues.

>

> As stated at the end of the meeting, Matt Freedman is working on an outline to further explore potential policy solutions and to request some utility data to help evaluate the feasibility of such proposals.

>

> You will be hearing from us soon.

>

> Thanks,

>

> Mark

>

> Mark W. Toney, Ph.D.

> Executive Director

> TURN—The Utility Reform Network

> 115 Sansome Street, Suite 900

> San Francisco, CA 94104

> 415 929 8876 x301

> mtoney@turn.org<<mailto:mtoney@turn.org>> • 510 590 2862 cell

>

> <TURN_logo.jpg>

>

>

>

> PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

> To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>