

From: Matthew Freedman  
Sent: 7/29/2013 9:01:37 AM  
To: Kauss, Kent (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=KWK3)  
Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);  
Cc: Mark Toney (mtoney@turn.org); Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com (Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com);  
'Serizawa, Linda' (linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov) (linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov);  
Bottorff, Thomas E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TEB3);  
Dan Skopec (dskopec@semprautilities.com); Lee Schavrien  
(lschavrien@semprautilities.com); Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com  
(Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com); 'enriqueg@greenlining.org'  
(enriqueg@greenlining.org) (enriqueg@greenlining.org); 'Campbell, Michael'  
(Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov) (Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov);  
'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org' (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org) (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org);  
'stephaniec@greenlining.org' (stephaniec@greenlining.org)  
(stephaniec@greenlining.org); russell.garwacki@sce.com  
(russell.garwacki@sce.com); Tracy E. Johnson (tejohnson@semprautilities.com);  
Lenny Goldberg (lga@cal.net) (lga@cal.net); 'MRichard@aarp.org'  
(MRichard@aarp.org) (MRichard@aarp.org); Matthew Marcus  
(matthew.marcus@cpuc.ca.gov); Heidi Barsuglia (hbarsuglia@semprautilities.com)

Bcc:

Subject: Re: Rate Reform Group Phase 2 - NEM discussion proposal

Kent,

The Governor's office is committed to adding NEM to the AB 327 debate. So we have the choice of (a) rejecting their proposal entirely and running the risk of a veto or (b) countering with our own proposal for NEM. I am not proposing that we put this additional language into AB 327 when the next set of amendments are put across the desk. I do think it helps for our organizations to figure out where we can go on NEM when the issue is inevitably put before us.

If NEM somehow never gets raised, then I don't think we should be the ones to raise it. But it would be a mistake to simply wait until the Governor's office releases language before coming up with our own alternative.

Matt

-----

On Jul 29, 2013, at 8:09 AM, Kauss, Kent wrote:

**I don't see a response to this but as discussed on the call we are not supportive of adding NEM to the AB 327 debate. The purpose of this discussion amongst this group of supporters was merely to be prepared should NEM really get traction. We are united in supporting the bill as proposed to be amended by the RN we all commented on and is being**

reworked.

**We are waiting to see the details from the Gov's office and this string is meant to only include this group.**

**From:** [Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com](mailto:Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com) [mailto:Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com]  
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 4:14 PM  
To: Matthew Freedman; Horner, Trina; Mark Toney; 'Serizawa, Linda' ([linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov)); 'Campbell, Michael' ([Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov)); 'stephaniec@greenlining.org' ([stephaniec@greenlining.org](mailto:stephaniec@greenlining.org)); 'enriqueg@greenlining.org' ([enriqueg@greenlining.org](mailto:enriqueg@greenlining.org)); 'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org' ([Jbriesemeister@aarp.org](mailto:Jbriesemeister@aarp.org)); Lee Schavrien; Bottorff, Thomas E; Dan Skopec; [Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com](mailto:Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com); [Russell.Garwacki@sce.com](mailto:Russell.Garwacki@sce.com); 'MRichard@aarp.org' ([MRichard@aarp.org](mailto:MRichard@aarp.org)); Lenny Goldberg ([lga@cal.net](mailto:lga@cal.net)); Matthew Marcus; Kauss, Kent; Heidi Barsuglia; Tracy E. Johnson  
Subject: Re: Rate Reform Group Phase 2 - NEM discussion proposal

Sorry I got dropped from the call. Are we including the other supporters of the bill at this point? I think it's important we continue to communicate with them as well.

Thanks. Kelly  
Kelly E. Boyd,  
Director, Legislative Affairs  
Southern California Edison  
(916) 551-1376

----- Original Message -----

From: Matthew Freedman [[matthew@turn.org](mailto:matthew@turn.org)]  
Sent: 07/24/2013 04:04 PM MST  
To: Trina Horner <[TNHc@pge.com](mailto:TNHc@pge.com)>; Mark Toney <[mtoney@turn.org](mailto:mtoney@turn.org)>; 'Serizawa, Linda' ([linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov))" <[linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov)>; 'Campbell, Michael' ([Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov))" <[Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov)>; 'stephaniec@greenlining.org' ([stephaniec@greenlining.org](mailto:stephaniec@greenlining.org))" <[stephaniec@greenlining.org](mailto:stephaniec@greenlining.org)>; 'enriqueg@greenlining.org' ([enriqueg@greenlining.org](mailto:enriqueg@greenlining.org))" <[enriqueg@greenlining.org](mailto:enriqueg@greenlining.org)>; 'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org' ([Jbriesemeister@aarp.org](mailto:Jbriesemeister@aarp.org))" <[Jbriesemeister@aarp.org](mailto:Jbriesemeister@aarp.org)>; Lee Schavrien <[LSchavrien@semprautilities.com](mailto:LSchavrien@semprautilities.com)>; Thomas Bottorff <[TEB3@pge.com](mailto:TEB3@pge.com)>; Dan Skopec <[DSkopec@semprautilities.com](mailto:DSkopec@semprautilities.com)>; Megan Scott-Kakures; Russell Garwacki; 'MRichard@aarp.org' ([MRichard@aarp.org](mailto:MRichard@aarp.org))" <[MRichard@aarp.org](mailto:MRichard@aarp.org)>; "Lenny Goldberg ([lga@cal.net](mailto:lga@cal.net))" <[lga@cal.net](mailto:lga@cal.net)>; Matthew Marcus <[matthew.marcus@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:matthew.marcus@cpuc.ca.gov)>; Kent Kauss <[KWK3@pge.com](mailto:KWK3@pge.com)>; Kelly Boyd; 'HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com' ([HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com](mailto:HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com))" <[HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com](mailto:HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com)>; "Tracy E. Johnson" <[tejohnson@semprautilities.com](mailto:tejohnson@semprautilities.com)>  
Subject: Rate Reform Group Phase 2 - NEM discussion proposal

Rate reform allies,

I'm forwarding an outline for a possible deal on Net Energy Metering (NEM) in AB 327. This approach may not be that different from what we're likely to see from the Governor's office. Here are the broad strokes:

(1) Codify NEM cap "new math" in §2827 with respect to definition of "aggregate customer peak demand".

(2) Direct the CPUC to develop new NEM program rules (including rates, size limitations, terms of service) by January 1, 2015. These rules should ensure that rates charged to customer-generators maintains ratepayer indifference for non-participating customers of the same electrical corporation.

(3) Beginning on January 1, 2015, all new customer enrollments in a net energy metering tariff, a co-energy metering tariff or a wind co-energy metering tariff, shall be subject to the revised rules.

(4) All customers served under tariffs authorized by §2827 (old NEM) shall remain subject to the terms and conditions of the tariff in effect as of December 31, 2014 until 7 years after the date the customer initially enrolled in NEM. After 7 years, the customer shall be subject to the revised NEM tariffs.

(5) Repeal §2827 as of December 31, 2021.

My guess is that the points of contention will be the date of initial transition, the date for existing NEM customers to switch to NEM 2.0, and the guidance provided to the CPUC on the parameters for NEM 2.0.

Feel free to email or call with feedback.

Matthew Freedman  
Staff Attorney  
The Utility Reform Network  
[matthew@turn.org](mailto:matthew@turn.org)  
415-954-8084

<image001.jpg>

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.  
To learn more, please  
visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

**Matthew Freedman**  
**Staff Attorney**  
**The Utility Reform Network**  
**[matthew@turn.org](mailto:matthew@turn.org)**  
**415-954-8084**



