

From: Warner, Christopher (Law
Sent: 8/16/2013 12:15:55 PM
To: Skopec, Dan (DSkopec@semprautilities.com); 'Campbell, Michael'
(Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov); Horner, Trina
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC); Serizawa, Linda
(linda.serizawa@cpuc.ca.gov); mtoney@turn.org (mtoney@turn.org); Schavrien,
Lee (LSchavrien@semprautilities.com); 'enriqueg@greenlining.org'
(enriqueg@greenlining.org) (enriqueg@greenlining.org); 'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org'
(Jbriesemeister@aarp.org) (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org); 'matthew@turn.org'
(matthew@turn.org) (matthew@turn.org); 'stephaniec@greenlining.org'
(stephaniec@greenlining.org) (stephaniec@greenlining.org); Kauss, Kent
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=KWK3); Bottorff, Thomas
E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TEB3); Marcus,
Matthew (matthew.marcus@cpuc.ca.gov); russell.garwacki@sce.com
(russell.garwacki@sce.com); Johnson, Aaron
(/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=AJJ9); Manzuk, Chuck
(CManzuk@semprautilities.com); Barsuglia, Heidi Dejong
(HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com); Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com
(Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com); Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com
(Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com); Lenny Goldberg (lga@cal.net) (lga@cal.net);
'MRichard@aarp.org' (MRichard@aarp.org) (MRichard@aarp.org); Johnson, Tracy
E. (TEJohnson@semprautilities.com)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Rate Reform Group Check in

I agree with Dan on the existing 2827(g) non-discrimination provision. But as Mike points out, you don't even get there if you just read existing AB 327 – no residential customer, solar or otherwise, can be “forced” onto an “optional rate.” Section 6 of AB 327 takes that one step further by repealing the existing parts of PU Code Section 745 that arguably allowed the CPUC to approve “mandatory” TOU pricing.

Chris

From: Skopec, Dan [mailto:DSkopec@semprautilities.com]
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2013 10:44 AM
To: 'Campbell, Michael'; Horner, Trina; 'matthew@turn.org' (matthew@turn.org); mtoney@turn.org; Serizawa, Linda; 'stephaniec@greenlining.org' (stephaniec@greenlining.org); 'enriqueg@greenlining.org' (enriqueg@greenlining.org); 'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org' (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org); Schavrien, Lee; Bottorff, Thomas E; Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com; Russell.Garwacki@sce.com; 'MRichard@aarp.org' (MRichard@aarp.org); Lenny Goldberg (lga@cal.net); Marcus, Matthew; Kauss, Kent; Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com; Barsuglia, Heidi Dejong;

Johnson, Tracy E.; Manzuk, Chuck; Johnson, Aaron; Warner, Christopher (Law)
Subject: RE: Rate Reform Group Check in

Sec 2827 of the PUC would prevent us from doing what Donne Brownsey suggests. You can't reform NEM unless you remove that language in Sec 2827. AB 327, in its current form, does not remove this language in Sec 2827.

Frankly, I'm pretty sure Donna knows this. It's the most important aspect of the PUC code for her members. My guess is that she's using this to scare Legislators into voting against AB 327.

Dan Skopec
Vice President, Regulatory & Legislative Affairs
Sempra Energy Utilities
(415) 202-9986
San Francisco, CA 94102

From: Campbell, Michael [<mailto:Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2013 10:23 AM
To: Horner, Trina; 'matthew@turn.org' (matthew@turn.org); mtoney@turn.org; Serizawa, Linda; 'stephaniec@greenlining.org' (stephaniec@greenlining.org); 'enriqueg@greenlining.org' (enriqueg@greenlining.org); 'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org' (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org); Schavrien, Lee; Bottorff, Thomas E; Skopec, Dan; Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com; Russell.Garwacki@sce.com; 'MRichard@aarp.org' (MRichard@aarp.org); Lenny Goldberg (lga@cal.net); Marcus, Matthew; Kauss, Kent; Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com; Barsuglia, Heidi Dejong; Johnson, Tracy E.; Manzuk, Chuck; Johnson, Aaron; Warner, Christopher (Law)
Subject: RE: Rate Reform Group Check in

Just a quick follow up – after our call this morning, Donne Brownsey (SEIA) contacted me about a “fatal flaw” in our language. Her “concern” is that the language that places the limit on the customer charges creates a loophole whereby the tariffs would be created with an optional rate that has a fixed charge in excess of \$10 and then solar customers would be forced on to that rate. I didn't go to lawyer school, but it seems it would be difficult to argue that you could force a customer onto an optional rate. Kinda flies in the face of having an option, don't you think?

Also, I seem to recall there are provisions in the PU code that doesn't allow discriminatory treatment of customer-generators. Do any of you know that PU Code section off the top of your heads?

I haven't responded to Donne – I'm not sure I want to give this concern the time of day. But I did want to alert you all to what might come up in the next few days from the Solar groups.

MC

-----Original Appointment-----

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]

Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 9:08 AM

To: Horner, Trina; 'matthew@turn.org' (matthew@turn.org); mtoney@turn.org; Serizawa, Linda; Campbell, Michael; 'stephaniec@greenlining.org' (stephaniec@greenlining.org); 'enriqueg@greenlining.org' (enriqueg@greenlining.org); 'Jbriesemeister@aarp.org' (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org); LSchavrien@semprautilities.com; Bottorff, Thomas E; DSkopec@semprautilities.com; Megan.Scottkakures@edisonintl.com; Russell.Garwacki@sce.com; 'MRichard@aarp.org' (MRichard@aarp.org); Lenny Goldberg (lga@cal.net); Marcus, Matthew; Kauss, Kent; Kelly.E.Boyd@sce.com; HBarsuglia@semprautilities.com; 'tejohnson@semprautilities.com'; 'Manzuk, Chuck'; Johnson, Aaron; Warner, Christopher (Law)

Subject: Rate Reform Group Check in

When: Friday, August 16, 2013 9:00 AM-9:45 AM (UTC-08:00) Pacific Time (US & Canada).

Where: Dial in only: 1-866-278-2490 / *4159736490* (please include asterisks before and after the number)

Placeholder for weekly check-ins through August; meeting will be held or cancelled as necessary.

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

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