

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 9/26/2013 3:55:15 PM
To: Baker, Simon (simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4)
Bcc:
Subject: Re: MEA OBR

Simon:

My apologies, I thought we had reached closure on the line-item billing agreement. Our attorney sent an edit to MEA on Tuesday to reflect the Financing Decision's requirement that the new EFLIC pilot would be administered through the Master Servicer and use contracts developed by CAEATFA (rather than be subject to an agreement between MEA and PG&E). This is required on pages 37 to 38 of the Financing Decision for the EFLIC Pilot, which we understand MEA is interested in participating in. The scope of MEA's financing pilot (whether it is limited to CCA customers or could be offered to non-CCA customers in Marin and Richmond) was the only substantive issue disagreement regarding the line-item billing agreement with MEA in the last few months. I understand that we are very close to concluding the line-item billing agreement with MEA for its CCA customers and we are hopeful we will be able to sign it very soon.

Also, I work very closely with [Redacted] our Financing lead, so am up to speed on the latest. As far as the other examples of events that differ from what we discussed the other day, I would be interested in seeing the summary document MEA is pulling together.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss this further.

[Redacted]

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

From: Baker, Simon [mailto:simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 26, 2013 2:44 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Dietz, Sidney
Subject: RE: MEA OBR

[Redacted]

After we spoke, I talked with Beckie Menten at MEA. She gave me a very different version of events than you conveyed to me. For example, she said that (on Tuesday) the MEA received another round of redlines to the agreement from PG&E. So, according to MEA, they have not yet signed the agreement. (You had said MEA finally signed the agreement.) There are many other examples of their version of events differing from PG&E's.

I asked MEA to prepare a document summarizing their version of events and where they see things stand on the remaining issue of contention: availability of MEA OBR for non-MEA customers. Once I receive that, we plan to ask both PG&E and MEA to meet with us to work towards a better working relationship. From what I can tell, it does not appear to be working very well.

P.S. - Beckie also said that she has not been working directly with you, and therefore you may not be fully informed about the current status of MEA's involvement with PG&E. She said that [Redacted] (sp?) has been her primary point of contact.

Best,

Simon Baker | Branch Manager, Demand-Side Programs | Energy Division, CPUC | simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov |

415-703-5649

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

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 24, 2013 9:08 AM
To: Baker, Simon; Dietz, Sidney
Subject: RE: MEA OBR

Hi Simon,

Per my voicemail, please let me know when you have time free to chat about this so I can give you the latest. My only conflicts today are between 10:00 -11:00 and 3:00-3:30. [Redacted]

[Redacted]
Manager, Energy Efficiency Policy
Pacific Gas and Electric Company
[Redacted]

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

From: Baker, Simon [mailto:simon.baker@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 23, 2013 3:12 PM
To: [Redacted] Dietz, Sidney
Subject: MEA OBR

Hi Sid / [Redact]

MEA tells me PG&E has yet to enable them to implement their OBR program. When I last spoke to [Reda] he said he would check on status. What's up?

Best,
Simon

Sent from my iPhone

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