From: Baker, Simon

Sent: 10/15/2013 10:11:01 AM

To: Redacted

Cc: Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); Goldstein, Larry (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=L1GF); Battis, Jeremy (jeremy.battis@cpuc.ca.gov)

Bcc:

Subject: Re: MEA OBR

Our understanding is that Commr Ferron's Office has spoken to PG&E (Sid) and PG&E has agreed to give MEA access to the EFLIC (once they launch it on the "fast track" per the EE finance decision) for MEA to offer its OBR program to non-MCE customers.

Meanwhile, our sense is that this OBR negotiation has perhaps revealed opportunities for improvement in the working relationship between MEA and PG&E. I think the time is right to have a three-way meeting with MEA, PG&E, and Energy Division. If nothing else we hope that this meeting will reaffirm the parties' willingness to do their part to make things go smoothly going forward as PG&E adjusts to a CCA administering EE programs in its service territory.

The meeting objectives would be:

1. Clarify any remaining issues (hopefully none!) related to MEA's use of PG&E's EFLIC.

2. Discuss any concerns regarding the MEA-PG&E effective working relationship, from each party's perspective, and work towards an understanding and shared expectations to improve the relationship going forward. (We will ask both MEA and PG&E to come prepared with any specific examples of past "breakdowns" that are worth highlighting and working through - with potential clarifications offered by the other party - in this forum.)

Jeremy will work with PG&E and MEA to set this meeting up and work with both parties to set an agenda. I would like MEA and PG&E to both propose agenda items (perhaps keyed off of any examples where collaboration has broken down), and Jeremy can structure an agenda based off of that, sharing with both parties well in advance.

Thanks!

Best,
Simon

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 26, 2013, at 3:55 PM, Redacted > wrote:

> 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.
>
> Redac
>
> -----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
>
> Redacte
>
> 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 / Redacted
>
> MEA tells me PG&E has yet to enable them to implement their OBR program. When I last spoke to Redac 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/
>
>
> PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
> To learn more, please visit http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/