LRITF Meeting

Tuesday, December 6, 2022

1:30 PM

ERCOT

Chris Rowley said that it would be a few minutes before we get started because a new webEx number was just emailed out.

Chris Rowley opened the meeting and read the antitrust statement.

Audio was checked. Issues have been resolved.

Introductions:

Attending in person

Chris Rowley Oncor Electric Delivery

Sheri Wiegand Vistra

Michael Winegeart Lubbock Clint Gardner Lubbock

Jamie Wood Lubbock

Jenny Smith Lubbock

Zach Stevenson Texas Electric Coops

Jerry Huerta ERCOT

Kathrine Thurman ERCOT

Ted Hailu ERCOT

John Schatz VISTRA

Amy McDonald POGO

Angela Ghormley Calpine

Heather Fails Oncor

Kathy Scott Centerpoint

Jesse O’Macias AEP

Bill Snyder AEP

Chris Hendrix Demand Control 2

Lauren Damen NRG

Debbie McKeever Oncor

Bill Barnes NRG

Sam Pak Oncor

Attending via-webEx

Dave Michelson ERCOT

Lysette Balance CNP

Matt Rose Lubbock

Pam Shaw Lubbock

William Butler Lubbock

Krista LP&L

Laura Green LP&L

Jordan Troublefield ERCOT

Frank Nunes NEC

Corina G LP&L

Dailey Smith LP&L

Darrell Miller ESG

Deb Belin MarketWise

Catherine Meiners ERCOT

Adrienne Downey

Amy Sue Stirland

Tamela APC

**Docket# 54212 LP&L Pro forma tariff**

Chris said we will go over what was discussed at RMS today. There are a couple of important dates.

* January 9 – comments due
* January 23 – reply comments due

If someone wants a public hearing, the deadline to request that is also January 23rd.

**New PUCT Project rule**

PUCT is making a new rule 25.419 for Munis and Coops possibly wanting customer choice in the future.

Chris said he would open this up for conversation.

Sheri asked Jenny to confirm activities.

Jenny replied and said there were a few minor changes but Lubbock is still reviewing. Lauren said they are still reviewing and that it looks similar but will need to review comments and see how close they are to what was suggested.

Sheri said it’s more of a clear path forward.

Lubbock noted that it depends on how many comments are received and how long it takes to go through those.

**LP&L Proposed Legislation**

Chris said he will turn it over to Jenny Smith and Matt Rose.

Matt Rose said that he will give an overall explanation of what LP&L is going to do there but they are looking at Chapter 40, proposing some minor tweaks on what their participation is in the market and Jenny has some draft legislation for what they can provide in the market.

First off – the POLR designation, Lubbock does not intend on operating as a retail company or anything that goes with it.

They are changing some “shalls” to “may” but they will abide by the Commission.

That is the first issue they are looking to modify.

The second has to do with dual billing. If a customer requests dual billing then they are trying to get into a scenario that LP&L does not do the billing. So, both of these things fold into what they have discussed in that they are looking to make minor tweaks that were not anticipated. Their overall philosophy is not to make huge changes and allow the statute to keep in place the overall state only offer options to the muni entering retail competition.

Matt (LP&L) is happy to receive feedback today or over the coming days. He said he and Jenny have discussed maybe giving until the end of the year for people to take a look and they can hear what happens until but they have not had any discussions to the “general legislation”. They want to be able to provide those so they can show what is being proposed.

So this is where they are as an overview and they can get into the weeds on this but those are the two issues they are trying to address with the document.

Note…document was distributed in the meeting.

Sheri wanted to know who should receive the comments. Deadline by end of this year. Those can be sent to them send any comments on proposed language to Michael Winegeart.

Sheri noted that the CRs or others should try.

Not saying to get with their regulatory groups. Matt said they thought that would be most beneficial but that he is not recruiting folks ask their regulatory groups, but he wants to make sure this whole group is very versed on what Lubbock is doing so if they are around the Commission and hear something, they are aware. There will be modifications to phrase this in certain ways or so. Keep the lines of communication open.

Lauren said that the TBD on customer data…the fact that is not in their info, that they have not finished but Matt said that they are not quite there yet.

Lauren asked…for the POLR designation, are they thinking it will be before competition or the next round? They are going through the process just now in selection of the POLR and this is just going forward they have no intention of setting up a REP and serving in that capacity at all so this is just something they need to address. If it is active it would be the next commission cycle to take place.

Chris asked Dave Michelson about the RMGRR

If we were in a similar situation and the PUCT may not have designated “see exact language in the draft RMG). 7.11.1.2 – Dave read the language”.

Dave said he didn’t want to take a long time on that but everyone could take a look at that on our own. Chris asked when does ERCOT think they would file this. Dave said that he hoped it could be submitted by the end of the year. It would be clean and polished by the end of the year but it could be early next year. Sheri wanted to know if that meant it would go to RMS early January. Dave said that he would be sure to get this to RMS as soon as he has it in his hands. He will bring it for review as soon as he has that. RMGRRs do not need to go to PRS.

He said that the allocation methodology is due on the same copy as what is received as from what they PUCT and they need it in advance in order to do the allocation. Dave said they still need a methodology and this would cover that methodology.

Kathy asked about how would ERCOT plan to do the statement in #2…Dave said that if they had one that wasn’t the designated authority, they would need something until the POLRs could be active in the 2nd year. The POLR assignments…in the same odd numbering year.

The next RMGRR, is the strategy they are trying to use to display the various options that are needed to review without having to rewrite all the Nodal protocols. There are a couple of word updates regarding what is listed for specifications. There is a table that Dave is refering to. In each section where the MOU would be…there are multiple places the MOU would need to follow. The table already existed but it only has 2 columns and 3 rows so Dave expanded it out to include protocol sections which by and large for all intensive purposes include the IOU processes so what they are following is the current IOU processes.

Sheri said the table is an excellent idea and maybe leverage for the customer choice billing if necessary. Dave asked for questions.

Dave said they will circulate it around internally and then prepare an IA and get to us the first chance they get.

Dave spoke to the NPRR which addressed the CSA and the impacted sections. They would make this relevant in the protocol or the RMG for all sections in the RMG…CSA…(see exact language in the 15.1.9).

This would allow the option for billing for processes for the MOU and TDSP and they will mirror that language for anywhere appropriate.

Language in the document was reviewed.

Kathy asked a question.

For table 1…Kathy asked if column 1 and 2 could be populated and would Dave submit without those.

Kathy mentioned two transactions not listed…Dave said they have some clean up to do and he is sure that Lubbock has the info. He said more clean-up is needed but they will be able to go through and work with Lubbock to get that info. He is trying to get in a situation before they finish the testing for the retail transactions but he is trying to get the RMG and the Protocols in place first. They need to be aligned and he is trying to get the list of the transactions that they are a “MOU” or “TDSP” so the is working with that and there would be a lot of copy and paste language.

Kathy asked if this is Dave’s opinion on understanding what is being propose with how Lubbock wants to operate or from what he has been told.

Kathy said she wants to make sure we stay consistent and clear.

Sheri asked if it would help if a smaller group took this offline and made sure it is all covered.

Sheri and Kathy both said they would agree to that and thought that would be helpful and would work with Jamie.

Jordan asked from the phone. Just to give a couple of timeline ideas…the next RMGRR posting deadline for January RMS is 12-26 and as a reminder since the NPRR and RMGRR are related, regardless the NPRR must be approved by RMS prior to filing and that would slow things down a little bit.

January 25 – deadline for the February PRS after the RMS approval of the documents.

Chris asked if we need to go back to the protocol revision request. Dave asked if there were any questions.

No questions or statements were made.

**Customer Choice Billing**

Sheri provided some background that included a small group getting together with REPS, ERCOT, TDSPs, Lubbock, EDI Providers… that this is something the Market Participants needed to work out if section 40.057 does not change…that is what Matt Rose just went over so that piece is moving forward.

The first meeting of the small group, while they looked at the language and the tariff that is out there

REP doing dual or consolidated billing.

Was a question for Shawnee…Is there an obligation to publicize this Customer Choice option?

We don’t want to do so because this is similar to what we do for an AMS meter…the AMS meter is default so that is how this would be designated as well.

Is there is a customer that wants to do the dual billing or if there is…

There are several statements. See #3. A REP (with dual billing) would be able to operate off of just an 867 instead of having to have the pair 810/867.

If the default is that there is going to be a consolidated bill, then the rep would keep the same bill. In other words, “business as usual”. How will these dual billing customers need to be identified? There is nothing indicated in the billing transactions but there is a billing segment in the dual or consolidated (ESP or dual) if they would be able to indicate to Lubbock this in either the 814\_01 or 814\_16, that would be applicable. The only other entity out there that offers customer choice other than a TDSP is NUECES and they only offer dual billing.

If they are moving along with a consolidated bill and then want to change, what is the process that will be used to communicate that? Could use Marketrak and the transaction could be an 814\_PC that the CR would send to Lubbock indicating that the customer wants dual billing. If a customer wants to move over to dual billing, there needs to be some sort of time parameters. John suggested maybe a 12 month stay on that and then if after that they could make a change. This would be an on-cycle change and could take two cycles for the change to become effective.

If a customer wants dual billing, will REPS be able to refuse service if unable to offer? Staff guidance is needed as this would be similar to a prepay product.

Sheri said that then they would move into a whole set of a customer protection issues.

Sheri said see the entire document (attached to the meeting page 12/6/22) including the top part of the transactions identified.

If dual billing is accepted, will any type of payments need to be made from the REP to Lubbock, something like the temp disconnect fee? How would that fee be captured? Does it go back to the Lubbock side of the house? These are just some types of things that need to be determined.

For Mass Transition…what if a customer is a dual billed customer and then the REP defaulted? The default would be consolidated billing, similar to if the customer was on a prepay product, then the consensus is that it would be consolidated billing offered by POLR REP.

There is a segment in the 814\_14 that does however provide for an option.

We hope the default is consolidated billing and if they want dual billing they have to take that up with their new REP.

John mentioned that the prepay products are voluntary by the CR and ….Sheri mentioned that’s a Shawnee question. “Will reps be able to refuse dual billing if the customer requests that?”

If a process is needed to be able to communicate dual billing, then Lubbock could have a form or it could be MarkeTrak. Those details would need to be worked out, but similar to the AMS opt out typically the TDSP does that and then they follow up with the transactions.

Nueces side does consolidated billing or dual billing but the only transaction that the Nueces accepts from a supplier is an 810. At an enrollment transactions is what is included as a dual. They are still offering a choice…dual by the rep and Nueces or consolidated by Nueces.

**Next steps:**

Working with staff and seeing what happens with the Customer Protection rules.

Question. What would cause a customer to do dual billing as opposed to consolidated billing? There should not be a difference in the amount of the bills. The due date is the difference.

There is a scenario where the REP doesn’t want to pass along all the REP charges.

Michael said that they are speculating that there would be a Muni or a COOP where they want to retain a relationship with their customers particularly with Coops where there is member ownership.

All are dual billing except one provider. There are about 30 providers and most are commercial.

Heather said that Eric stated that they do dual billing when it’s usually large commercial customers with complex billing needs who request separate bills.

**ACTIONS List**

Sheri displayed the task list.

Jamie said that a bill cycle is when the meter is read.

Chris asked if when they read a meter, do they have any indication of when the bill is received? Jamie said they have 3 days but most of the time it is one day and that’s their plan.

Chris brought up the issue of “tax exempt customers” what will be the process once we go live in terms of the customer and right now the thought is that the rep would have to obtain that from the customer.

When would the information about historical usage be available?

Sheri said that first you have to create the ESIs. It’s on the integrations list.

Kyle asked if the email addresses would be available. He remembers that in a past conversation maybe Jamie said that their vendor has the email addresses and not Lubbock.

That’s an attribute in a file that would go to the VREP. Both Sheri and Kyle agree.

Michael said that Lubbock has primarily been a “voice to voice” or “face to face” company with their customers. Jamie said that they have good customer contact info and have a lot of it. Chris mentioned that the TDSPs would very much appreciate getting customer’s email addresses too.

Sheri presented/brought up the “Transition to Competition” table and some specific items were discussed.

*Customer Enrollment process*

She suggested we get the timeline posted to the main meeting page and maybe when things get further down what is the window for opening to competition, and when does it close? When do the default transactions need to be sent? That’s what is meant in this section for this question. The answer is currently identified as Q1 2023

Customer billing piece – Chris said everyone is working on that one.

If we have to wait for legislation that might push to later.

Delivery Service Agreement– change to Q1

Question in Queue: needed clarification.

Restated and Michael said that all the numbers on their website are current.

Can they use the utility information, like emergency/outage calls and so forth?

Call center support line – being deferred to the Q1 2023 deadline

Heather noted that the contact numbers are on the DSAs for the TDSPs and wasn’t known whether those numbers will be on Lubbock’s DSA or not.

Sheri mentioned that the Access Agreement is not finalized yet but the phone numbers would be on the Access Agreement.

PUCT complaints – Chris said he remembered Michael saying something about they are working on a process and Sheri said some of those might be noted in the customer protection rules.

Discussion regarding whether or not adding substations is complete. No new substations are being added. They are just managing by changing feeder information. That will be noted as complete.

SAC 04 codes – still in progress.

Lubbock plans to use the LSE files

AMS Operational days – they will be upgrading on Saturdays. Can be marked as complete.

Question from Lubbock: what is the Smart Meter Texas Portal? Jamie said that she could not find out whether or not SMTP is a legal entity or other and cannot find out an answer.

Kathy and Debbie noted that is it a central system for meter data and not a legal entity.

Chris said that we are moving to the next item on the agenda is Open Discussion:

No comments were made. No questions asked.

Sheri said that they have a lot of items identified as being complete on Q1 so there will be a lot to review.

Chris announced the date of the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 PM