

From: Warner, Christopher (Law)
Sent: 1/14/2010 2:25:16 PM
To: 'Roscow, Steve' (scr@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7);
Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Marin CCA/Ross Town Council meeting/Complaint about [Redacted]

Thanks Steve. I'll be happy to talk with you any time about any of these issues, or as part of our informal followup on the Marin Energy Authority implementation plan. I do want you to know that I have great personal respect for you, dating way back to some of the most difficult and sensitive issues I have worked with you on, such as the DWR contracts and revenue requirements, so regardless of what [Redacted] or Julie may think, I personally want to apologize to you on behalf of PG&E if in any way we have been uncivil to you in our public discussions.

Chris

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:scr@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2010 1:25 PM
To: Warner, Christopher (Law)
Cc: Cherry, Brian K; Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Marin CCA/Ross Town Council meeting/Complaint about [Redacted]

Chris,

Responding to your 2 voicemails yesterday:

I'd like a written response to my note, because I requested proof of any misleading statements that [Redacted] claims that I made to the council meetings in Marin. So I won't be calling you to discuss those matters—my note is clear. More to the point, Julie and [Redacted] have suggested that I am likely wasting my time if I'm waiting for an apology, so I will do us both a favor and drop that request. Back to work, in other words.

On the substantive questions about shareholder funding, we can do formal discovery as we decide whether/how to pursue this further. In that event, I'll route those through Brian and Trina.

All the best to you—

Steve

Steve Roscow

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189

From: Warner, Christopher (Law) [mailto:CJW5@pge.com]

Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 10:19 AM

To: Roscow, Steve

Cc: Fitch, Julie A.; [Redacted] Clanon, Paul; Cherry, Brian K; Horner, Trina

Subject: RE: Marin CCA/Ross Town Council meeting/Complaint about [Redacted]

Thanks I'll call you to discuss.

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:SCR@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 10:13 AM

To: Warner, Christopher (Law)

Cc: Fitch, Julie A.; [Redacted] Clanon, Paul; Cherry, Brian K; Horner, Trina

Subject: RE: Marin CCA/Ross Town Council meeting/Complaint about [Redacted]

Chris,

Thanks for the call, but my note did not identify any misunderstanding that needs to be cleared up. I asked some questions in my note below, so I'd appreciate a response to those questions. Then we can see where to go from there.

Steve Roscow

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189

From: Warner, Christopher (Law) [mailto:CJW5@PGE.COM]

Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 9:40 AM

To: Roscow, Steve

Cc: Fitch, Julie A.; [Redacted] Clanon, Paul; Cherry, Brian K; Horner, Trina

Subject: RE: Marin CCA/Ross Town Council meeting/Complaint about [Redacted]

Thanks Steve. I left you a voicemail and would be happy to clear up any misunderstanding. Feel free to give me a call, 415-973-6695.

Chris

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:SCR@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2010 12:32 AM

To: Warner, Christopher (Law)

Cc: Fitch, Julie A.; [Redacted] Clanon, Paul

Subject: Marin CCA/Ross Town Council meeting/Complaint about [Redacted]

Chris,

As you know, I've been attending the recent series of town meetings in Marin, where each town council has been voting on whether or not to continue its membership in the Marin CCA joint powers authority.

At most of those meetings, [Redacted] has identified himself as a consultant speaking on behalf of PG&E, though today he specified that he was speaking for a newly formed group called "Common Sense Coalition of Marin", a group he stated was funded by PG&E.

Near the end of his presentation tonight to the Ross Town Council, where he provided a number of reasons that Ross should withdraw from the JPA, Joe equated the "opt-out" structure of the CCA statute to customers being "slammed" onto CCA service.

In fact, as you know, the opt-out structure was adopted as part of AB 117—it is not in any way, shape or form “slamming”. It is required as part of the Public Utilities Code.

After the meeting, I told Joe that I was concerned that he equated “opt-out” with slamming, because that is a practice that greatly concerns the CPUC, so we would not want that term inaccurately associated with CCA formation. I told Joe that I would be contacting you, in order to ask you to ask him to stop using that term.

In response, Joe immediately became angry and said that he objected to my repeatedly misinforming the councils about the role of the CPUC in implementing CCAs, whereupon I told him that if he had any specific complaints, he should contact my bosses. He said he would do so, then said he didn't need to waste his time talking to me, brushed past me and walked away. [Redacted] was standing right there, if you want to check any of this with him. [Redacted] remarks to the council were fine.

Based on the above, I have several requests to make of you, Chris:

First, if you can cite a single instance where I “misinformed” any council meeting about the CPUC's role in all of this, I would like you to provide a copy of the council meeting transcript, with any such statements clearly indicated. I will say right now that I do not think you can provide a single example. What you do not know is that Julie and [Redacted] made it very clear to me before I attended any meetings that I was to remain completely neutral in my remarks at these meetings, and I am 100% certain that I have done so. I know this because I really am neutral on whether CCAs are formed or not. Furthermore, I have been thanked for attending—and providing helpful clarifying information about the Commission's role in implementing the CCA statute—a number of times, for example by the mayor of San Anselmo, the city attorney of San Anselmo, and I'd say by the entire County Board of Supervisors this morning, and the Ross Council tonight. None of the council members has raised any objection at all to anything that I said.

Second, I would like to know from you if PG&E shareholders have been paying for Joe's services, and if so, whether you believe that PG&E shareholders are somehow entitled to pay a lobbyist (who is being managed by PG&E staffers funded by ratepayers) to call a Commission staffer a liar in a public place, as Joe did tonight. Accusing me of “misinforming” the councils is no different.

If your answer to the 2 questions above is “no”, I would like to request an apology from you, or whoever at PG&E is “managing” Joe's work, and I would like PG&E to have Joe apologize to me as well. You and I have interacted a fair amount in the last few years, and I hope you have gotten to know me well enough to understand that I will not sit by and have anyone associated with PG&E speak to me in that manner, whether they are paid by “ratepayers” or “shareholders”. I also will not sit by and have the Commission's actions misrepresented, as Joe has been doing consistently at every meeting I have

attended, even after I corrected his description of the Commission's role at the first meeting that he and I attended together (in Mill Valley, January 4th).

Steve