

From: Roscow, Steve
Sent: 2/19/2010 4:39:05 PM
To: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting
Hi Trina,

Thank you—this helps a bit in filling in the gaps.

If it works for you, let's schedule our talk after you send me the info about “orders” and SAP that you were going to get from [Redacted]. I think that would be the most effective use of everyone's time.

Steve

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2010 4:05 PM
To: Roscow, Steve
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Steve,

I think I mentioned when we spoke last week that I would send to you the org charts for the groups that supervise various CCA communications. Those org charts are in the attached documents and are described in the attached Word document.

I will call you next week to further follow up on our conversation. Have a nice weekend.

Trina

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:scr@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2010 1:09 PM
To: Horner, Trina
Cc: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Trina,

Sorry to hear that you were out sick some more last week—I hope you've managed to shake the bug!

In my response to you last week, I asked some follow-up questions about PG&E's claim for Section 583 protection for the data and the DR response word document. It would be helpful to have a response to that question soon.

Also, regarding Q2, I'm escalating that up to Brian in hopes that will result in a "responsive" response, w/o having to resort to formal discovery. PG&E's unwillingness to tell us who is working on this project and authorizing expenditures and use of staff time was a real eye-catcher with senior management here, last week.

Attaching your initial response, for Brian's benefit.

Steve

From: Roscow, Steve
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2010 5:31 PM
To: Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Trina,

Thanks-

As you might expect, I have to say your responses to #2 and #3 are insufficient, and non-responsive to my questions. I'll draft up some formal discovery, and if there is any interest internally in pursuing it, we'll provide it.

Also, why is the word document Section 583, and why is the "non-labor" spending Section 583? The labor info, with employee names, makes sense, but I don't understand the other parts?

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]
Sent: Mon 2/1/2010 5:00 PM
To: Roscow, Steve
Subject: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Steve,

As promised, I'm sending along the homework items from the meeting that [Redacted] and I had with you and Gurbux in late December regarding PG&E's CCA-related below-the-line accounting and procedures. FYI, I had the questions and answers put into the standard data request template just because that is the format that folks here are used to working with; that is the Word document. The Excel file contains the summary and detail of the Marin and SF expenses going back to 2007, in response to the first question; I think this is the same template used for the SJVPA-related expense reporting but definitely let me know if it is not what you wanted. As we discussed, this information is confidential, provided pursuant to P.U. Code Section 583.

Let me know if you'd like to discuss this information or if it raises further questions for you that PG&E can address.

Trina

<<ED Data Response CCA BTL 2-1-10.doc>> <<SF-MARIN CCA Expenses (ED Request).xls>>