

From: Horner, Trina  
Sent: 4/28/2010 9:49:43 PM  
To: [Redacted] Velasquez,  
Carlos A. (carlos.velasquez@cpuc.ca.gov); Kahlon, Gurbux  
(gurbux.kahlon@cpuc.ca.gov); 'Roscow, Steve' (steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc: [Redacted]  
Fitch, Julie A. (julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: Resolution E-4250, PG&E compliance with OP 2.C.

Steve and Carlos, thanks for the feedback. Folks here are (and have been) working quite diligently to make all of the various changes ordered in E-4250 and suggested by Carlos, but I appreciate that those efforts and process have not been as transparent to you as they could have been. I take responsibility for that and we'll put together a proposal to make it more so.

The work folks have been doing here is coming together and you should see very shortly some draft language on various issues, as follow-up to the conversations with Carlos.

Trina

**From:** Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 28, 2010 12:31 PM  
**To:** Velasquez, Carlos A.; [Redacted] Kahlon, Gurbux  
**Cc:** Horner, Trina; [Redacted]; Fitch, Julie A.  
**Subject:** RE: Resolution E-4250, PG&E compliance with OP 2.C.

PG&E folks:

I appreciate Roger's responses, but at the same time, the ad hoc nature of this is not working for Energy Division. We expect these changes, which are necessary for PG&E to be in compliance with the Orders in the Resolution, to be immediate.

To that end, I'd like PG&E to propose a simple protocol that establishes the timeline you will follow with your ongoing changes as well as in response to changes ED states are necessary, as Carlos has done in the attached note. For example, PG&E receives a request from ED on Day 1, is required to either make the change or respond to ED on Day 2, ED responds by Day 3, and the change goes live on Day 4. As it is, Carlos made suggestions last Friday (Day 1) and we have not yet even received a response today (Day 4). This is unacceptable, as your customers are going to your website all the time.

Finally, a side-note to [Redacted] I understand you have been making legal arguments to Carlos on these calls, and if you are going to do that, we would like you to make them in writing so that we can involve our attorneys as well. ED staff (non-attorneys) cannot respond to legal arguments from PG&E, for obvious reasons. We also cannot have a lawyer on every "nuts and bolts" call. So I've got to request that you put these arguments in writing.

Thanks to all--

Steve Roscow

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189

**From:** Velasquez, Carlos A.  
**Sent:** Monday, April 26, 2010 7:04 PM  
**To:** [Redacted]; Roscow, Steve; Kahlon, Gurbux  
**Cc:** Horner, [Redacted]; Fitch, Julie A.  
**Subject:** RE: Resolution E-4250, PG&E compliance with OP 2.C.

Thanks Roger. When can we expect an update on the rest of the issues that I raised in that email?

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

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 26, 2010 6:54 PM  
**To:** Velasquez, Carlos A.; Roscow, Steve; Kahlon, Gurbux  
**Cc:** Horner, Trina; [Redacted]; Fitch, Julie A.  
**Subject:** Resolution E-4250, PG&E compliance with OP 2.C.

Hi Carlos, Steve and Gurbux,

I can confirm that the hyperlink to the Commission's CCA webpage on PG&E's CCA web site is now "active", as requested by Energy Division email of April 23, 2010 at 7:02 pm. You should be able to verify it on the link below.

[www.pge.com/cca](http://www.pge.com/cca)

This email complies with O.P. 2.C of Resolution E-4250:

"In the future, whenever any of the utilities modify their websites to include new or revised language, illustrations, or images regarding the CCA program they shall notify the Energy Division on the same day they make the modification."

Please let Trina, Jon or me know if you have any questions about this change.

Thanks,

Redacted