

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 4/29/2010 3:31:12 PM
To: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);
'Roscow, Steve' (steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

I appreciate it Steve. Something I should have clarified in my earlier email about the timing issue is that reasonable turn around deadlines would obviously depend on the extent of the data request.

Thanks again.

Daren

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 3:22 PM
To: Chan, Daren; Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi [Redacted]

Yes, I realize this isn't sustainable for very long. Let me think a bit, as some of my questions so far have been in the nature of quick "clarifications", like the missing names and the update of the Order list, but I can see I'm getting closer to substance that might need more turnaround time.

I'll try to get back to you tomorrow with a workable approach.

Steve

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 1:58 PM
To: Roscow, Steve; Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Steve,

We're working on answering your most recent questions and hope to have a response to you by tomorrow, but I had a thought and wanted to run it by you. For PG&E's sake we are trying to keep track of all the questions that you have in regards to the BTL data response we sent to you this week. My guess is that as you are reviewing the data multiple questions are coming up. Instead of the informal emails that you and I have been exchanging I think it would be helpful, at least from PG&E's end, if we could receive all of the questions at once in a more formal data request (ie data request 2 or supplemental data request); this would allow PG&E to keep a formal history of all the questions and provide one comprehensive response to you.

Also, it would be extremely helpful to us if when you send the data request we could have up to 3 to 5 business days to respond to the questions. Our goal is to respond to your questions as quickly as possible, but setting a reasonable timeframe to respond would allow us to manage our resources better. I believe with advice letter data request GO 96-B allows for 5 business days to respond.

Let me know what you think about this. For our response below and for the questions that you have asked and I have responded to up to this point I am going to roll those all into PG&E's formal data response.

Thanks,

Redacted

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 9:37 AM
To: [Redacted]; Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Daren,

Thank you again. This update helps, but is also confusing, and here's why:

First example: one of the new Orders is below:

Redacted

Redacted

Here's a second example:

Redacted

If you could shed some light on this, that would help us understand what we are seeing in these reports.

Thanks again,

Steve Roscow

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189

From: Redacted

Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2010 8:30 AM

To: Roscow, Steve; Horner, Trina

Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Proprietary and Confidential under PU Code 583 Do Not Disclose

SB_GT&S_0488897

Steve,

Per your request, please find attached the SF-Marine CCA Orders list which has been updated to reflect new orders for Q1 2010.

Daren

R
e
d
a
c
t
e
d

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 11:47 AM
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Daren and Trina,

I'm forwarding back to you a spreadsheet that Trina provided to us last month, which contains the names of the PG&E folks who are monitoring this spending. In the spending data that you provided yesterday, there are several new "Orders" that are not included on the spreadsheet. Could you update this spreadsheet with the relevant information for these orders?

Thanks again—here's the list:

Redacted

Redacted

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 18, 2010 2:51 PM
To: Roscow, Steve; [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Steve, Jake, recall that I was going to send to you the spreadsheet that includes the names of the people who are monitoring the CCA BTL order number charges. It's attached. My apologies for the delay - I tried to tinker with it to figure out why it didn't print the last column and I am sure it is something very simple but my excel skills are so rusty I gave up. But it shows up on the screen.

Trina

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 10, 2010 1:31 PM
To: Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Trina,

We are still planning to meet with you and Redacted tomorrow—could you confirm?

Redacted

Thanks again,

Steve

From: Roscow, Steve
Sent: Monday, March 08, 2010 1:18 PM
To: 'Horner, Trina'
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Trina, yes, that sounds good. Let me know your preferred time, and I'll try to block out a room here, and again, we are happy to come to Beale street, if that is easier.

I think you were also going to provide some more written material "before" we met? I'll send a clarifying note about that later today, if that would be helpful, but in the meantime, I'll block out Thursday afternoon.

Steve

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@PGE.COM]
Sent: Sunday, March 07, 2010 12:53 PM
To: Roscow, Steve
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Steve, how would Thursday afternoon work? I am out of the office early in the week but Thursday afternoon looks good for both Redacted and me. Let me know.

Trina

From: Horner, Trina
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 2:39 PM
To: 'Roscow, Steve'
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

I'm really sorry to hear you got that bug, it's NO fun at all. I am sure we can find a time next week to meet up, assuming Karen is around. I'll check.

Hope you have a restful weekend.

Trina

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, March 05, 2010 12:21 PM
To: Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Hi Trina,

Since we last exchanged notes, that "bug" that knocked you out seems to have caught up with me--I'm in Day 10 of this thing, but hoping I'm almost done with it. Is there a day next week that works for you and Karen to come meet with me and one of my staffers? Let's try to set something up for sure--we'd be happy to come downtown, if that works too.

Thanks,

Steve

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]
Sent: Fri 2/19/2010 4:54 PM
To: Roscow, Steve
Subject: Re: Homework from CCA BTL meeting

Yes, that's what I was referring to - somewhat obliquely. I intend to get clarity on that next week. Have a nice weekend.
Trina

From: Roscow, Steve <scr@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: Horner, Trina
Sent: Fri Feb 19 16:39:05 2010
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 Karen Crowley 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>>