

From: Cherry, Brian K  
Sent: 5/6/2010 4:56:43 PM  
To: 'Fitch, Julie A.' (julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: IMPORTANT: CCA "below the line" spending: NEW Energy Division request for April 2010 information

Agreed. I don't deny that it is similar. In fact, it most likely should be disclosed in the 77M when filed and in reports we make to the FPPC. It isn't sunshine I'm concerned about. It is more a question of timing and why now.

Our folks are calmed down. I told Edison and they had checked with Bob and are willing to be patient. I didn't have the heart to tell Sempra. I figured they need to work for their information instead of being a free rider....and they are still bouncing off the ceiling.

**From:** Fitch, Julie A. [mailto:julie.fitch@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 06, 2010 4:53 PM  
**To:** Cherry, Brian K  
**Subject:** RE: IMPORTANT: CCA "below the line" spending: NEW Energy Division request for April 2010 information

Let us talk it over and I'll get back to you. I would note that I think it's generally similar to the information about spending on a political campaign. Light of day does seem reasonably justified. But that's just me.

Are folks calmed down about the EE RRIM ruling?

Julie

**From:** Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@PGE.COM]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 06, 2010 3:46 PM  
**To:** Fitch, Julie A.  
**Subject:** FW: IMPORTANT: CCA "below the line" spending: NEW Energy Division request for April 2010 information

Julie - my apologies. I missed seeing you after the PUC meeting to discuss. I understand Steve would like to release this information to the press. It consists of below the line shareholder funded dollars we have spent on CCA activities to date and there is an outstanding request for the most recent balances through April. Is there an over-riding public policy need to present this breakdown to the press ? I will have to jump through a large number of hoops internally to get the authority internally to release this data. I can do that but I wonder what the need really is. I also understand that the Commission can in its discretion choose to waive the 583 privilege. Is this issue that important for everyone right now given the letter that I sent under my signature today ?

**From:** Redacted

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 05, 2010 8:30 AM

**To:** Kiyota, Travis; Horner, Trina; Cherry, Brian K

**Cc:** Hartman, Sanford (Law); Warner, Christopher (Law)

**Subject:** RE: IMPORTANT: CCA "below the line" spending: NEW Energy Division request for April 2010 information

This is the table Steve is proposing to share with the press.

**SAN FRANCISCO AND MARIN BELOW THE LINE  
CCA EXPENSES**

**FOR THE PERIOD: JANUARY 1, 2007 THROUGH  
DECEMBER 31, 2009**

	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>Total by Area</b>
<b>San Francisco</b>					
Labor and Labor Related \$	187,326 \$	37,145 \$	66,960 \$	65,570 \$	357,000
Materials and Contracts \$	194,078 \$	57,840 \$	19,079 \$	823,054 \$	1,094,051
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 381,404</b>	<b>\$ 94,984</b>	<b>\$ 86,038</b>	<b>\$ 888,624</b>	<b>\$ 1,451,051</b>
<b>Marin</b>					
Labor and Labor Related \$	97,573 \$	487,422 \$	251,399 \$	272,122 \$	1,108,516
Materials and Contracts \$	25,900 \$	325,095 \$	496,088 \$	\$1,863,680	\$ 2,710,763
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 123,473</b>	<b>\$ 812,517</b>	<b>\$ 747,487</b>	<b>\$2,135,802</b>	<b>\$ 3,819,279</b>
<b>Unclassified</b>					
Labor and Labor Related \$	300 \$	10,449 \$	5,476 \$	1,953 \$	18,178
Materials and Contracts \$	5,000 \$	- \$	- \$	- \$	5,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 5,300</b>	<b>\$ 10,449</b>	<b>\$ 5,476</b>	<b>\$ 1,953</b>	<b>\$ 23,178</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 510,176</b>	<b>\$ 917,951</b>	<b>\$ 839,002</b>	<b>\$3,026,379</b>	<b>\$ 5,293,508</b>