

From: Cherry, Brian K  
Sent: 5/20/2010 10:56:56 AM  
To: Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);  
'pac@cpuc.ca.gov' (pac@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: Edits to letter to 6000

This is unacceptable.

**From:** Horner, Trina  
**To:** Cherry, Brian K  
**Sent:** Thu May 20 10:52:30 2010  
**Subject:** Fw: Edits to letter to 6000

FYI. I haven't had a chance to look at yet. Paul wants to talk with me after the meeting.

**From:** Roscow, Steve <steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov>  
**To:** Horner, Trina; Weisz, Dawn <DWeisz@co.marin.ca.us>  
**Sent:** Thu May 20 10:48:10 2010  
**Subject:** RE: Edits to letter to 6000

Trina, Dawn—

I've reviewed PG&E's edits, and unfortunately, they do change the message a bit from simply apologizing for the letter and clearing up the incorrect info PG&E included in that letter. In particular, there is no need to include—yet again--instructions for opting out in this letter.

HOWEVER, I have devised an easy approach to the fix, which is reflected in the attached version. What I've done is "flipped" the editing process, using the "compare docs" function that Trina mentioned to start with PG&E's document, then impose my original on top of it as edits to PG&E's original. This makes the change in tone quite clear.

THEN, I went thru and highlighted (in green) the specific words that I expect PG&E found troublesome—I suggest we focus on finding more neutral replacement words that we all can live with, then wrap this up so we can get it reviewed by the higher-ups, and sent out. The end result will be a version close to my original, which MEA has already agreed they can live with.

I think the edits and next steps will be clear once you open the document.

Steve

**From:** Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 20, 2010 9:16 AM  
**To:** Weisz, Dawn; Roscow, Steve  
**Subject:** RE: Edits to letter to 6000

Hi Dawn, I'm sorry, I'm afraid I don't have that document as that's not how the letter was edited here. I know it's possible to do a "compare docs" function in Word though that should quickly give you the comparison you are looking for though.

I'll be available all afternoon to discuss, in the CPUC meeting from 10-noonish but I am happy to step out of that as well (glad for the excuse, actually) if that would work better for you. Just let me know.

Trina

415-722-6504 (mobile)

**From:** Weisz, Dawn [mailto:DWeisz@co.marin.ca.us]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 19, 2010 6:42 PM  
**To:** Horner, Trina; Roscow, Steve  
**Subject:** RE: Edits to letter to 6000

Hi Trina,

Could you send a version with Steve's changes all accepted and just your edits showing?

That would greatly simplify the review process.

Thanks!

Dawn

**From:** Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 19, 2010 6:28 PM  
**To:** Roscow, Steve; Weisz, Dawn  
**Subject:** RE: Edits to letter to 6000

Hi Steve and Dawn,

Attached is a clean copy of PG&E's edits to this letter (the track changes was getting a little overwhelming). I'd be happy to discuss more, but in a nutshell, we tried to keep this letter very factual and keep the focus on addressing those issues that were raised in the May 4th letter, as Steve suggests is a priority to MEA in his email below. Hopefully we've achieved that; let me know your thoughts and if/when you'd like to discuss further. Thanks,

Trina

**From:** Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 19, 2010 2:06 PM  
**To:** Horner, Trina; Weisz, Dawn  
**Subject:** Edits to letter to 6000

Trina, Dawn—

At the direction of Paul and Brian, I've been asked to "hurry up" on finalizing the letter that will be sent to all the customers to whom PG&E sent its May 4 letter. Just to put you both on the same footing, let me clarify that CPUC has received first drafts from both PG&E and MEA. The attached contains my edits of the MEA letter. Trina, just so PG&E folks understand, the most important aspect of this letter from MEA's perspective is that it correct the mis-statements in the May 4 letter. MEA does NOT want this to essentially serve as yet another explanation to customer of how they can opt-out. That information, I believe PG&E has agreed with Paul, should be reserved for the 2 remaining official mailers that MEA will be sending in the next 60 days. That's why I didn't start with the PG&E version.

Finally, Paul suggests that the letter be sent, and signed, by all 3 entities: CPUC, PG&E, MEA. That

said, I'd like the 3 of us to work thru the edits to this draft and come up with something we can recommend to Paul and Brian.

Let me know next steps. I'm free late today, and most of tomorrow.

Steve Roscow

CPUC Energy Division

415-703-1189

Email Disclaimer: <http://www.co.marin.ca.us/nav/misc/EmailDisclaimer.cfm>