

From: Clanon, Paul
Sent: 5/21/2010 9:47:41 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7);
Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);
Roscow, Steve (steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Redacted
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter

MEA gave Steve some markups last night, and Steve and I are trying to do a call with them in the next few minutes to discuss.

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@PGE.COM]
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 9:47 AM
To: Horner, Trina; Roscow, Steve; Clanon, Paul
Cc: Redacted
Subject: RE: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter

Can someone tell me where we are on the letter ?

From: Horner, Trina
Sent: Friday, May 21, 2010 9:45 AM
To: 'Roscow, Steve'; 'Clanon, Paul'
Cc: Cherry, Brian K; Redacted
Subject: RE: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter

Hi Paul and Steve,

Just to finish out my homework items from yesterday:

- 1) I can confirm that the turnaround time for the letter is 2-3 days. With changes to the standard envelope, it is 5-7 days, with best-efforts to get it done more quickly than that.
- 2) On the envelope recommendation, marketing folks here recommend adding a tag line to the outside of the envelope with "Inside: A message from PG&E, Marin Energy Authority and the California Public Utilities Commission".
- 3) One change suggested to the letter from the marketing folks was to change the phrase "PG&E has suspended any opt-out requests" to "PG&E will not process any opt-out requests ...". Their thinking is that "suspended" is ambiguous: it doesn't explicitly tell the customer that we are not opting them out.

Let us know what you think.
Trina

From: Horner, Trina
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 4:59 PM
To: 'Roscow, Steve'; Clanon, Paul
Cc: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter

Hi Steve,

There's MORE space to breath without that sentence in there! :) (sorry - I think that's Paul's sense of humor rubbing off on me)

Hopefully, there's no faulting of anyone in this letter. ALL of the different rate changes and who has what rates in place at what point and who is basing what rates off of whose, all really point to not including this sentence. The important point to communicate (and clarify from the 5/4 letter) is that MEA has been in the making for the better part of 6 years and has done so in an informed way -- and the letter does that.

Like I said, we can get an autograph from a well-placed officer level type for this draft (w/o the lower rate sentence). If there are any other edits you have or MEA has, or if you've heard from MEA about their 3rd Customer Notification date, let us know.

thanks...

Trina

From: Roscow, Steve [mailto:steve.roscow@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 4:38 PM
To: Horner, Trina; Clanon, Paul
Cc: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter

Trina, thanks. Generally, I see your point and I've told Paul that I have no problems deleting that sentence, though I'm checking with MEA to see if there is something we are all missing. More broadly, I've observed that MEA seems to have a business model based on simply matching PG&E's rates, then using the revenue to pay Shell and run their operation. Based on their public filings, PG&E's recent spate of rate changes (CIA, summer rate relief, GRC phase 2 tier changes) have caught them unawares, and their public process prevents them from instantly changing their rates to match PG&E's new rates. So I don't think it is fair, or on point, actually, to fault them for that. PG&E can't change its rates overnight, either. They have been upfront in the public meetings I have attended as to what their business model is doing.

I thought y'all committed to Paul to back off and give them some breathing space, no?

Steve

From: Horner, Trina [mailto:TNHc@pge.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 3:59 PM
To: Clanon, Paul; Roscow, Steve
Cc: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter

Hi Paul and Steve, thanks again for taking the time to talk this morning. Some folks here are less impressed with our work than we were. Brian has beat them back on pretty much everything, except there is strong disagreement -- even on a factual level -- with the sentence "Indeed, MCE believes that its current rates are the same as or lower than those charged by PG&E".

Factually, I've since confirmed that MEA customers will indeed be billed the CRS by PG&E regardless of whether they are a MCE or PG&E procurement customer. It may be that MEA is going to reduce their rates by that same amount anyway, which is maybe what you were referring to Steve when you said they are going to eat it. In any case, certain rates - like PG&E's Tier 5 rate approved by the CPUC today - are in fact going to be lower than MCE's. So it depends on which rate(s) you are talking about as being lower, and we are already splitting hairs since we're getting down to the PCIA. So PG&E doesn't agree this is factually true. Even saying the "MCE believes" its rates are lower is different from what MCE has said previously -- MCE's official Notification to customers (which we found posted on their web site) says their rates are "the same rates you currently pay" to PG&E.

With that sentence out, PG&E is ready to sign. The attached has one last edit, marked, replacing "correct" with "clarify", for your consideration.

In terms of timing, I am still confirming but my preliminary understanding is that the letter with three logos and a standard envelope should be 2, maybe 3 days max. With changes to the envelope, it is 5-7 days. Will confirm.

Let me know your thoughts and what you've heard from MEA. Thanks again.

Trina

From: Clanon, Paul [mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 20, 2010 12:11 PM
To: Roscow, Steve; Horner, Trina
Subject: Latest Markup MEA/PUC/PG&E Letter