

From: Nora Sheriff
Sent: 8/24/2010 5:55:22 PM
To: Redacted James
Weil (jweil@aglet.org)
Cc: ljt@cpuc.ca.gov (ljt@cpuc.ca.gov); ckt@cpuc.ca.gov (ckt@cpuc.ca.gov); Bob Finkelstein (bfinkelstein@turn.org); Liebert Ron (RLiebert@CFBF.com); douglass@energyattorney.com (douglass@energyattorney.com); rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com (rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com); wendy@econinsights.com (wendy@econinsights.com); lex@consumercal.org (lex@consumercal.org); O'Neill, Edward (edwardoneill@dwt.com); mef@mrwassoc.com (mef@mrwassoc.com); Yoo, Salle (salleyoo@dwt.com); Prabhakaran, Vidhya (VidhyaPrabhakaran@dwt.com); Yura, Jane (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JKY1); Frank, Steven (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SWF5); Singh, Amrit P (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=APS5); atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com (atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com); StephanieC@greenlining.org (StephanieC@greenlining.org); Enrique Gallardo (enriqueg@greenlining.org); David J. Byers (dbyers@landuselaw.com)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: A.09-12-020 PG&E GRC ** CONFIDENTIAL **

Patrick & PG&E Team:

EPUC a few following questions on offer #11; to the extent PG&E can provide answers on tomorrow morning's call, it would be helpful.

- 4.3: What is PG&E's intent with the changed language in 4.3 on Tesla? Are just the cancellation expenses removed from the 2011 rev req to get to the \$395 M increase? Is the \$26.6 million in Tesla capital (for which PG&E sought placement in ratebase as PHFU) to be litigated? How would PG&E intend for the litigation result for Tesla capital to be incorporated into PG&E's 2011 revenue requirement?

- 4.4: what are the capital costs of Britton powerhouse (both total capital dollars and revenue requirement)

- 9.2: what is the nuclear fuel inventory revenue requirement associated with the 2% bump to the commercial paper rate

On the table on page 8:

- Line 7: why did the expense reduction drop to (28) in offer #11 from (42) in offer #9?
- Line 18: why did the capital expenditures reduction drop from (50) in offers #7 and #9 to (40) in offer#11
- Line 18: is offer #11's removal of the (27) reduction to rate base that was in offer #9 associated with the proposed litigation of Tesla PHFU?

Thanks,

Nora

Nora Sheriff

Alcantar & Kahl

www.a-klaw.com

415.421.4143

From: Redacted

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 12:13 PM

To: James Weil

Cc: ljt@cpuc.ca.gov; ckt@cpuc.ca.gov; Bob Finkelstein; Liebert Ron; wendy@econinsights.com; Nora Sheriff; O'Neill, Edward; Yoo, Salle; Prabhakaran, Vidhya; lex@consumercal.org; rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com; douglass@energyattorney.com; mef@mrwassoc.com; David J. Byers; stephaniec@greenlining.org; Enrique Gallardo; atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com; Singh, Amrit P; Yura, Jane; Frank, Steven (Law)

Subject: RE: A.09-12-020 PG&E GRC ** CONFIDENTIAL **

James, et al:

Here are the numbers for the 10 am call tomorrow:

Redacted

Patrick

From: James Weil [mailto:jweil@aglet.org]

Sent: Tuesday, August 24, 2010 12:00 PM

To: Redacted

Cc: ljt@cpuc.ca.gov; ckt@cpuc.ca.gov; 'Bob Finkelstein'; 'Lieber Ron'; wendy@econinsights.com; 'Nora Sheriff'; 'O'Neill, Edward'; 'Yoo, Salle'; 'Prabhakaran, Vidhya'; lex@consumercal.org; rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com; douglass@energyattorney.com; mef@mrwassoc.com; 'David J. Byers'; stephaniec@greenlining.org; 'Enrique Gallardo'; atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com

Subject: A.09-12-020 PG&E GRC ** CONFIDENTIAL **

Patrick,

On behalf of the active participants in the Intervenor Group, I request that PG&E arrange a conference call at 10 am tomorrow, Wednesday, Aug 24. The purpose of the call would be for DRA and intervenors to ask clarification questions about PG&E's Offer #11. I understand that PG&E might not be able to answer all possible questions immediately, but I hope that tomorrow's call will expedite the process.

James Weil, for Aglet