

From: Wong, John S.
Sent: 8/30/2010 5:12:05 PM
To: atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com (atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com); pinney@capp.ca (pinney@capp.ca); mrw@mrwassoc.com (mrw@mrwassoc.com); rothenergy@sbcglobal.net (rothenergy@sbcglobal.net); jheckler@levincap.com (jheckler@levincap.com); julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com (julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com); jdibble@calpine.com (jdibble@calpine.com); Yim@ZimmerLucas.com (Yim@ZimmerLucas.com); doug.vanbrunt@credit-suisse.com (doug.vanbrunt@credit-suisse.com); mnelson@mccarthylaw.com (mnelson@mccarthylaw.com); Stock, William (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WCS3); Orr, Carl (GT&D) (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CDO1); Graham, Roger (GT&D) (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=RAG5); filings@aklaw.com (filings@aklaw.com); klatt@energyattorney.com (klatt@energyattorney.com); ek@a-klaw.com (ek@a-klaw.com); marcie.milner@shell.com (marcie.milner@shell.com); michael.alexander@sce.com (michael.alexander@sce.com); ray.welch@navigantconsulting.com (ray.welch@navigantconsulting.com); JLSalazar@SempraUtilities.com (JLSalazar@SempraUtilities.com); peteresposito@earthlink.net (peteresposito@earthlink.net); william.tomlinson@el Paso.com (william.tomlinson@el Paso.com); bday@sparkenergy.com (bday@sparkenergy.com); eva_neufeld@transcanada.com (eva_neufeld@transcanada.com); Lei, Wendy (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=WMLb)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: FW: E-mail ruling re: Aug. 27, 2010 Motion of PG&E to Amend Procedural Schedule in A.09-09-013

To the Service List in A.09-09-013:

On August 27, 2010, PG&E filed its motion to amend procedural schedule. In an e-mail ruling that afternoon, I granted PG&E's request to shorten the time for parties to respond to PG&E's motion. Responses to PG&E's motion were due at 5:00 pm today. SDG&E and SoCalGas served a response to PG&E's motion.

SDG&E and SoCalGas state that they do not oppose PG&E's proposed amendment to the schedule, but seek clarification that the reference in the August 25, 2010 ALJ "Ruling Regarding the Process to Address the August 20, 2010 Motion for Approval of Gas Accord V Settlement Agreement" to "two issues that have not been settled" does not preclude or limit SDG&E and SoCalGas from raising other issues in this proceeding that are within the scope of this proceeding.

This e-mail ruling grants PG&E's request to modify the dates for serving the DRA and intervenor testimony, and for serving the concurrent rebuttal testimony, as set forth in the August 25, 2010 ALJ Ruling. Accordingly, the DRA and intervenor testimony (which addresses the party's pre-settlement position and/or the party's agreement or disagreement with the settlement) shall be served on **September 20, 2010**, so as to coincide with the Sept. 20, 2010 date for any party who plans to file comments contesting all or part of the settlement. The new date for the parties to serve concurrent rebuttal testimony shall be **October 11, 2010**. The evidentiary hearing dates of October 25-October 27, 2010 remain unchanged, if hearings are needed.

In addition, this e-mail ruling clarifies that the reference in the August 25, 2010 ALJ ruling to the "two issues that have not been settled..." does not preclude or limit any party from raising other issues that are within the scope of this proceeding. However, any party intending to raise an issue contesting all or part of the settlement, or an issue within the scope of this proceeding but which was not addressed by the settlement, must address such issues in the testimony which is to be served on September 20, 2010.

A written ruling confirming this e-mail ruling will issue next week.

John S. Wong

ALJ

CPUC

415 703-3130