

From: Redacted
Sent: 8/5/2010 3:36:27 PM
To: 'mlc@cpuc.ca.gov' (mlc@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Hughes, John (Reg Rel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J8HS); 'trp@cpuc.ca.gov' (trp@cpuc.ca.gov); 'dyk@cpuc.ca.gov' (dyk@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: Request for approval of Pending Notice of Ex parte Communication filing (Confirmation#34391)

Hello Michele,

On August 2, I requested help (via email) from Docket regarding our Notice of Ex parte Communication filing (noted below). Since I didn't hear back from Docket, I went ahead and efiled the Notice of Ex parte Communication and served the parties to avoid violation of the PU Code.

Today, around 2:40pm, Domenica Ko phoned me and stated that our Notice of Ex parte Communication approval is pending due to exhibits 1, 2, and 3 presented during the meeting with Mr. Murtishaw (Advisor to Comm Pres Peevey). The fact that the exhibits are not on file with the CPUC-Docket, which were served to the parties, I was asked to request your approval for acceptance of our Notice of Ex parte Communication as filed.

For further question regarding the exhibits, please contact John Hughes at 415/973-3652 or email at j8hs@pge.com.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Redacted

From: Redacted
Sent: Monday, August 02, 2010 2:42 PM
To: 'efile-help@cpuc.ca.gov'
Subject: Pending Notice of Ex parte Communication filing

Docket, I need your help before I efile:

Q: Is the language highlighted below acceptable and the attached web links?

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval to Revise its Electric Marginal Costs, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design, including Real Time Pricing, to Revise its Customer Energy Statements, and to Seek Recovery of Incremental Expenditures. (U39M).

Application 10-03-014

(Filed March 22, 2010)

NOTICE OF *EX PARTE* COMMUNICATION

Pursuant to Rule 8.3(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) hereby gives notice of the following *ex parte* communication. The communication occurred on Wednesday, July 28, 2010 at approximately 3:30 p.m. to the offices of the California Public Utilities Commission in San Francisco. The communication was oral, and **copies of PG&E's Phase 2 GRC application filed March 22, 2010 and exhibits 1, 2 and 3 were handed out. Due to size of referenced documents, web links are provide below of this notice.** [Rule 8.3(a)(c)]

Mr. Hughes gave an oral summary of the GRC Phase 2 application. He stated that PG&E is proposing a \$3.00 a month residential customer charge for non-Care customers. Currently PG&E does not have a customer charge. He pointed to a page in the filed testimony that illustrates that several Investor Owned Utilities throughout the United States have a customer charge as high as \$16.00 a month. He stated that several of the municipally owned utilities in California have a customer charge. For example, SMUD has a \$7.00 a month customer charge.

Mr. Hughes stated that PG&E proposes to collapse its currently authorized 4 tier rate structure into 3 tiers and also decrease the baseline quantities in Tier 1 and 2. As a result the proposed Tier 3 rate would drop to \$ 0. 298 per kWh and be more in line with the upper tier rates charged by Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and Electric. [Rule 8.3(c)]

To obtain a copy of this notice, please notify

Redacted

or via email at

Redacted

Respectfully submitted,

Redacted

Redacted

Dated: August 2, 2010

Link for application filed March 22, 2010:

https://www.pge.com/regulation/GRC2011-Ph-II/Pleadings/PGE/2010/GRC2011-Ph-II_Plea_PGE_20100322-01.pdf

Link for exhibits 1, 2, and 3:

<http://apps.pge.com/regulation/SearchResults.aspx?NewSearch=True&CaseID=921&DocType=>

Redacted