From: Kinosian, Robert
Sent: 9/29/2010 11:53:10 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: ordering paragraphs are identical

Works for me.

**From:** Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2010 11:48 AM
**To:** Kinosian, Robert
**Subject:** RE: ordering paragraphs are identical

We support the alternate. That said, DRA and TURN won't so why don't we plan on seeing John after they do.

**From:** Kinosian, Robert [mailto:robert.kinosian@cpuc.ca.gov]
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2010 11:46 AM
**To:** Cherry, Brian K
**Subject:** RE: ordering paragraphs are identical

John is fine with our alternate, so I don't think he needs any arm twisting on it, though it never hurts to indicate if you can "live" with it. I think it would be a waste of your time to argue for the IOU proposal vs what we put forth in the alternate, unless you think there is a major problem with the alternate. However, once we see what TURN and DRA say, it might be worth a visit to refute them.

**From:** Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2010 11:33 AM
**To:** Kinosian, Robert
**Subject:** RE: ordering paragraphs are identical

Hey, we have the same problems on our end from time to time too.

Any advice on lobbying ? Does John want us to come in and talk to him ?

**From:** Kinosian, Robert [mailto:robert.kinosian@cpuc.ca.gov]
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 29, 2010 11:32 AM
**To:** Cherry, Brian K
**Subject:** RE: ordering paragraphs are identical

Awesome, guess that means steno didn't include the other couple of clean up edits that were supposed to go in.

**From:** Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 5:11 PM
**To:** Kinosian, Robert
**Subject:** FW: ordering paragraphs are identical

FYI. Procedural boo boo

---

**From:** Dietz, Sidney
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 28, 2010 4:42 PM
**To:** Cherry, Brian K
**Subject:** ordering paragraphs are identical

The alternate cites the controversy, then sticks with the holdback amounts from the previous decision. But then, it leaves the ordering paragraphs the same as the PD. However, the first-page analysis says 77M for the four utilities, which doesn't match the O.P.s. I printed out copies for you, they are on your chair.