

From: Diaz De La Rubia, Tomas  
Sent: 10/27/2010 9:53:28 PM  
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7); cab@cpuc.ca.gov (cab@cpuc.ca.gov); mpl@cpuc.ca.gov (mpl@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc: Rose-McConville, Lisa L. (rosemcconville1@llnl.gov); Dempsey, Pat (dempsey4@llnl.gov); Tomas Diaz de la Rubia (delarubia@llnl.gov)  
Bcc:  
Subject: Re: P21 Proposal Summary to PG&E and CPUC

Dear Brian,

Thank you for the quick response. The High Performance Computing Innovation Center (HPC-IC) described in the document is part of the off-campus site and a main element of our Livermore Valley Open Campus (LVOC) effort. The P21 will contribute \$25 million to this center which will provide the full power of people and computing systems we discussed as an essential component of making this partnership a success. We have, however, reduced the costs to this partnerships related to the HPC-IC from the original \$50 million by leveraging some of LLNL's own internal funds for computing hardware purchases. However, I am curious about your comment below regarding rate-basing the hardware portion of the investment. If you would like, we can discuss this in more detail before our November 3 lunch meeting in San Francisco. I would be happy to find a convenient time to drive into the City and get together to go over the rationale and details for these plans in some more detail.

Cheers,  
Tomás

On 10/27/10 1:20 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <[BKC7@pge.com](mailto:BKC7@pge.com)> wrote:

Tiomas - thanks for the update. In reading this document, it looks like you have dropped the off-campus site proposal (separate from the secure area) and eliminated the dedicated computer resources (moved more to utilizing existing DOE/National Security computers). Are the proposed savings from eliminating these items really worth it? I'd suggest it is

something we should revisit, understanding that Edison may have a problem with it. Having a site outside the secure area would lead to greater access and functionality for the private and public sectors. On the computer side, if we are worried about hardware costs of another \$10-\$20 million per participant over 5 years, perhaps we could find a way to rate base that portion of the investment. I suspect the other utilities might find this more palatable. Just a thought.

**From:** Rose-McConville, Lisa L.  
[<mailto:rosemcconville1@lnl.gov>] **On Behalf Of** Diaz De La Rubia, Tomas  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 27, 2010 12:06 PM  
**To:** Cherry, Brian K; [cab@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:cab@cpuc.ca.gov); [mp1@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:mp1@cpuc.ca.gov)  
**Cc:** Dempsey, Pat; Diaz De La Rubia, Tomas; Rose-McConville, Lisa L.  
**Subject:** P21 Proposal Summary to PG&E and CPUC

Please see the attached copy of an update to the P21 proposal. This has been worked extensively with Bruce Foster's staff at Southern California Edison. If you have questions, please feel free to contact me.

Cheers,

Tomás

Tomás Díaz de la Rubia  
Deputy Director for Science and Technology  
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory  
P.O. Box 808, L-001  
Livermore, CA 94551  
Phone: 925-422-6714