

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 10/6/2010 10:07:14 AM
To: 'Kinosian, Robert' (robert.kinosian@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Ex Parte

Enjoy. Let's just get the debate behind us and develop something simple, sensible and easy to quantify going forward (from 2009 BTW !)

From: Kinosian, Robert [mailto:robert.kinosian@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 10:06 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Ex Parte

That's one of the two or three options being considered.

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 10:04 AM
To: Kinosian, Robert
Subject: RE: Ex Parte

Understood. That makes sense. Of course, if you use that logic, then the PFM was subsumed in the policy call and you can dispense with it.

From: Kinosian, Robert [mailto:robert.kinosian@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 10:03 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Ex Parte

I'm not expecting to make any changes based on numbers arguments. This was a policy call. The only thing that might change, from my perspective, is if we modify last year's numbers for Sempra based on their existing petition for modification of last year's decision. It's something I didn't address in the alternate, so I still need to resolve it one way or the other.

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 06, 2010 8:38 AM
To: Kinosian, Robert
Subject: Ex Parte

Bob - there were no hearings in the EE Incentives proceeding. Do you understand that to mean there are no requirements for ex parte reporting ? Also, I understand my fellow utilities each want a little bit more based on using different measurements, but I thought the numbers given us so far represent an overall compromise and incorporate pluses and minuses. If I'm wrong on that, then I may need to come in and chart with you.....