

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: 10/1/2010 4:15:44 PM  
To: 'Zafar, Marzia' (marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov); Harvey, Sommer C. (sommer.harvey@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]  
[Redacted]  
Cc: Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); Esquivias, Roland (roland.esquivias@cpuc.ca.gov); Meeusen, Karl (karl.meeusen@cpuc.ca.gov); liz.hurst@draftfcb.com (liz.hurst@draftfcb.com); Caron, Jennifer (jennifer.caron@cpuc.ca.gov); Prosper, Terrie D. (terrie.prosper@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]  
[Redacted]; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com (liz.hurst@draftfcb.com)  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: Our Suggested Revisions to the Large Ag 60-Day Default Letter

Thank you - we will ensure these changes are incorporated into the final letter.

Best,  
[Re]

---

[Redacted]  
Director, Solutions Marketing  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
[Redacted]

**From:** Zafar, Marzia [mailto:marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 01, 2010 4:12 PM  
**To:** [Redacted]; Harvey, Sommer C.; [Redacted]  
**Cc:** Dietz, Sidney; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com; Esquivias, Roland; Meeusen, Karl; Caron, Jennifer; Prosper, Terrie D.; [Redacted]; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com  
**Subject:** RE: Our Suggested Revisions to the Large Ag 60-Day Default Letter

Hello,

great. thanks. I made two minor grammatical changes.

regards,  
marzia

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 01, 2010 4:04 PM  
**To:** Zafar, Marzia; Harvey, Sommer C.; [Redacted]  
**Cc:** Dietz, Sidney; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com; Esquivias, Roland; Meeusen, Karl; Caron, Jennifer; Prosper, Terrie D.; [Redacted]; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com  
**Subject:** RE: Our Suggested Revisions to the Large Ag 60-Day Default Letter

Marzia,

Thank you for clarifying the origin of the statement. That's very helpful. The "blue plan" deck that you reference was developed for customer research. It was shared with customers only as part of specific focus groups. Importantly, it was crafted to be initial "stimulus" to allow us to learn which key messages/information are most important to customers. This concept was crafted to guide and inform future messaging and outreach materials. Once we learned where to focus messages (based on customer feedback), we then developed actual outreach materials which were presented to our legal team to ensure how we articulate PDP messages is fully compliant with any/all required claims support.

Net, from this research, the feedback from customers was that they needed/wanted to know that the new pricing policy applied to multiple customer classes (that it wasn't just their industry segment being "singled out.") They also wanted to know that the policy wasn't just from PG&E, that the CPUC and other IOUs also support this effort.

With that information, we have kept the core concept, but adjusted the language to ensure that the claim is supportable. This is why we articulated the core concept as follows "This type of plan is a part of a larger policy supported by the California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) and all leading California utilities...."

Long answer to a short question. Hope this helps explain the change in our specific language.

In terms of the Large Ag 60 Day default letter and your comments - attached is an updated draft of the letter. Overall, generally we agree with many of your comments and recommendations. For the "Why PDP" section - calling attention to the varying costs (not just customer price) of energy for customers is an interesting idea and something that we will need to - and commit to - exploring with our policy and legal folks and with customers. I think it's an interesting way to articulate the context for PDP/time varying pricing. We don't have time to vet the language for this specific mailing (given that it's due today), but will explore it for future outreach.

Thanks,

[Redacted]

---

[Redacted]

Director, Solutions Marketing  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

[Redacted]

**From:** Zafar, Marzia [mailto:marzia.zafar@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 01, 2010 8:59 AM  
**To:** [Redacted]; Harvey, Sommer C.; [Redacted]  
**Cc:** Dietz, Sidney; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com; Esquivias, Roland; Meeusen, Karl; Caron, Jennifer; Prosper, Terrie D.  
**Subject:** RE: Our Suggested Revisions to the Large Ag 60-Day Default Letter

Hello,

We took that sentence from your power point that has the blue plan for large Ag, so maybe you can tell us what PG&E meant by that; I took it as CPUC directive and the CPUC in this case is the State of California. Also, if the letter is in draft we'd like to see what you incorporated before it goes out.

And thank you for spending a good two hour with us yesterday. We appreciate the dialogue and hope that we can build on this.

marzia

**From:** [Redacted]  
**Sent:** Friday, October 01, 2010 7:37 AM  
**To:** Harvey, Sommer C.; [Redacted]  
**Cc:** Dietz, Sidney; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com; Zafar, Marzia; Esquivias, Roland; Meeusen, Karl; Caron, Jennifer; Prosper, Terrie D.  
**Subject:** RE: Our Suggested Revisions to the Large Ag 60-Day Default Letter

Sommer,

Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback. We will seek to incorporate key points into the letters.

I had a questions about one point in your comments - the comments suggest framing the customer feedback that this new pricing structure affects many customers with the following language: "The State of California has directed all utilities, including PG&E, to make rates available to customers which reflect the true cost of electricity...."

I wanted to check with you all (and I'll check with our legal team as well) - to confirm the details of the statement. I understood (though, I could be mistaken) that time varying pricing is a policy direction from the CPUC (vs from Sacramento). So that all IOUs are implementing this policy - but I thought that MUNIs/CCA/DA customers, etc would not necessarily be required to implement this new pricing structure.

I don't have a strong POV on this point - in fact, I like the proposed language from your comments. I just wanted to double "fact check" the point.

Thanks again,

Redac

---

Redacted

Director, Solutions Marketing  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company

Redacted

**From:** Harvey, Sommer C. [mailto:sommer.harvey@cpuc.ca.gov]

**Sent:** Thursday, September 30, 2010 4:49 PM

**To:** Redacted

**Cc:** Dietz, Sidney; liz.hurst@draftfcb.com; Zafar, Marzia; Esquivias, Roland; Meeusen, Karl; Caron, Jennifer; Prosper, Terrie D.

**Subject:** Our Suggested Revisions to the Large Ag 60-Day Default Letter

Hi Erin & John,

Thanks for meeting with us earlier today. We've reviewed the 60-day default letter for Large Ag that you will be loading into your system tomorrow. I've attached a revised letter with our suggested changes. Unfortunately, we did not have time to review the 60-day default letter for Small Ag or the 30-day default letters by the end of today, but we're hoping that the attached revision will give you a sense of what we would like to see in those letters as well. Please let me know if you have any questions about our suggested revisions.

Regards,  
Sommer

Sommer Harvey

*Small Business Outreach Officer*

*California Public Utilities Commission*

505 Van Ness Avenue

San Francisco CA 94102-3298

Desk: (415) 703-1182, Cell: (415) 810-8904

[som@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:som@cpuc.ca.gov)