

From: Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G.
Sent: 10/26/2010 1:31:39 PM
To: Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com (Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com)
Cc: Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Hardy, Katherine (katherine.hardy@cpuc.ca.gov); Lai, Peter (peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov); Besa, Athena (ABesa@semprautilities.com); larry.cope@sce.com (larry.cope@sce.com); don.arambula@sce.com (don.arambula@sce.com); Steven.Long@sce.com (Steven.Long@sce.com)

Bcc:

Subject: Re: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Alyssa -- thanks for your email below. However, I've learned that there was actually a later version of the document that was sent to the utilities (see attached email from Jeff H., with the May 27 version of the document). We would consider this May 27 version as the latest set of Energy Division recommendations that the utilities had, which I suppose you worked off on in preparing the attachment to the PFM.

-----Original Message-----

From: Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com [mailto:Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com]
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2010 2:11 PM
To: Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G.
Cc: Besa, Athena; Hardy, Katherine; Lai, Peter; Ramaiya, Shilpa R; Larry.Cope@sce.com; Don.Arambula@sce.com; Steven.Long@sce.com
Subject: Re: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Zeny and all-

I was able to track down the document we are considering the "original", which was sent from Natalie Walsh to the IOUs on 5/21/10. Her email specified this was the final version, pending any additional IOU suggested edits (note that subsequent IOU suggested edits were submitted, but we have not considered these agreed to, as we are not aware of a final response to these proposals). However, in comparing this document to the IOU-filed version, there are significant differences, as the IOU filed version is essentially a summary of issues we considered most critical, and pared down/rearranged substantially. As such, while much of the content is the same, redlining the document results in a completely redlined document, which doesn't effectively portray agreements and differences.

I've attached the original from ED (with the original email from Natalie for context) and the version filed in the PFM by the IOUs. We'd propose that rather than submit a redlined version, a summary of key differences could be developed, or a table that shows each issue, each parties position, and outstanding concerns for easy identification.

Please let us know how you'd like to proceed and we can provide whatever is needed.

Thanks,

(See attached file: 5.21.10 Custom Process from ED to IOUs-Clean.DOC)(See attached file: Email from ED- Custom Process.pdf)(See attached file: Appendix C- Customized Project Approach.doc)

Alyssa Cherry
Regulatory Group
Customer Energy Efficiency & Solar Division
Southern California Edison
Internal PAX 43129 External 626-633-3129 "The reward of a thing well done is to have done it." - Emerson

From: "Tapawan-Conway, Zenaida G." <zenaida.tapawan-conway@cpuc.ca.gov>
To: "Besa, Athena" <ABesa@semprautilities.com>, <Alyssa.Cherry@sce.com>
Cc: "Lai, Peter" <peter.lai@cpuc.ca.gov>, "Hardy, Katherine" <katherine.hardy@cpuc.ca.gov>
Date: 10/25/2010 10:44 AM
Subject: redlined version of the Appendix C in the PFM

Athena/Alyssa -- per our conversation last Friday at the PHC, please send us ASAP today the IOUs' redlined version of the Custom Project Application review process document that's attached as Appendix C to the PFM. Based on the discussion at the PHC, my understanding is that we're supposed to show the initial Energy Division proposed document, with the IOUs' edits, so that parties can see our recommendations. We'd like to start with that redlined version first and see if that could be the attachment to the forthcoming ALJ ruling on this matter. Thanks!