

From: Woo, Shirley A (Law)
Sent: 11/22/2010 7:03:09 PM
To: Tan, Lee-Whei (lee-whei.tan@cpuc.ca.gov); Khoury, Dexter (dexter.khoury@cpuc.ca.gov); Mills Karen (kmills@cfbf.com); enriqueg@greenlining.org (enriqueg@greenlining.org); [Redacted]; [Redacted]; Mark Fulmer (mef@mrwassoc.com); Chan, Cherie (cherie.chan@cpuc.ca.gov); michael@kerntaxpayers.org (michael@kerntaxpayers.org)
Cc: [Redacted]; [Redacted]; GRC 2011 Phase II PMT (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GRC2011PHASEIIPMT); [Redacted]; Danforth, Christopher (christopher.danforth@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]; [Redacted]; Chan, Cherie (cherie.chan@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: PG&E 2011 GRC Phase 3 schedule -- DRA proposed changes

Karen, Lee-Whei,

I need to consult with my colleagues at PG&E on Karen's suggestion. We will try to get back to you by Wednesday.

With respect to Lee-Whei's dates, her schedule reduces the time for rebuttal slightly, which I can't accept. The full three weeks needs to be preserved, resulting in a rebuttal date of May 6.

(I will send this message to the parties in smaller groups to avoid spam filters.

Shirley

From: Mills Karen [mailto:K Mills@CFBF.com]
Sent: Monday, November 22, 2010 4:35 PM
To: Tan, Lee-Whei; Khoury, Dexter; [Redacted] michael@kerntaxpayers.org; enriqueg@greenlining.org; Mark Fulmer; Chan, Cherie; matthew@turn.org; Wendy Illingworth; William Booth; Barbara Barkovich; Nora Sheriff; Keith McCrea; douglass@energyattorney.com; Levin, Robert; Norman J CIV NAVFAC SW Furuta; larry.r.allen@navy.mil; Dan Geis; steven@moss.net; alison@bartlewells.com; prabv@dwt.com; mkasnitz@dralegal.org; Reed Schmidt; [Redacted]; Ed Poole; jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com; Carlos.Parente@sce.com; Charles Collins; thomas.long@sfgov.org; kfox@keyesandfox.com; pk@utilitycostmanagement.com; James A. Ross; Kevin Simonsen; Jeff Nahigian; Richard McCann; Tom Beach; dbyers@landuselaw.com; tgoldner@co.kern.ca.us; Roberts, Thomas; Bruce.Reed@sce.com; Russell.Garwacki@sce.com; bill@jbsenergy.com; Carolyn Kehrein; ifdrck@wziinc.com; Brubaker, Maurice
Cc: GRC 2011 Phase II PMT; [Redacted] Danforth, Christopher; Chan, Cherie
Subject: RE: PG&E 2011 GRC Phase 3 schedule -- DRA proposed changes

Lee-Whei—

Thank you for addressing this. I agree an extension is appropriate and suggest an additional 10 days or 2 weeks be added to your proposed dates for testimony, hearings and briefs as the tentative requested schedule for the SDG&E Dynamic Pricing proceeding is very close to the dates you have proposed. (I have attached a copy of that proposed schedule). Thank you,

Karen Norene Mills

California Farm Bureau Federation

From: Tan, Lee-Whei [mailto:lee-whei.tan@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Monday, November 22, 2010 12:27 PM

To: Khoury, Dexter; [Redacted] michael@kerntaxpayers.org; enriqueg@greenlining.org; Mark Fulmer; Chan, Cherie; matthew@turn.org; Wendy Illingworth; William Booth; Barbara Barkovich; Nora Sheriff; Keith McCrea; douglass@energyattorney.com; Levin, Robert; Norman J CIV NAVFAC SW Furuta; larry.r.allen@navy.mil; Dan Geis; steven@moss.net; alison@bartlewells.com; prabv@dwt.com; mkasnitz@dralegal.org; Reed Schmidt; [Redacted]; Ed Poole; jarmstrong@goodinmacbride.com; Carlos.Parente@sce.com; Charles Collins; thomas.long@sfgov.org; kfox@keyesandfox.com; pk@utilitycostmanagement.com; James A. Ross; Kevin Simonsen; Jeff Nahigian; Richard McCann; Tom Beach; dbyers@landuselaw.com; tgoldner@co.kern.ca.us; Roberts, Thomas; Bruce.Reed@sce.com; Russell.Garwacki@sce.com; bill@jbsenergy.com; Carolyn Kehrein; jfrdrck@wziinc.com; Mills Karen; Brubaker, Maurice

Cc: GRC 2011 Phase II PMT; [Redacted] Danforth, Christopher; Chan, Cherie

Subject: RE: PG&E 2011 GRC Phase 3 schedule -- DRA proposed changes

Dear all,

I know that all of us are focusing on hearings right now. However, the schedule for Phase 3 is a serious issue, and we intend to seek extension with the Judge and hope to get your support.

The current phase 3 schedule overlaps with the modified phase 2 (non-residential rate issues) schedule, and DRA's contract just got approved a couple weeks ago due to the long delay of California budget approval. The current phase 3 schedule

requires that DRA and the intervenors file testimony on February 5, 2011, which is just about a little over two months. There are also holidays (Thanksgiving, Christmas and New Year) to consider. Overall, it will not provide sufficient time for DRA's consultants to conduct an adequate review of PG&E's IT revenue requirements and may deprive the Commission with a complete record for an informed decision-making.

DRA's proposed new schedule for the Phase 3 is shown below:

PG&E GRC III, A.10-03-014, DRA Proposed Revision		
PG&E GRC III, A.10-03-014, Current Adopted Schedule		
Application	March. 2010	March. 2010
DRA and Intervenor Testimony	2/5/2011	3/15/2011
Concurrent Rebuttal Testimony	2/26/2011	4/5/2011
Evidentiary Hearings	03/22–25/2011	4/20 - 4/26/2011
Opening Briefs	4/19/2011	5/20/2011
Reply Briefs	5/7/2011	6/7/2011
Proposed Decision	August. 2011	Sept. 2011

Please let us know by COB Tuesday (Nov. 23, 2010) if you have any suggested changes or objections.

If we don't hear from you, we would take that as you do not object to the changes.

Thank you for your attention and time to consider this.

Lee-Whei Tan

DRA, Co-Project Coordinator

(415) 703-2901