

From: Myers, Richard A.
Sent: 12/16/2010 4:43:11 PM
To: Marre, Charles (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=CMM6); Cadenasso, Eugene (eugene.cadenasso@cpuc.ca.gov); Kahlon, Gurbux (gurbux.kahlon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Stock, William (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WCS3); Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);

Redacted

Bcc:
Subject: RE: Line 132

Chuck, there seems to be a difference in a certain authorized/forecasted number between what you provided in the spreadsheet and what was provided to the CPUC in its Oct 4, 2010 response to Paul Clanon.

In Work Code 75, here are the figures that you show as totals in the spreadsheet 2008 Rate Case vs Actuals

in millions

Recorded
Forecast

2009	
\$28.5	\$19.9

Here's what was provided by PG&E in the Oct. 4, 2010 response to Paul Clanon

Recorded
Authorized

2009	
\$28.5	
\$30.3	

Can you explain this difference? Why is there such a large difference between the 2009 "forecasted" number you provided, and the "authorized" number provided in response to Paul Clanon?

Is there a difference in definitions between "authorized" and "forecast" between these two submissions?

Richard Myers, CPUC

From: Marre, Charles [mailto:CMM6@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 15, 2010 5:58 PM
To: Kahlon,
Gurbux; Cadenasso, Eugene; Myers, Richard A.
Cc: Stock, William;
Horner, Trina; [Redacted]; Marre, Charles
Subject: RE: Line
132

Gurbux

Following up on our call today and my note from last night, attached is the updated spreadsheet to reflect 2006. I've modified the headings of some of the columns - hopefully this provides greater clarity. In addition, I have added a summary tab to compare the total forecast amount by category of work those projects forecasted in the 2008 GT&S rate case and not worked to the total recorded costs for those projects worked and not included in the 2008 GT&S rate case.

Also, as we discussed today, I will add the two additional categories of work - Manage Buildings and Power Plant Gas Metering - and update the spreadsheet sometime tomorrow. As a point of reference for these two categories of work the total recorded spend and amount forecasted in the rate case for the period 2006 - 2009 are \$6.1 million and \$7.4 million, respectively.

Please contact me should you have any further questions

or would like me to clarify the information.

Chuck Marre

973-1940

From: Marre, Charles
Sent: Tuesday,
December 14, 2010 7:42 PM
To: Kahlon, Gurbux; Cadenasso, Eugene;
Myers, Richard A.
Cc: Stock, William; Horner, Trina; Yura, Jane;
Redacted
Subject: RE: Line 132

Gurbux

Per your request, and following up on the voice message I left, attached are a couple of schedules to respond to the questions below. The first attachment and to be used for question 1, GA IV Projects.xls, provides three separate worksheets which show the following for the years 2007 through 2009:

- A listing of all projects either forecast in Gas Accord IV or with recorded costs. This schedule shows both the capital forecast and recorded costs by category of work and planning order.
- Projects were forecast for Gas Accord and in which no recorded costs have been reported
- Projects in which there have been reported costs and which were not forecast in Gas Accord IV

The detailed forecast and recorded information for 2006 is currently being compiled and will be sent out tomorrow.

In response to the second question, I have attached PG&E's October 4, 2010, memo to Paul Clanon, which provides a comparison of the amount authorized versus spent on pipeline safety and pipeline replacements for the period of 2003 through 2009.

As you review the attachments, you may contact me to help explain or clarify the information. Thanks

Chuck Marre

973-1940

From: Kahlon, Gurbux
[mailto:gurbux.kahlon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010
4:06 PM
To: Dowdell, Jennifer; Yura, Jane; Cadenasso, Eugene; Myers, Richard A.
Cc: Marre, Charles; Stock, William; Horner, Trina
Subject: RE: Line 132

Thanks. When you are ready, please send this information to Rich Myers (ram@cpuc.ca.gov) and to Eugene Cadenasso (cpe@cpuc.ca.gov) also. .

From: Kahlon, Gurbux
[mailto:gurbux.kahlon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 14, 2010
9:57 AM
To: Dowdell, Jennifer; Yura, Jane
Subject: Line 132

Jennifer, we are getting questions on the \$5 million that was

**diverted
from line 132. PG&E has maintained that it spent more money in
total than was authorized but spent the money on other higher
priority
projects.**

**1.
Please provide me an explanation of which higher priority project
(s) the \$5
million was spent on along with a complete list of all projects done
during that
time.**

**2. Also
need actual pipe line safety expenditures over the last 5 years.**

**I need
this information by the end of the day today. Please give me a call
if you
have any questions. Thanks.**

*Gurbux
Kahlon*

*Manager, Rate
Regulation, Analysis and Policy Branch*

*Energy
Division*

*California Public
Utilities Commission*

*505 Van Ness Ave, San
Francisco Ca 94102*

Tel:

415-703-1775

E-mail: gkk@cpuc.ca.gov