

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 1/19/2011 7:21:01 PM
To: 'paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov' (paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Rancho Cordova

That's pretty clear and decisive

From: Clanon, Paul [mailto:paul.clanon@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 07:08 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Re: Rancho Cordova

No.

On Jan 19, 2011, at 6:36 PM, "Cherry, Brian K" <BKC7@pge.com> wrote:

Paul - do you think we could eek out another week ?

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 6:36 PM
To: Lichtblau, Erich (Law); Dowdell, Jennifer
Subject: RE: Rancho Cordova

Draft something. I will touch base with Paul to see if there is any chance of getting such a request granted.

From: Lichtblau, Erich (Law)
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 4:01 PM
To: Dowdell, Jennifer; Cherry, Brian K
Subject: Rancho Cordova

Brian and Jennifer,

As you know, we stipulated with CPSD for a three month extension, to March 17, but the Commission only gave us two, to February 17. We will get it done if we have to, but an extra week would be a great help. In addition to defending against the CPSD allegations, part of the OII requires us to summarize, subsection by subsection for each part of 49 CFR section 192.615 (about 20 parts), "each communication made [from 1-1-200 to 1-23-2008], both verbal and written, by which PG&E communicated each procedure required by [192.615] to PG&E employees." As you can imagine, gathering all of the documents and drafting this summary is time consuming. What do you think about, despite the prior rejection of March 17, filing a request for an additional one week extension? The report would still be due before the scheduled prehearing

conference. I think it is likely such a request would be denied, but it seems worth a shot. Michelle and I wanted your input before filing anything.

Thank you,

Erich