

From: Weismehl, Philip S.  
Sent: 3/30/2011 9:51:21 AM  
To: Hughes, John (Reg Rel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J8HS); Villegas, Pedro (PVillegas@semprautilities.com)  
Cc: Brian.Prusnek@sce.com (Brian.Prusnek@sce.com); Katague, Ditas (ditas.katague@cpuc.ca.gov); Chan, Jovita (jovita.chan@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: MARCH25All Party Meeting Notice.doc

Thanks, John. You'll note my reference below to "brief" and "concise". There will be a number of other folks and Commissioner Sandoval will have read the comments filed.

Phil

Philip Scott Weismehl  
Interim Chief of Staff  
Office of Commissioner Catherine J. K. Sandoval  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness  
San Francisco, CA 94507  
(415) 703-2314  
[psw@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:psw@cpuc.ca.gov)

**From:** Hughes, John (Reg Rel) [mailto:J8HS@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 30, 2011 9:27 AM  
**To:** Weismehl, Philip S.; Villegas, Pedro  
**Cc:** Brian.Prusnek@sce.com; Chan, Jovita; Katague, Ditas  
**Subject:** RE: MARCH25All Party Meeting Notice.doc

Phil

This is to let you know that the PG+E speakers will be Brian Cherry starting off and Kent Harvey doing most of the presentation. There will be an additional PG+E personnel in attendance, including myself, to address any further issues if necessary.

Edison, Sempra and PG+E had a brief conference call to determine the order of the energy company presentations. It was decided that PG+E will go first since we are positioned differently from the other two because we have a 2011 GRC test year whereas Edison and Sempra have a 2012 test year. Edison will go after PG+E and then Sempra. See you at 2:00pm today.

John Hughes

**From:** Weismehl, Philip S. [mailto:philip.weismehl@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 29, 2011 9:56 AM  
**To:** Villegas, Pedro  
**Cc:** Brian.Prusnek@sce.com; Hughes, John (Reg Rel); Chan, Jovita; Katague, Ditas  
**Subject:** RE: MARCH25All Party Meeting Notice.doc

This is not a formal docket so my understanding is that there really isn't a formal service list for this resolution as such. However, I believe the notice was sent to every organization/individual that filed comments on any of the versions. If the comments were filed by the counsel for a party, notice would have been sent to that counsel.

We don't have an agenda as such at this point. Commissioner Sandoval has read the comments and while it may be useful for parties to be prepared to give their brief clear and concise perspective, she will likely have questions to be addressed.

Phil

Philip Scott Weismehl  
Interim Chief of Staff  
Office of Commissioner Catherine J. K. Sandoval  
California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness  
San Francisco, CA 94507  
(415) 703-2314  
[psw@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:psw@cpuc.ca.gov)

**From:** Villegas, Pedro [mailto:PVillegas@semprautilities.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 28, 2011 6:41 PM  
**To:** Weismehl, Philip S.  
**Cc:** Brian.Prusnek@sce.com; 'Hughes, John (Reg Rel)'; Chan, Jovita  
**Subject:** FW: MARCH25All Party Meeting Notice.doc

Hello Phil.

The Sempra Utilities just received the attached notice of the Wednesday all-party meeting this afternoon from the other utilities. Lee Schavrien's email was mis-typed, so I suspect that the notice was returned to sender.

We appreciate the Commissioner's holding the draft reso from last Thursday's meeting in order to examine this issue more thoroughly. I expect that other interested parties also would like to participate in the all-party meeting, but from a quick look at the notice below, there are many parties that are on the distribution list for the draft reso that were not noticed, Jack Hawks at CalWater for example. Was this sent separately to the larger group that has been involved in the draft reso?

In the case of the Sempra Utilities, the draft reso is closely related to our active GRC application, which is why we served Dan Skopec's letter on behalf of the Sempra Utilities to the GRC service list. I believe that the other utilities did likewise with their own letters on the draft reso. Without proper notice of all-party meeting to the GRC service list (and without herein discussing any relevant merits of our GRC application), we would be prevented on Wednesday from discussing the specific relationship between the GRC and the draft reso, which is presented in our letter and which the Commissioner may want to explore during the all-party meeting.

Also, might you have an agenda for the meeting? Should each party (representatives to be identified by 5:00 tomorrow) be prepared to present our respective positions in a couple of minutes each and then answer questions from the dais?

I wanted to also forward this to Ditas Katague, but her email has yet to post on the CPUC contacts roster. Apologies to Ditas in advance.

Thank you,  
Pedro

*Pedro Villegas  
Manager of Regulatory Relations  
Sempra Energy Utilities  
601 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 2060  
San Francisco, California 94102-6316  
Telephone: 415-202-9986*

---

**From:** Chan, Jovita [<mailto:jovita.chan@cpuc.ca.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, March 25, 2011 4:48 PM

**To:** mmattes@nossaman.com; steer@turn.org; rfinkelstein@turn.org; LSschavrien@SempraUtilities.com; akbar.jazayeri@sce.com; [Redacted]; Cherry, Brian K; mschreiber@cwclaw.com; Lindh, Frank; Aguilar, Arocles; Weismehl, Philip S.; Sandoval, Catherine J.K.; Katague, Ditas; cathie.allen@pacifcorp.com; Catherine Sandoval

**Cc:** Perlstein, Joel T.; Wetzell, Mark S.

**Subject:** MARCH25All Party Meeting Notice.doc

<<MARCH25All Party Meeting Notice R0602012.doc>>