

From: Burns, Truman L.
Sent: 9/7/2011 10:09:05 AM
To: Hughes, John (Reg Rel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J8HS)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: PG&E seismic costs?

Its emails like that one that prove you are PG&E's best recent acquisition. Why SCE let you go is still a mystery to me.

From: Hughes, John (Reg Rel) [mailto:J8HS@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 07, 2011 8:59 AM
To: Burns, Truman L.; Post, Jennifer (Law)
Cc: Tam, Bonnie W.
Subject: RE: PG&E seismic costs?

Truman

Ha-Ha. Still the wise A**. I bet that Lee Schaverian will not be sending you a Christmas card after reading DRA's testimony on his GRC.

From: Burns, Truman L. [mailto:truman.burns@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2011 9:31 PM
To: Post, Jennifer (Law)
Cc: Hughes, John (Reg Rel); Redacted
Subject: RE: PG&E seismic costs?

Jennifer,
You let John Hughes read your emails? Thanks for the update on where PG&E is with our request and your upcoming motion.

Truman L. Burns
Division of Ratepayer Advocates/CPUC
505 Van Ness, Rm. 4102
San Francisco, CA 94102
txb@cpuc.ca.gov
415/703-2932

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

From: Post, Jennifer (Law) [mailto:JLKm@pge.com]
Sent: Tue 9/6/2011 12:06 PM
To: Burns, Truman L.
Cc: Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted]
Subject: RE: PG&E seismic costs?

Hi Truman:

Glad you finished up with the GRC's; they are always such grueling proceedings. I apologize for the long delay on this end. We are in the midst of RFP's for the seismic work and so still finalizing our costs. In addition, we will be filing a motion to re-open A.10-01-014 to recover additional costs. I am having some back and forth on that motion internally; I hope it will be filed by September 15, however. I would like to provide DRA the response to the data request simultaneous with filing the motion, so we don't get ahead of ourselves.

Thanks,
Jennifer

From: Burns, Truman L. [mailto:truman.burns@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, September 02, 2011 3:26 PM
To: Post, Jennifer (Law)
Subject: RE: PG&E seismic costs?

Hello Jennifer,
Now that I am recovering from the whirlwind that was DRA's Sempra GRC filing, I'm inquiring whether PG&E's Geosciences group has made any progress on this request. DRA's testimony due date was postponed to Sept. 30th.
Truman Burns/DRA

From: Post, Jennifer (Law) [mailto:JLKm@pge.com]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2011 1:33 PM
To: Burns, Truman L.
Cc: Patrizio, Mark (Law); Logan, Scott
Subject: Re: PG&E seismic costs?

Hi Truman. I will forward to the geosciences group to see if we can fill in the blanks. Just to let you know, we will be filing a motion to re-open A.10-01-014 to request additional funding for the 2D and 3D seismic studies that were the subject of that application. The cost will be significantly higher than the \$16.73 M we anticipated and received funding authorization for -- on the order of 2-5x higher looking at the optimistic and pessimistic scenarios. We hope to file the motion to re-open in the next few weeks.

Jennifer

From: Burns, Truman L. [mailto:truman.burns@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2011 01:18 PM
To: Post, Jennifer (Law)
Cc: Patrizio, Mark (Law); Logan, Scott <scott.logan@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: PG&E seismic costs?

Hello Jennifer Post,
Mark Nelson and Jose Perez at SCE said you might be able to find out how much money PG&E spends on its Long Term Seismic Program (LTSP) and on the recently approved seismic studies. I assume LTSP costs are recovered in the GRC. Attached is SCE's data response to DRA, comparing their \$64 million seismic request with a small amount of public information about PG&E's spending. My hope is that someone at PG&E can fill in the

PG&E estimate columns.

Truman L. Burns
Division of Ratepayer Advocates/CPUC
505 Van Ness Avenue, Rm. 4205
San Francisco, CA 94102
txb@cpuc.ca.gov<<mailto:txb@cpuc.ca.gov>>
415/703-2932

(That which does not appear to exist is to be regarded as if it did not exist. Cal. Civ. Code sec. 3530).