

From: Zelmar, Karen
Sent: 11/21/2011 6:18:50 PM
To: Berman, Janice S (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=JSBa); Dietz, Sidney (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SBD4); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Cc: Woo, Shirley A (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SAW0); Slocum, Gail (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=GLSg); Litteneker, Randall (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=RJL9); 'Levin, Robert' (rl4@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted]
Bcc:
Subject: RE: PG&E Updated Oct 28 Testimony in A.10-02-028 (PG&E 2010 RDW)

I am okay with going ahead with the filing. This was a risk we already considered and still decided to file for consolidation. DRA's reaction doesn't change that.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 1:33 PM
To: Berman, Janice S; Zelmar, Karen; Dietz, Sidney
Cc: 'Levin, Robert'; Litteneker, Randall (Law); Woo, Shirley A (Law); Slocum, Gail (Law); [Redacted]
Subject: RE: PG&E Updated Oct 28 Testimony in A.10-02-028 (PG&E 2010 RDW)

Privileged and Confidential

I talked with Bob Levin about the motion to consolidate today. DRA and TURN have discussed this and DRA now believes that they cannot join the motion. Bob said that the biggest concern was that we would be "waking up" a proceeding that was otherwise dead: why the DRRP case. I agreed and said that I understood this was a risk, but that could not say today that expending funds on PTR now was the prudent thing to do. The selection of the DRRP case was intentional to allow us to resolve longer term issues.

Bob said DRA might offer an alternative proposal of consolidating with the 2012 RDW proceeding. I indicated that I thought this would be perceived as strictly a delay. That is, the only thing that would change would be to process the PTR case later. It was not clear to me how the ALJ would find that reasonable (particularly since it would certainly push PTR to 2014). I also indicated that I thought we had agreed not to request funding in future RDWs and that we could not waive the cost of doing PTR.

I told Bob that we would likely go ahead with the motion without the request for day-for-day delay as that now become their problem, but that I would keep him informed.

Jan, Karen and Sid: Please confirm that you are ok filing the Motion without DRA. If possible, please let me know no later than Tuesday. I would like to file no later than Wed.

Thankyou. Dan

From: Redacted

Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 3:13 PM

To: matthew@turn.org

Cc: 'Levin, Robert'; Litteneker, Randall (Law); Woo, Shirley A (Law); Slocum, Gail (Law)

Subject: FW: PG&E Updated Oct 28 Testimony in A.10-02-028 (PG&E 2010 RDW)

Matt: As part of PG&E's updated testimony in the 2010 RDW, which included only the Peak Time Rebate (PTR) proposal, we provided as our primary proposal that the Commission consolidate the PTR and Default Residential Rate Programs proceeding, rather than move forward with PTR in isolation. We have approached DRA to see if they would be interested in joining in a formal motion to consolidate the cases. Earlier today we forwarded the attached draft for their consideration, and they are reviewing it now. We also would like to know if TURN would be interested in supporting the motion.

At this point, we were not sure who at TURN would be handling the 2010 RDW case. Could you let us know who should be involved? I will be out of the office tomorrow, but Randy Litteneker (ccd above) could address any questions you may have. Our main contact at DRA has been Bob Levin.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Redacted

From: Redacted

Sent: Thursday, November 17, 2011 9:06 AM

To: 'Levin, Robert'; Coyne, Keith

Cc: Tan, Lee-Whei; Danforth, Christopher; Heiden, Gregory; Khoury, Dexter; Woo, Shirley A (Law); Litteneker, Randall (Law)

Subject: RE: PG&E Updated Oct 28 Testimony in A.10-02-028 (PG&E 2010 RDW)

Bob: I have attached the draft motion and am resending the draft letter for delay. Section D has been added to include "next steps". After some discussion here, we thought the best approach would be to ask the ED for a suspension of the procedural schedule, and attach the request to the motion. Of course we would defer to you on this, but thought it it would carry more weight if it came from DRA. We will also be contacting TURN. Please let us know what you think.

Dan