

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 12/7/2011 5:23:55 PM
To: 'Tang, Clayton K.' (clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc: Pocta, Robert M. (robert.pocta@cpuc.ca.gov); Enderby, Marshal B. (marshal.enderby@cpuc.ca.gov); Hunter, Stacey (stacey.hunter@cpuc.ca.gov); Kanter, Marek (marek.kanter@cpuc.ca.gov); [Redacted]
[Redacted] Sharp, Shelly (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SSM3); [Redacted]
[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J8HS); [Redacted]
[Redacted] [Redacted]

Bcc:
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Clayton,
Thank you for the evaluator names. They will each be given access to the Power Advocates site by our Sourcing department.

Regarding the scorecard, we reviewed your suggestions as well as our own ideas for modifications. We agree with DRA that the Experience weighting was low at 5%, but felt 10% was adequate since we narrowed the vendors to those that we felt could be competitive for this large project. We reduced the Pricing weighting to 15% to accommodate the increase in Experience. Other modifications are explained below, above the revised scorecard.

Can you let us know if you have other comments or concerns about this revision by close of business 12/8?
Thanks,

Barbara

Additional Modifications to Scorecard:

Experience:

- Changed question weightings
- Replaced "experience with working jointly with company and regulatory agency" with "experience of comp and benefits consultants on team". This latter item is important, and the "experience with utilities/regulatory process" question will address the deleted item.

Capabilities/Database Resources:

- Deleted "Company qualifications" as it seemed duplicative of experience.
- Separated "existing database" for cash compensation and benefits, as they are very different
- Deleted "outside survey resources" as it is irrelevant
- Changed question weightings

Approach/Process:

-Added "timeline" question separate from other methodology considerations

-Changed question weightings

Criteria	Review Team	Criteria Weighting	Question Weighting	Questions
Experience	LOB	10%	10%	Dedicated utility practice
			45%	Experience with utilities/regulatory process
			5%	Experience with providing expert testimony
			40%	Experience of comp and benefits consultants on team
Capabilities / Database Resources	LOB	25%	40%	Company qualifications
			20%	Similar surveys conducted
			40%	Existing cash compensation database
			40%	Outside survey resources
Approach / Process	LOB	25%	70%	Existing benefits database
				Project plan (methodology, assumptions, obstacles)
			20%	Timeline
Pricing	Sourcing	15%	10%	Problem resolution
			100%	
Green Diversity	Green Supplier Diversity	5%	100%	Green responses
			20%	100%

From: Tang, Clayton K. [mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov]

Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 8:02 PM

To: [Redacted]

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted]; Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted]; Sharp, Shelly

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Marek Kanter, Marshal Enderby, and Stacey Hunter (or some subset, depending on availability) will be the DRA evaluators.

From: [Redacted] [Redacted]

Sent: Tue 12/6/2011 5:16 PM

To: Tang, Clayton K.

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted]; Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted] Sharp, Shelly

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Thanks Clayton for the quick response!

The PG&E team will have a meeting tomorrow to discuss your comments and we will get back to you tomorrow on the proposed scorecard issue.

Any chance you have decided on the DRA evaluator(s) to review the Total Comp Study proposals?

Thanks!
Minci

From: Tang, Clayton K. [mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, December 06, 2011 11:27 AM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]; [Redacted] John (Reg Rel); [Redacted]; Sharp, Shelly
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

One comment/concern at this point: In the scorecard template, we think the “experience” criteria weighting (5%) is too low and the “pricing” criteria weighting (20%) is too high. Why is there such a disparity? Would there be any downside to making the two weightings more comparable?

Also, if we increase the “experience” weighting, it should not be done so at the expense of the “capabilities/database resources” and “approach/process” weightings as currently indicated.

If we have additional comments/concerns, we’ll let you know. Thanks.

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 5:33 PM
To: Tang, Clayton K.
Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]; [Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted]; Sharp, Shelly
Subject: FW: Total Compensation

Clayton,

Attached please find PG&E's responses to vendors' questions posted today on the Power Advocates site by our Sourcing department.

We have two questions for you:

1. Can you please tell us who will be the evaluator(s) for DRA of the proposals for the Total Comp Study? The proposals from three vendors are due in next Monday, 12/12. We are expected to have a "short list" of bidders by 12/22 to invite to the interviews on Jan 3 and Jan 4, if we think the field can be reduced after looking at the proposals.

2. Can your team please review the attached proposed scorecard template and see if this is okay? PG&E Sourcing asked us to provide inputs on the scorecard template by end of day tomorrow (1/6). [Redacted] has asked for additional time, but do not have an answer yet as to how much time we can take since vendor responses are due on Dec 12.

Thank you so much!

[Redacted]

Criteria	Review Team	Criteria Weighting	Question Weighting	Questions
Experience	LOB	5%	10%	Dedicated utility practice
			30%	Experience with utilities/regulatory process
			30%	Experience with providing expert testimony
			30%	Experience with working jointly w/a company and regulatory agency
Capabilities / Database Resources	LOB	25%	10%	Company qualifications
			10%	Similar surveys conducted
			40%	Existing database
			40%	Outside survey resources
Approach / Process	LOB	25%	80%	Project plan (methodology, assumptions, timelines, obstacles)
			20%	Problem resolution
Pricing	Sourcing	20%	100%	

Green	Green	5%	100%	Green responses
Diversity	Supplier Diversity	20%	100%	Diversity responses

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 5:08 PM
To: [Redacted]
Cc: Sharp, Shelly; [Redacted] dacted
Subject: FW: Total Compensation

[Redacted]

The attached document with our responses to the questions from the vendors was posted today on the Power Advocates site by our Sourcing Department.

Barbara

From: Tang, Clayton K. [<mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 05, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Sharp, Shelly; [Redacted]
Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]
[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Was PG&E going to send us a copy of the responses before providing them to the vendors? Or were we going to receive the final responses only?

From: Sharp, Shelly [<mailto:SSM3@pge.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 3:17 PM

To: Tang, Clayton K.

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted] [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

The plan is Monday, December 5. I don't think that the questions/answers are controversial. Please take a quick look and let me know if you feel differently.

From: Tang, Clayton K. [<mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 3:16 PM

To: Sharp, Shelly

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted];

[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted] [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Ok, thanks. When does PG&E have to provide responses to the vendors' questions?

From: Sharp, Shelly [<mailto:SSM3@pge.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, November 30, 2011 3:12 PM

To: Tang, Clayton K.

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted] [Redacted]

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Clayton

Quick update – the RFP was issued on Monday. We had a handful of questions that came in – see attached. We will send you our answers late this week or early next.

I will be on vacation until December 12, so please contact [Redacted] if you have any questions or concerns.

Thanks,

Shelly

From: Tang, Clayton K. [<mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 2:34 PM
To: Sharp, Shelly
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Not sure yet.

From: Sharp, Shelly [<mailto:SSM3@pge.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 2:34 PM
To: Tang, Clayton K.
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Thank you – who should Barbara working with if vendors have questions?

From: Tang, Clayton K. [<mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 2:03 PM
To: Sharp, Shelly
Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted];
[Redacted]; Hughes, John (Reg Rel)
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Shelly,

As of now, we don't have any comments re: the draft RFP. If you don't hear from us by tomorrow afternoon, then I guess it's good to go.

For January 3 and 4, DRA will likely have multiple attendees at the interviews.

Clayton

From: Tang, Clayton K.

Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 10:11 AM

To: 'Sharp, Shelly'

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted]; Hughes, John (Reg Rel)

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

We'll try to get comments back to you soon. And we'll have to get back to you about who'll be taking the lead for DRA – though I would hesitate to refer to anyone as “the next Marty Lyons.”

From: Sharp, Shelly [<mailto:SSM3@pge.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2011 10:04 AM

To: Tang, Clayton K.

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted]; Hughes, John (Reg Rel)

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Clayton

Unfortunately, in order to have the compensation study done in time for inclusion in the NOI, the schedule as proposed including interviews early in January needs to be followed. Is there one person who will be taking the lead for DRA (like Marty Lyons has previously) who could work with [Redacted] to review the questions from vendors and the RFPs after they are received on 12/12 as well as commit to the 1/3 and 1/4 interview dates?

We are working with our Sourcing folks who will issue the RFP on 11/28 and manage the process using an online medium that DRA can be given access to. As such the format of the RFP has changed, with some more detail added, though the content is substantially the same. See attached and let us know if you have any concerns about it being issued 11/28.

Thanks, Shelly

From: Tang, Clayton K. [<mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov>]

Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 11:06 AM

To: Sharp, Shelly

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel)

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

We want to see if the companies responding to the RFP have the information. If they don't, can they get it? If they do have it, would it make sense for us to use it? To be decided.

A couple of things:

- We are now in Standard Time, not Daylight Savings Time.
- Is it realistic to have finalist interviews right after the New Year's holiday?

Otherwise, seems ok to send out RFP.

From: Sharp, Shelly [<mailto:SSM3@pge.com>]

Sent: Monday, November 21, 2011 9:17 AM

To: Tang, Clayton K.

Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.; [Redacted]

[Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel)

Subject: RE: Total Compensation

Clayton

Your edits are fine. However, I want to be clear that our agreement to the revisions does not mean that we will

agree to include all the companies in the study without understanding all the potential comparator companies, and how - in particular the water companies and any small municipal utilities - meet the revenue criteria. Are you okay if we send out the RFP next week? I have attached below the proposed RFP timing based on feedback from our sourcing organization.

Shelly

RFP Schedule	Date
RFP Distributed to Bidders	11/28/11
Last Day to Submit Written Questions to PG&E	11/30 12 P.M. PDT
PG&E Responds to Submitted Questions	12/5/11
Bidders Sign & Return Intent to Bid Form	12/6/11
RFP Responses Due	12/12/11
Short-list Bidders	12/22/11
Finalist Interviews (please reserve these dates)	1/3/12, 1/4/12
Target Date for Contract Execution	1/23/12

From: Tang, Clayton K. [<mailto:clayton.tang@cpuc.ca.gov>]
Sent: Friday, November 18, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Sharp, Shelly; [Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel)
Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Pocta, Robert M.
Subject: RE: Total Compensation

DRA has some suggested changes. See page 3 of the draft RFP.

From: Sharp, Shelly [<mailto:SSM3@pge.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2011 9:52 AM
To: Pocta, Robert M.; Tang, Clayton K.
Cc: Kanter, Marek; Hunter, Stacey; Enderby, Marshal B.; Hughes, John (Reg Rel); [Redacted]; [Redacted]
Subject: Total Compensation

Mark and Clayton

Following up to see if you had any proposed changes to the proposed RFP for the Total Compensation Study.
Please advise.

Shelly