

From: Myers, Richard A.  
Sent: 7/6/2012 10:03:42 AM  
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: Re: shorten 30-day period for Res. E-4498?

Thanks Brian.

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

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]  
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2012 10:01 AM  
To: Myers, Richard A.  
Cc: Allen, Meredith; [Redacted] Hughes, John (Reg Rel); Mistry, Dinyar  
Subject: Re: shorten 30-day period for Res. E-4498?

Richard - yes, we will stipulate to a shorten time period.

On Jul 6, 2012, at 9:58 AM, "Myers, Richard A."  
<richard.myers@cpuc.ca.gov<mailto:richard.myers@cpuc.ca.gov>> wrote:

Hi Brian: Sorry to bother you with this trivial matter.

A few days ago, the Energy Division issued Draft Resolution E-4498 (AL 3997-E) for comments. (Draft Resolution E-4498 approves a change in PG&E's Liquidity Limit, but reduces PG&E's proposed term of confidentiality for attachments to the AL.) The Draft Resolution was intended for the Commission August 2 agenda.

Unfortunately, our Tariff Unit provided the resolution too late in the day to the Docket Office on Monday for it to appear on the July 3rd Daily Calendar, so it appeared instead on the July 5th Daily Calendar. This means that the required 30-day public review period will not be met for the Draft Resolution to appear on the August 2 Commission agenda.

However, if PG&E (the only party) will stipulate to a shortening of the 30-day review period, the Draft Resolution could still appear on the August 2 agenda. Otherwise, the Draft Resolution would need to appear on the August 23 agenda.

Will PG&E stipulate to a shortening of the 30-day public review period (from 30 days to 28 days) for Draft Resolution E-4498?

Comments on the resolution would still be due on July 23rd.

Richard