From: Randolph, Edward F.
Sent: 8/21/2012 5:08:21 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Thank you

Your folks should have looked very closely at the provisions of SB 790. Our review of the MEA application is very limited.

Also, I was willing to let of this go since you have the right to do whatever you want, but I do not appreciate the lobbying effort of criticizing ED staffs' ability to do their job as a means of moving your issues forward.

Edward Randolph | Director, Energy Division
California Public Utilities Commission
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 4004
San Francisco, CA, 94102
415-703-2083 | edward.randolph@cpuc.ca.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2012 4:49 PM
To: Randolph, Edward F.
Subject: Re: Thank you

Ed - I sympathize with you on this issue. Tom and I took the matter to the SVP of Customer Care to see if we could let this one go. Unfortunately, that wasn't the case. I know that is little comfort to you and your staff who have to move the matter through the Commission. It wasn't a money issue although there are some concerns that the money being spent duplicates spend in the county. The primary issue was one of disclosure. If Marin had filed a Petition and parties could have been heard, then we could have done that and moved on. Instead, special dispensation was granted. I get why and the amount isn't material but it created a firestorm internally here across the board. While I know we have real issues with Marin (and likely some imagined ones too), staff actions played into the hands of those here at PG&E who see a conspiracy between staff and MEA no matter the issue. I know we all argue about transparency and how important it is, but this one created a big problem for me in recommending we let it go unanswered. It wasn't about not complying with the statute It was about the process and Marin's attempt to play by a very different set of rules.

On Aug 21, 2012, at 4:24 PM, "Randolph, Edward F." <edward.randolph@cpuc.ca.gov> wrote:

> Brian,
>
> While I do appreciate your thanks, it does seem somewhat halfhearted once I learned that while I was in

Sacramento PG&E staff was having ex parte meetings with Commissioners trying to kill an ED resolution that merely gives MEA $400,000 for one year and criticizing ED staff as part of the argument. The IOU's approach to protesting this resolution has been less than honest as it appear you all are intentionally trying to confuse issues and are ignoring the facts that SB 790 give MEA specific rights to do what they asked for. I don't know what position PGE took on SB 790 but the issue of giving CCAs their own access to EE funds was front and center in the discussions.

>
> It would be much easier to focus on the important things if I didn't have to fight over minor things and didn't have to defend against the use of ED as a scapegoat.

>
>
> Edward Randolph | Director, Energy Division California Public
> Utilities Commission
> 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 4004
> San Francisco, CA, 94102
> 415-703-2083 | edward.randolph@cpuc.ca.gov
>
>
>> _____
>> From: Cherry, Brian K [BKC7@pge.com]
>> Sent: Monday, August 20, 2012 7:31 PM
>> To: Krausse, Mark
>> Cc: Randolph, Edward F.; Bottorff, Thomas E
>> Subject: Re: Thank you
>>
>> Ed - my thanks too.
>>
>>
>> On Aug 20, 2012, at 7:16 PM, "Krausse, Mark" <MCKd@pge.com> wrote:
>>
>>> Edward, I would be remiss if I didn't thank you profusely for taking the time and going to the trouble of coming up here and representing the commission today. You made a big difference. Thanks for your help.

>>>
>>> Still learning to use my iPhone
>>
>>
>> PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
>> To learn more, please visit
>> http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/
>
>
> PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
> To learn more, please visit
> http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/