## BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Companyfor Approval of 2013-2014 Energy Efficiency Programs and Budget (U39M).

Application 12-07-001 (Filed July 2, 2012)

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company(U902M) for Approval of Electric and Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Programs and Budgets for Years 2013 through 2014.

Application 12-07-002 (Filed July 2, 2012)

Application of Southern California Gas Company(U904G) for Approval of Natural Gas Energy Efficiency Programs and Budgets for Years 2013 through 2014.

Application 12-07-003 (Filed July 2, 2012)

Application of Southern California Edison Company(U338E) for Approval of Energy Efficiency and DemandResponse Integrated DemandSide Management Programs and Budgets for 2013-2014.

Application 12-07-004 (Filed July 2, 2012)

(CONSOLIDATED)

## NOTICE OF EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Pursuant to Rule 8.4(a) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure,
Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) hereby gives notice of the following ex parte
communication. The communication occurred on Wednesday, November 7, 2012, at
approximately 3:30 p.m., by telephone to the offices of the California Public Utilities
Commission (CPUC) in San Francisco. The communication was oral only. [Rule
8.4(a)]

Sidney Dietz, Director, Regulatory Relations, PG&E, initiated the communication

with Matthew Tisdale. Advisor to Commissioner Michel Florio. [Rule 8.4(b)]

Mr. Dietz stated that PG&E supports the Proposed Decision (PD) and

appreciates the CPUC's work in providing it on time for launch of programs in early

2013. Mr. Dietz stated that PG&E is committed to energy efficiency as a resource, and

that PG&E's programs and budgets proposals meet the CPUC's and PG&E's priority in

finding deeper savings using a customer and data-driven approach. Mr. Dietz further

stated that PG&E's initial filing also supports partnerships with third parties and local

governments for program delivery. Mr. Dietz further stated that the PD went too far in

reducing PG&E's proposed budget and placing restrictions on the budget allocations,

and would prevent PG&E from executing programs to support the policy objectives and

requirements in the guidance decision. Mr. Dietz stated that PG&E had already

reduced its budget in its filing compared to the comparable annual budget of the 2010-

2012 portfolio cycle. [Rule 8.4(c)]

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian K. Cherry

Brian K. Cherry

Vice President, Regulatory Relations

Pacific Gas and Electric Company

P.O. Box 770000, Mail CodeB10C

San Francisco, CA94177

Phone: 415-973-4977 Fax: 415-973-7226

E-mail: BKC7@pge.com

Dated: November 7, 2012