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

Application of Southern California Edison Company(U338E) for Approval of Energy Efficiency and DemancResponse Integrated DemancSide Management Programs and Budgets for 2013-2014. Application 12-07-001 (Filed July 2, 2012)

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

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

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,

<u>/s/ Brian K. Cherry</u> 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