

From: Sher, Nicholas
Sent: 1/27/2013 6:56:33 PM
To: Allen, Meredith (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MEAe); Kraska, David (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=DTK5)
Cc: [Redacted]; Reiger, J. Jason (Jonathan.Reiger@cpuc.ca.gov); Mee, Charles (charles.mee@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions on PG&E AL 4058-E

Heya Meredith,
Thank you very much for your email. I will get back to you with clarifying language tomorrow.

Yours,
Nicholas

From: Allen, Meredith [MEAe@pge.com]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 5:30 PM
To: Sher, Nicholas; Kraska, David (Law)
Cc: [Redacted]; Reiger, J. Jason; Mee, Charles
Subject: RE: Unanswered questions on PG&E AL 4058-E

Hi Nicholas,

I tried calling and didn't reach you but was able to reach Jason to discuss the questions. As I mentioned to Jason, I had understood that Q 1-3 were on hold and would not be addressed in the context of this AL. We have discussed with Ed Randolph and Molly having a meeting with SED and Energy Division to discuss PG&E's overall response to the NERC Alert, including the work beyond AL 4058-E. We are currently working on preparing the materials for that meeting and are targeting February. In the meantime, we are happy to provide what we can prior to the meeting.

Jason and I discussed the following in regard to each question:

1. We are not sure what number 1 is requesting. Please provide more information on what cost information is being requested.
2. We can provide a per mile cost for the work to identify the discrepancies.
3. We do not have an overall cost to mitigate all of the discrepancies that have been identified to date as many of the projects have not been scoped. This work will be performed over many

years.

4. We can provide the definition of response 2.

5. Between 2011 and 2012, we evaluated 354 circuits. For each circuit, there is an approximately 1-20 page document that describes the feet to structure and/or feet to ground at particular temperatures. We can provide copies of these documents.

I asked Jason if it would be possible to have the traditional 10 business days to respond to the questions. Jason mentioned that we should provide information on a rolling basis and therefore, we will do our best to provide information within the 5 business days requested.

Please let me know if you have questions or would like to discuss.

Thanks,

Meredith

415-828-5765

From: Sher, Nicholas [mailto:nicholas.sher@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 25, 2013 11:15 AM
To: Allen, Meredith; Kraska, David (Law)
Cc: [Redacted]; Reiger, J. Jason; Mee, Charles
Subject: Unanswered questions on PG&E AL 4058-E

Hi David,

On December 17 and 18 2012, Energy Division sent a number of questions to PG&E relating to AL 4058-E that PG&E has yet to answer.

Please, within the next five business days, provide the answers to the following questions Energy Division has previously requested:

- (1) Please provide the cost of development of the NERC assessment plan;
- (2) Please provide the cost of discrepancy identification, analysis, and elimination (or findings report);
- (3) Please provide the cost of reconstructing the 125 circuits listed by PG&E in the excel spreadsheet provided to Energy Division (that is, the cost of mitigating the clearance issues, PG&E believes are present - see attached PG&E spreadsheet);
- (4) The spreadsheet provided by PG&E indicates "see response 2" as to why PG&E decided not to de-rate any of the circuits/lines, please provide Response 2;
- (5) The spreadsheet listed a number of discrepancies, but did not describe those discrepancies in detail. If PG&E has detailed findings, please provide the detailed findings.

Yours,

Nicholas Sher

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>