

From: Long, Douglas M.  
Sent: 1/15/2013 10:53:39 PM  
To: Slocum, Gail (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=GLSg)  
Cc: Redacted Hughes, John  
(Reg Rel) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=J8HS); Litteneker, Randall  
(Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=RJL9); Keane, Dennis  
(/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=DMK5)  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: A1212002

Ok, thank for the candid and prompt information. This is helpful for me and I will check-in with the relevant Assistant Chief Judge and the Assigned Commissioner's office. If everyone agrees then we would need to match the assigned Judge (probably me) to the same Commissioner (currently Peevey) for the Phase 2 rate design. (I wish we would drop the ancient name for that proceeding now that it's a separate application and not a true second "phase" but regulatory jargon dies very slowly.)

## Douglas M. Long

Administrative Law Judge

[Douglas.Long@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Douglas.Long@cpuc.ca.gov)

(415) 703-3200

**From:** Slocum, Gail (Law) [GLSg@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 15, 2013 6:37 PM  
**To:** Long, Douglas M.  
**Cc:** Litteneker, Randall (Law); Redacted Keane, Dennis; Hughes, John (Reg Rel)  
**Subject:** RE: A1212002

ALJ Long:

Thank you for your procedural email asking questions about PHC scheduling in the 2013 RDW (A12-12-002).

1. In answer to your first question: We do not expect to know the precise filing date for our 2014 GRC Phase 2 until about 2 weeks from now. It's possible that we may request it be delayed.

2. Given your stated scheduling constraints, we would prefer the PHC for the 2013 RDW be held at or after the end of March, when you expect to become fully available. This would line up nicely with the fact that important CPUC Net Energy Metering Cost-Benefit Study is expected to be issued by the end of March (in the new DG OIR proceeding). If a delay in our GRC Phase 2 Application filing date is approved, it's possible that the protest period might not be over until after an April 2013 RDW PHC, however.

3. We continue to prefer that this single, yet complex Option R rate issue be consolidated with the complete marginal cost, revenue allocation and rate design showing in our 2014 GRC Phase 2 proceeding, if possible. While we recognize that doing so would delay the effective date if any such rate were approved, we note that not only would consolidation create administrative efficiencies (by eliminating the need for a separate docket), but integration would also leverage substantive elements of the Phase 2 showing that are relevant to Option R.

4. We will discuss these points in our Reply to the Protest, which is due 1/28/13.

## Gail Slocum


PG&E Law Department

<http://www.pge.com>

[glsq@pge.com](mailto:glsq@pge.com)

415 973-6583

415 515 2892 cell



**From:** Long, Douglas M. [mailto:douglas.long@cpuc.ca.gov]

**Sent:** Tuesday, January 15, 2013 2:44 PM

**To:** Slocum, Gail (Law)

**Subject:** A1212002

In your application you propose a prehearing conference on or after Feb. 14<sup>th</sup>; but you propose to consolidate the application with the "phase 2" app. due to be filed "mid-

February.” Seems to me I should hold off on a conference until after the phase 2 app. really exists. When do you think you will know for sure it’s likely filing date?

After Feb. 19<sup>th</sup> I am tied up in other proceedings’ hearings until the end of March, unless I recess for a couple of hours to slip in a conference. That might coincide with the phase 2 app’s end of protest period.

What are your thoughts and preferences?

## Douglas M. Long

Administrative Law Judge

[Douglas.Long@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Douglas.Long@cpuc.ca.gov)

(415) 703-3200

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

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