

From: Kauss, Kent  
Sent: 3/18/2013 4:55:36 PM  
To: Mark Toney (mtoney@turn.org); Samuel S. Kang (samuelk@greenlining.org); Bottorff, Thomas E (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TEB3); Dan Skopec (dskopec@semprautilities.com); Enrique Gallardo (enriqueg@greenlining.org); Joe Como (joc@cpuc.ca.gov); Matthew Freedman (matthew@turn.org); Janee Briesemeister (Jbriesemeister@aarp.org); Akbar Jazayeri (akbar.jazayeri@sce.com); Linda Serizawa (lss@cpuc.ca.gov); Stephanie Chen (stephaniec@greenlining.org); Lee Schavrien (lschavrien@semprautilities.com); Michael Richard (MRichard@aarp.org); Mike Campbell (Michael.Campbell@cpuc.ca.gov); Russell G. Worden (russell.worden@sce.com)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: April 2 Proposed Meeting Date

Thanks Mark. As I mentioned in the Capitol last week to you and Matt, we are very anxious to move forward on this issue and look forward to the thoughts that Matt was to put on paper and send around following our last meeting.

As some of you saw, Assm Perea's office sent a note around on Friday afternoon informing us of the Assm U&C Cmte deadline for any amendments to the bill prior to the April 15 hearing. I know that TURN is going to oppose the bill in its current form but not sure if you plan to work it or just note opposition and support the bill moving forward so we can continue discussions. The reality is any version of a bill will have to go thru the entire process and be signed by the Governor to have any meaning so to me it does not make sense to oppose any effort at this point. As such, we are not opposing any bills on this subject and instead will state our priority support for moving the bills forward and continuing to have discussions on the issue. We are all pressed for time and would rather focus that time on getting the bills moving and discussions to continue. I thought our only mtg to this point on the subject was helpful and we should get them moving again. I am not suggesting a Peace Death March for you AB 1890 fans but we need a little more attention on the issue and resolving it as it appears to me from the discussion in the Governor's office as well as our smaller gathering that we all agree a fix is needed now and tinkering around the edges doesn't do much to solve the problem.

In any event, with that deadline looming as well as the Cmte hearing date of April 2 for the Steinberg bill, I'd suggest we not wait until April 2 to meet and instead try to meet this week or at the latest next week. Can we schedule time this Thurs or Friday or early next week instead?

**From:** Mark Toney [mailto:[mtoney@turn.org](mailto:mtoney@turn.org)]

**Sent:** Monday, March 18, 2013 3:03 PM

**To:** Samuel S. Kang; Joe Como; Akbar Jazayeri; Bottorff, Thomas E; Matthew Freedman; Linda Serizawa; Janee Briesemeister; Dan Skopec; Enrique Gallardo; Russell G. Worden; Stephanie Chen; Mike Campbell; Michael Richard; Mark W. Toney; Lee Schavrien; Kauss, Kent

**Subject:** April 2 Proposed Meeting Date

Dear Utilities & Consumers Working Group,

I propose we take advantage of the April 2 Senate Utilities Committee meeting by scheduling a meeting in Sacramento of the Utilities & Consumers Working Group to further explore potential areas of agreement on residential rate design policy, since I believe most of us had already planned to be in the Capitol that day.

How about we plan to meet on April 2 at 2:00? I will get back to you on a location in walking distance of the Capitol.

Thanks,

Mark

Mark W. Toney, Ph.D.  
Executive Director  
TURN—The Utility Reform Network  
115 Sansome Street, Suite 900  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
415 929 8876 x301  
[mtoney@turn.org](mailto:mtoney@turn.org) • 510 590 2862 cell

