

From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 10/21/2013 1:36:07 PM
To: brian.turner@cpuc.ca.gov (brian.turner@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: FW: Sen Hill hearing on San Carlos and communications issue

Here is what I've heard about the Hill meeting.

From: Kauss, Kent
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2013 11:51 AM
To: Stavropoulos, Nickolas; Ittner, Mary Ellen; Bedwell, Ed; Pruett, Greg S; Doll, Laura; Cherry, Brian K; Bottorff, Thomas E; Singh, Sumeet; Johnson, Kirk; Soto, Jesus (SVP); [Redacted]; [Redacted]; Fitzpatrick, Tim; [Redacted]; Kiyota, Travis; Howe, James; Yura, Jane; [Redacted]; Gambelin, Papia; Hogle, Jessica; Lavinson, Melissa A; [Redacted]
Subject: RE: Sen Hill hearing on San Carlos and communications issue

I just met with Sen Hill's staff and have a few more details to share on the hearing for next Monday, however, things are still evolving so this may change a bit between now and next week. The staff hopes to have paper out in the next couple days with additional detail as well.

The hearing will be broken up into 3 or 4 panels as noted below. A description of each is then noted below the list.

- 1) City of San Bruno, City of San Carlos and possibly a third but that is not yet resolved
- 2) "Communications Expert" – this is the most the unsettled piece of the agenda as they don't know how to define this or who they could get
- 3) Public Comment
- 4) CPUC and PG&E

The first panel with city representatives will include a discussion by them on what they see from the utilities and the CPUC to obtain information about work that is being done in their city. These two cities see the utilities as having silos and difficult to obtain information about the specific safety issues associated with work that is to be done and getting specific answers.

They are concerned about Gov Rel people vs Gas Ops people and whether or not we are sharing all the information or just the good news information.

The Communications expert panel is likely not to happen but staff's thinking was to have someone there to talk about how communications should be done. One person's communication plan is not always universally accepted as the right way to go which is contributing to the difficulty with this panel idea.

Third panel would be public comment. Sen Hill wants to encourage more dialogue between the public and PG&E and the CPUC and doesn't feel that happens if the public comment period is at the end. They are not going to have an ongoing debate between a customer and the utility or regulator but want the two entities to know the public comments before our presentations.

The final panel would have us give a 5-7 presentation on our process for notifying the public and gov't officials before a project is started describing what is involved, why it is being done, permitting requirements or notifications on that process followed by how we validate the safety of the facilities. They also want to hear our thoughts on how we validate the safety perspective that we provide. We have let them know that we will have a gas operations witness and Papi so we are confirmed with two witnesses.

The CPUC panel is wide open right now. He needs to follow up with the CPUC's legislative director who I will also contact.