

From: Cherry, Brian K  
Sent: 10/10/2013 5:29:30 PM  
To: Florio, Michel Peter (MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: RBC report

Mike – I'm totally comfortable with the GRC decision being delayed because of San Bruno. I just think telling the analysts about it is a bad idea because it raises their expectations as to what a reasonable result is.....

**From:** Florio, Michel Peter [mailto:MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:28 PM  
**To:** Cherry, Brian K  
**Subject:** RBC report

Brian – Sepideh said that you were concerned about the suggestion that the GRC would be decided after San Bruno. I had been thinking that would be the best sequence in order to “reach a GRC decision that would be untainted by San Bruno.” Do you disagree? I think that’s a procedural matter that we can discuss. I believe I also said that if San Bruno were subject to further unexpected delays, we might have to revisit that sequence. I have consistently told the analysts that I am embarrassed by the delays experienced by SCE and Sempra, and want us to do much better, including your current case. It just seemed to me to be easier to reach a sensible decision on the GRC absent the San Bruno overhang, but that’s not locked in stone . . . Cheers,  
Mike