

From: Florio, Michel Peter
Sent: 10/10/2013 5:34:45 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: RBC report

Fair point, and one that I hadn't considered. I usually try to be as transparent as I can be with these guys so there are no surprises. Since I've been telling them we need to be faster with GRCs, I was concerned that waiting til after San Bruno might not be well received. Maybe we should chat before the next horde comes to visit?? Nothing is scheduled at the moment, but they tend to come in waves.

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 10, 2013 5:30 PM
To: Florio, Michel Peter
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

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.
To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>