From: Cherry, Brian K
Sent: 10/10/2013 5:40:18 PM
To: Florio, Michel Peter (MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: RE: RBC report

Sounds good.

Brian K. Cherry
PG&E Company
VP, Regulatory Relations
77 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA. 94105
(415) 973-4977

On Oct 10, 2013, at 5:34 PM, "Florio, Michel Peter" <MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov>
wrote:

> 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]

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