

From: Florio, Michel Peter
Sent: 12/18/2013 12:05:34 PM
To: Cherry, Brian K (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BKC7)
Cc:
Bcc:
Subject: Re: Line 147 Decision

No problem – she’s in the loop, albeit away from the office in Sac

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 11:12 AM
To: Florio, Michel Peter
Subject: RE: Line 147 Decision

Sorry. I cc'd Sepideh on the last email. Hope that doesn't cause trouble.

From: Florio, Michel Peter [mailto:MichelPeter.Florio@cpuc.ca.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:59 AM
To: Cherry, Brian K
Subject: RE: Line 147 Decision

We want to go ahead but now the Governor's office is asking if we can somehow "compromise" with the City on 240 psi, which is the number they think they can live with. Mike and I are very leery since we have no basis for that number and don't know the impacts. What would you think if I ask from the dias that PG&E voluntarily limit to 240 unless absolutely necessary to avoid bigger problems? Just trying to find a way to move forward . . .
. Mike

From: Cherry, Brian K [mailto:BKC7@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 18, 2013 10:56 AM
To: Khosrowjah, Sepideh; Florio, Michel Peter
Subject: Line 147 Decision

Sepideh/Mike – is the decision a go for the Business Meeting or do you expect it to be held ?

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>

PG&E is committed to protecting our customers' privacy.

To learn more, please visit <http://www.pge.com/about/company/privacy/customer/>