



FILED
4-18-16
04:59 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Investigation and Ordering
Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear
and Show Cause Why It Should Not Be
Sanctioned for Violations of Article 8 and Rule
1.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure and
Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2 and
1701.3

Investigation 15-11-015
(Filed November 23, 2015)

**JOINT MEET AND CONFER PROCESS REPORT OF THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO,
THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS, THE OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES, THE
SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK,
AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

KIRK A. WILKINSON
SEAN P.J. COYLE
LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
355 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 485-1234
Facsimile: (213) 891-8763
Email: Kirk.Wilkinson@lw.com

Dated: April 18, 2016

Attorneys for
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Investigation and Ordering Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear and Show Cause Why It Should Not Be Sanctioned for Violations of Article 8 and Rule 1.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure and Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2 and 1701.3

Investigation 15-11-015
(Filed November 23, 2015)

**JOINT MEET AND CONFER PROCESS REPORT OF THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO,
THE CITY OF SAN CARLOS, THE OFFICE OF RATEPAYER ADVOCATES, THE
SAFETY AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK,
AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY**

Pursuant to the January 8, 2016 Ruling Directing Parties to Engage in Meet and Confer Process and Setting Prehearing Conference (“Meet and Confer Order”), the City of San Bruno, the City of San Carlos, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (“ORA”), the Safety and Enforcement Division (“SED”), The Utility Reform Network (“TURN”), and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (“PG&E”) (collectively, the “Parties”) have engaged in a substantive and detailed meet and confer process. The Parties hereby file this Joint Meet and Confer Process Report in advance of the Prehearing Conference scheduled for April 20, 2016.

I. MEET AND CONFER PROCESS

The Parties met and conferred concerning the issues identified in the Meet and Confer Order. The Parties worked diligently to reach agreement on the proposed scope of the proceeding, a procedure for moving undisputed facts into the evidentiary record, a diligence process for providing additional factual information, and a proposed procedural schedule for resolving this matter.

The Parties met by telephone on January 25, March 17, and April 15, and in person on January 27, February 11, February 18, March 1, March 8, March 15, April 7, and April 13, and exchanged information as part of the meet and confer process.

The major areas of discussion during the meet and confer process were:

- Communications in the proceeding as identified in the Commission’s Order Instituting Investigation and Ordering Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear and Show Cause Why It Should Not Be Sanctioned for Violations of Article 8 and Rule 1.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure and Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2 and 1701.3 (“OII Order”), dated November 19, 2015;
- Additional communications that the City of San Bruno, the City of San Carlos, ORA, SED, and TURN (“Non-PG&E Parties”) proposed adding to this proceeding;
- Factual stipulations in order to move undisputed facts into the evidentiary record so that the Commission can resolve the legal and policy issues for certain communications at issue without further discovery;
- Additional information requested by the Non-PG&E Parties (the “Data Requests”) regarding specific communications between PG&E and the CPUC;
- Protocols for PG&E to follow to respond to the Data Requests;
- Proposed schedule for PG&E to respond to the Data Requests;
- Proposed schedule for the remainder of the proceeding.

II. SCOPE OF PROCEEDING

The Parties worked diligently throughout the meet and confer process to reach agreement on the proposed scope of the proceeding. In the OII Order, the Commission identified 48 communications at issue. These 48 communications were comprised of 7 communications for which PG&E provided late-filed notices of improper communications and 41 communications that the City of San Bruno alleged were ex parte communications in its Motion to Show Cause,¹

¹ *Motion of the City of San Bruno for an Order to Show Cause Why Pacific Gas and Electric Company Should Not Be Held in Violation of Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 8.3(b) (Rule Against Ex Parte Communication) and for Sanctions and fees*, filed on July 28, 2014.

filed July 28, 2014, and its Motion for Evidentiary Hearing,² filed November 10, 2014 (together, the “San Bruno Motions”). During the meet and confer process, the Parties reached agreement that 2 of the 41 communications from the San Bruno Motions would not be pursued further. As a result, the Parties propose that 46 of the communications identified in the OII remain at issue.

In response to the Non-PG&E Parties’ proposal to include a number of additional communications,³ subject to the Commission’s approval, the Parties also have agreed to add 113 additional communications to this proceeding. Further, the Parties were unable to reach agreement as to whether to include an additional 21 communications, and therefore, the Parties have agreed to brief whether these should be included in this proceeding as part of the schedule set forth below.

Therefore, subject to the Commission’s approval, the Parties have agreed that the scope of this proceeding may include a total of 159 communications (the 46 communications already included in the OII and 113 additional communications). These 159 communications have been divided into two categories. The majority of these communications (135) are evident from the face of the email communication at issue, and therefore the Parties have agreed to enter additional factual information into the evidentiary record by submitting stipulations. As discussed below, these 135 communications have been placed in “Category 1.” The Non-PG&E

² *Motion for Evidentiary Hearing on City of San Bruno’s Motion for an Order to Show Cause as to Why Pacific Gas and Electric Company Should Not Be Held in Violation of Commission Rule of Practice and Procedure 8.3(b) and for Sanctions and Fees*, filed on November 10, 2014.

³ Several of the additional communications that the City of San Bruno proposed including in this proceeding also were identified by the City of San Bruno as alleged ex parte communications in its *Motion of the City of San Bruno for an Order to Show Cause Why Pacific Gas and Electric Company Should Not Be Held in Violation of Commission Ex Parte Rules and For Sanctions and Fees with Supporting Exhibits 1 Through 71*, filed December 1, 2015, in proceeding A.13-12-012. The City of San Bruno had indicated its intention to withdraw its Motion in proceeding A.13-12-012 if the Commission approves the inclusion of such communications in the instant proceeding.

Parties have requested additional diligence concerning the remaining 24 communications, and the Parties have negotiated a protocol and a schedule by which PG&E would conduct that diligence as described below. These 24 communications have been placed in “Category 2.”

The Parties have agreed that the 21 communications about which the Parties disagree as to whether they should be included in the proceeding will be labeled “Category 3.” The Parties will brief whether to include these communications on the schedule set forth below. If they are included, PG&E will need additional time to perform its diligence concerning Category 3.

Aside from those communications for which PG&E has filed late-filed notices of improper communications, PG&E disagrees with the Non-PG&E Parties that the additional communications proposed to be included in the proceeding constitute ex parte violations. PG&E has agreed to add these items for efficiency and to allow the disputed communications to be resolved in one proceeding.

During the meet and confer process, PG&E asked the Non-PG&E Parties to withdraw some documents that it believed did not constitute ex parte violations. As part of the meet and confer process, the Non-PG&E Parties agreed to withdraw a number of those documents from consideration in the proceeding.

The categories described above are described in the chart included as Exhibit 1. Additional detail for each category is provided below.

III. CATEGORY 1

Category 1 is comprised of 135 communications (1-1 through 1-135) and generally consists of emails transmitting information—such as an analyst report, a news article, or a press release—from a PG&E employee to one or more individuals at the CPUC. The first 36 communications (1-1 through 1-36) are communications that already are included in the

proceeding per the OII Order. The remaining 99 communications (1-37 through 1-135) are additional communications that one or more of the Non-PG&E Parties propose be added to the proceeding.

The Parties agree that any factual or evidentiary issues in the Category 1 communications can be resolved by stipulation, and therefore any legal or policy issues can be resolved by the Commission without further discovery. The format for such stipulations was discussed throughout the meet and confer process and below is a sample of the proposed stipulation format (additional exemplars have been provided in Exhibit 2).

Tab No.	Date of Email	Proceeding(s) Alleged	Potential Factual Stipulations for Discussion	Issues of Policy or Law
1-1 (Tab 1)	3/16/11	1. I.11-02-016 (Record-keeping OII)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The communication took place on March 16, 2011, and as reflected in the email. 2. The proceeding (I.11-02-016) was an adjudicatory proceeding, so ex parte communications concerning the proceeding was prohibited under Rule 8.3(b). 3. Brian Cherry was a representative of PG&E, an interested party. Michael Peevey was a decisionmaker at the Commission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this a substantive communication about an open proceeding? 2. Did this communication violate the Commission's Rules or Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2(c)? 3. If so, how many violations occurred and what sanctions should be imposed on PG&E?

Upon the Commission's approval of the Parties' proposed treatment of Category 1 communications, the Parties will submit the completed stipulations to the Commission by August 12, 2016.

IV. CATEGORY 2

Category 2 is comprised of 24 communications (2-1 through 2-24). Category 2 generally consists of emails concerning PG&E activities, and many involve descriptions of oral communications. The first 10 communications (2-1 through 2-10) are communications that

already are included in the proceeding per the OII Order. The remaining 14 communications (2-11 through 2-24) are additional communications that one or more of the Non-PG&E Parties proposed to be added to the proceeding.

For each of the 24 communications in Category 2, the Non-PG&E Parties have indicated their position that for the documents included in Category 2, there appears to have been an ex parte violation, but they need additional information to confirm that conclusion (or determine it is not an ex parte violation) and/or to provide information concerning the appropriate penalty. While not agreeing with the Non-PG&E Parties' position or that there are disputed issues of material fact, PG&E has agreed to conduct diligence and provide additional information about the Category 2 communications.

To accomplish this diligence efficiently and limit any disputes concerning the process, the Non-PG&E Parties have provided PG&E with Data Requests for the Category 2 communications. (Exhibit 3). The Parties have agreed to a protocol that PG&E will apply to each communication while completing the diligence necessary to respond to the Non-PG&E Parties' Data Requests. (Exhibit 4). This protocol is as follows:

Review PG&E participants' emails,⁴ looking for emails that could be part of or concern the same chain for a period starting *3 days before and ending 3 days after* the email.

Review PG&E participants' emails for emails that could relate to the future or past meeting or communication for a period starting *3 days before and ending 3 days after* the future or past meeting or communication date identified in the email.

⁴ The Non-PG&E Parties have requested that PG&E also subject text messages to the protocol in responding to the Data Requests. PG&E is evaluating their request, including whether it is technically feasible.

If when applying the above protocol, additional communications with the CPUC decisionmakers or advisors are identified concerning the same topic, the above protocol will be applied to the dates and participants involved in the additional communications as well.

Interview participants who are current employees and seek interviews from participants who are former employees to pose the questions set forth in the Data Requests.

For three of the communications included in Category 2, the Parties have identified participants who were not PG&E employees and therefore their emails are not within PG&E's control. PG&E will seek to obtain relevant emails from such individuals for review and seek an interview from such individuals to pose the questions set forth in the Data Request.

Upon the Commission's approval to include Category 2 in the scope of this proceeding, PG&E anticipates that it will take approximately 4-6 months to answer the Data Requests using the above protocol. This will involve: collecting emails from PG&E employees who participated in those communications for a total of seven days per communication (*3 days before and 3 days after*); reviewing the emails collected to determine if there is additional information concerning the communications at issue; conducting interviews with current employees and seeking interviews from former employees; and, providing written responses to the Data Requests.

The Non-PG&E Parties reserve the right to seek additional information, by discovery or hearings. PG&E reserves its right to object to any further information requests after it responds to the Data Requests using the protocol negotiated.

V. CATEGORY 3

Category 3 is comprised of 21 communications (3-1 through 3-21). None of the Category 3 communications are currently included in the proceeding. The Category 3 communications primarily consist of communications that reference potential oral communications, including meetings, meals, encounters, or site visits involving PG&E personnel

and CPUC personnel, but do not provide much detail concerning those events. The Non-PG&E Parties have requested these Category 3 communications be included in the proceeding, asserting that while they do not appear to be ex parte violations themselves, the communications suggest that a violation may have occurred. Accordingly, the Non-PG&E Parties believe that due diligence requires further inquiries be made in order to determine whether the meeting with a decisionmaker and/or advisor occurred, and if so, what was discussed. PG&E objects to including these communications because, among other things, the events described in the emails do not indicate any ex parte violations. Therefore, it is PG&E's position that adding such communications to the proceeding would be inefficient and would require substantial diligence for communications that, in any event, are poorly identified and even more difficult to subject to reasonable diligence.

The Parties have agreed to brief whether the Category 3 communications should be added to the proceeding, and have recognized that PG&E would follow a similar protocol as for Category 2 if they are included. PG&E anticipates that it would require up to two additional months to complete the necessary diligence for Category 3 communications if they are added to the proceedings and the protocol discussed in Category 2 is applied.

VI. PROPOSED SCHEDULE

As instructed by the Commission in its Meet and Confer Order, the Parties engaged in a substantive and detailed meet and confer process and developed an efficient proposal for a procedural schedule to resolve the issues identified in the OII Order. The Parties have agreed upon the following proposed schedule for additional activities in this proceeding, with further activities to be scheduled after PG&E completes its diligence in response to the Data Requests for Category 2, and if included, Category 3.

EXHIBIT 1

Ex Parte OII – Communications At Issue

	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Total
Communications Identified in OII	36 (parties agreed to remove 2 items)	10	0	46
Additional Communications Identified by Non-PG&E Parties	99	14	21	134
Total	135	24	21	180

Category 1: Category 1 consists of transmittal emails with attachments. The Parties propose including the additional items in the scope of the proceeding and will submit stipulations for all of them by August 12, 2016.

Category 2: Category 2 consists of emails that describe oral communications or meetings. The Non-PG&E Parties request additional information to assess whether or not the communication described is an ex parte violation (and, if so, to provide information concerning the appropriate penalty). While not agreeing with the Non-PG&E Parties' position, PG&E has agreed to conduct diligence and provide additional information about the Category 2 communications by following the agreed protocol to answer the Data Requests.

Category 3: Category 3 consists of communications that reference potential oral communications, including meetings, meals, encounters, or site visits involving PG&E personnel and CPUC personnel, but do not provide much detail concerning those events. The Non-PG&E Parties have requested these Category 3 communications be included in the proceeding asserting that while they do not appear to be ex parte violations themselves, they suggest that a communication that could possibly be a violation may have occurred. PG&E objects to including these communications because, among other things, the events described in the emails do not indicate any ex parte violation occurred, and adding such communications would require substantial diligence for communications that are poorly identified and therefore even more difficult to subject to efficient and reasonable diligence. The Parties will brief whether these communications should be included in the scope of this OII.

EXHIBIT 2

Ex Parte OII – Sample Stipulations

Tab No.	Date of Email	Proceeding(s) Alleged	Potential Factual Stipulations for Discussion	Issues of Policy or Law
1-1	3/16/11	1. I.11-02-016 (Record-keeping OII)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The communication took place on March 16, 2011, and as reflected in the email. 2. The proceeding (I.11-02-016) was an adjudicatory proceeding, so ex parte communications concerning the proceeding was prohibited under Rule 8.3(b). 3. Brian Cherry was a representative of PG&E, an interested party. Michael Peevey was a decisionmaker at the Commission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this a substantive communication about an open proceeding? 2. Did this communication violate the Commission’s Rules or Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2(c)? 3. If so, how many violations occurred and what sanctions should be imposed on PG&E?
1-2	3/16/11	1. I.11-02-016 (Record-keeping OII)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The communication took place on March 16, 2011, and as reflected in the email. 2. The proceeding (I.11-02-016) was an adjudicatory proceeding, so ex parte communications concerning the proceeding was prohibited under Rule 8.3(b). 3. Brian Cherry was a representative of PG&E, an interested party. Michael Peevey was a decisionmaker at the Commission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this a substantive communication about an open proceeding? 2. Did this communication violate the Commission’s Rules or Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2(c)? 3. If so, how many violations occurred and what sanctions should be imposed on PG&E?

Tab No.	Date of Email	Proceeding(s) Alleged	Potential Factual Stipulations for Discussion	Issues of Policy or Law
1-11	6/09/11	1. I.11-02-016 (Record-keeping OII)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The communication took place on June 9, 2011, and as reflected in the email. 2. The proceeding (I.11-02-016) was an adjudicatory proceeding, so ex parte communications concerning the proceeding was prohibited under Rule 8.3(b). 3. Brian Cherry was a representative of PG&E, an interested party. Michael Peevey was a decisionmaker at the Commission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this a substantive communication about an open proceeding? 2. Did this communication violate the Commission's Rules or Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2(c)? 3. If so, how many violations occurred and what sanctions should be imposed on PG&E?
1-97	9/11/12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I.12-01-007 (San Bruno OII) 2. I.11-11-009 (Class Location OII) 3. I.11-02-016 (Record-keeping OII) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The communication took place on September 11, 2012, and as reflected in the email. 2. The proceedings (I.12-01-007, I.11-11-009, I.11-02-016) were adjudicatory proceedings, so ex parte communications concerning the proceedings were prohibited under Rule 8.3(b). 3. Brian Cherry was a representative of PG&E, an interested party. Mark Ferron was a decisionmaker at the Commission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this a substantive communication about an open proceeding? 2. Did this communication violate the Commission's Rules or Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2(c)? 3. If so, how many violations occurred and what sanctions should be imposed on PG&E?

Tab No.	Date of Email	Proceeding(s) Alleged	Potential Factual Stipulations for Discussion	Issues of Policy or Law
1-103	11/01/12	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I.12-01-007 (San Bruno OII) 2. I.11-11-009 (Class Location OII) 3. I.11-02-016 (Record-keeping OII) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The communication took place on November 1, 2012, and as reflected in the email. 2. The proceedings (I.12-01-007, I.11-11-009, I.11-02-016) were adjudicatory proceedings, so ex parte communications concerning the proceedings were prohibited under Rule 8.3(b). 3. Brian Cherry was a representative of PG&E, an interested party. Mark Ferron was a decisionmaker at the Commission. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was this a substantive communication about an open proceeding? 2. Did this communication violate the Commission's Rules or Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2(c)? 3. If so, how many violations occurred and what sanctions should be imposed on PG&E?

EXHIBIT 3

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Investigation and
Ordering Pacific Gas and Electric Company
to Appear and Show Cause Why It Should
not be Sanctioned for Violations of Article 8
and Rule 1.1 of the Rules of Practice and
Procedure and Public Utilities Code
Sections 1701.2 and 1701.3.

Investigation 15-11-015
(Filed November 19, 2015)

FIRST DATA REQUEST OF COMMISSION STAFF AND INTERVENORS⁵ TO PG&E

⁵ Parties submitting this data request are the Commission's Safety and Enforcement Division and Office of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, the City of San Bruno and the City of San Carlos.

INSTRUCTIONS

You are instructed to answer the following Data Requests in the above-captioned proceeding, with written, verified responses per Public Utilities Code §§ 309.5 and 314, and Rules 1.1 and 10.1 of the California Public Utilities Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Restate the text of each request prior to providing the response.

PG&E shall use the protocol agreed upon (attached as Exhibit 4 to the Joint Meet and Confer Process Report filed April 18, 2016) to answer each Data Request. Each Data Request is continuing in nature. If you acquire additional information after providing an answer to any request, you must supplement your response following the receipt of such additional information.

Identify the persons providing the information used to answer to each Data Request. Responses should be provided both in the original electronic format, if available, and in hard copy. (If available in Word format, send the Word document and do not send the information as a PDF file.) All electronic documents submitted in response to this data request should be in readable, downloadable, printable, and searchable formats, unless use of such formats is infeasible. Each page should be numbered. Documents produced in response to the data requests should be Bates-numbered, and indexed if voluminous. Responses to data requests that refer to or incorporate documents should identify the particular documents referenced by Bates-numbers or Bates-range.

If a request, definition, or an instruction, is unclear, notify counsel for intervenors as soon as possible. In any event, answer the request to the fullest extent possible, specifying the reason for your inability to answer the remaining portion of the Data Request.

The questions all refer to Tab numbers in the binders the parties have been using in the Meet & Confer process. For any of the following items, if PG&E is unable to provide the information, please provide a detailed explanation of why not and what steps PG&E undertook to attempt to provide the information

Tab 2-1

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-1, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Peevey on or around May 30, 2010, including but not limited to the “dinner” the two shared on May 30, 2010, as described in the two emails from Brian Cherry to Tom Bottorff on May 31, 2010. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-2

Q1: Was Jerry Hallisey acting as an agent of PG&E or receiving consideration to represent PG&E at the time of his communication with Commissioner Ferron on September 20, 2011, as recounted in his email to Brian Cherry and Tom Bottorff at 5:12 PM that same day?

Q2: Please explain the scope and duration of consulting services provided by Mr. Hallisey to PG&E, as referenced in the email included in Tab 2-3 from Brian Cherry to Tom Bottorff at 8:45 PM on November 22, 2011.

Q3: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-2, between Jerry Hallisey and Commissioner Ferron on or around September 20, 2011, including but not limited to the meeting on September 20, 2011, as described in the email from Mr. Hallisey to Brian Cherry and Tom Bottorff that day. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-3

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-3, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Florio on or around November 21, 2011, including but not limited to the meeting on November 21, 2011, as described in the email from Mr. Hallisey to Marc Joseph, Brian Cherry and Tom Bottorff on November 22, 2011. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Q2: To PG&E's knowledge, did the "meeting in the very near future by organized labor with Florio" that Jerry Hallisey recommended in his email to Marc Joseph, Brian Cherry and Tom Bottorff on November 22, 2011 occur? If so, and to the extent an employee or agent of PG&E, or someone receiving consideration to represent PG&E, attended that meeting or otherwise participated in the communication, provide the following information about that communication with Commissioner Florio:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-4

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications between an employee or agent of PG&E, or someone receiving consideration to represent PG&E, and Commissioner Peevey on or around March 2, 2012 and pertaining to the subject matters addressed by “Susan” in her email to Brian Cherry on March 2, 2012. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-5

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-5, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Peevey on or around January 1, 2013, including but not limited to their meeting in Sea Ranch on December 31, 2012, as described in the email from Brian Cherry to Tom Bottorff on January 1, 2013 at 4:08 PM. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-6

Q1: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-6, that took place on or around April 25, 2013 between Ms. Doll and Ms. Brown. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-7

Q1: Besides Mr. Cherry's 1/1/14 email to Carol Brown and the Response (Tab 2-8) were there any other communications on around 1/1/14 between PG&E and Ms. Brown concerning either I.12-01-007, I.11-02-016, or I.11-11-009? If so, provide the same information as for Tab 2-6.

Tab 2-9

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-9, between Sidney Dietz and “Scott M” on or around January 28, 2014, including but not limited to the communication referenced in Mr. Dietz’s email exchange with Michael Campbell on January 28, 2013. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-10

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-10, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Florio on or around March 6, 2014, including but not limited to the communication referenced in Mr. Cherry's email to Erik Jacobson and Meredith Allen on March 6, 2014. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-11

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-11, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Peevey on or around August 29, 2010, including but not limited to their communication on August 29, 2010, as described in the email from Brian Cherry to Tom Bottorff that day. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-12

Q1: For the meeting with Commissioner Florio on 9/23/11, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.
- Provide the second attachment to Jennifer Dowdell's email ("Rough comparative spending statistics").

Tab 2-13

Q1: Please provide a description of any communication, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-13, including but not limited to voice messages, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Florio on or around 11/2/11. For each such communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-14

Q1: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-14, that took place on or around January 31, 2012, between Mr. Bottorff and Mr. Clanon and/or Mr. Lindh. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Q2: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-14, that took place between Mr. Early and President Peevey and/or Commissioner Florio on or around January 31, 2012. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-15

Q1: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-15, that took place on or around July 11, 2012, between Mr. Cherry and Commissioner Ferron or his advisors. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Q2: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-15, that took place on or around July 11, 2012, between Ms. Doll and Mr. Clanon. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each person involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-16

Q1: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-16, that took place on or around July 23, 2012, between Mr. Cherry and Commissioner Florio. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-17

Q1: Please provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-17, between Laura Doll and Commissioner Florio on or around August 16, 2012, including but not limited to the “meet and greet” described by Ms. Doll in her email to Jane Yura on August 17, 2012. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-18

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-18, between Brian Cherry and Commissioner Florio on or around December 19, 2012, including but not limited to the “visit” referenced in the 12:06 pm email from Commissioner Florio to Mr. Cherry. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-19

Q1: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-19, that took place on or around February 22, 2013, between Mr. Cherry and Commissioner Florio. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-20

Q1: Provide a complete listing of communications, concerning the matter(s) at issue in the email(s) included in Tab 2-20, that took place during the seven-day period concluding on October 2, 2013, between Mr. Hughes and CPUC Commissioners and advisors, including Mr. Colvin. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Q2: To the extent not provided in response to the first part of this question, provide a complete listing of all communications between PG&E and Commissioners and/or advisors regarding A.12-03-001 that took place during the seven-day period concluding on October 2, 2013. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Tab 2-21; Tab 2-22; Tab 2-23; and Tab 2-24

Q1: Provide a complete listing of all communications from December 15 through December 19, 2013, between Mr. Brian Cherry, and/or any PG&E employees or consultants and CPUC Commissioner Michael Florio and/or any other Commissioner or advisors concerning Line 147 or the repressurization proceeding (R.11-11-019). For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination and medium of communication;
- Which open CPUC proceedings were discussed, if any;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

Q2: To the extent not provided in response to the first part of this question, provide a complete listing of all communications between Brian Cherry or Laura Doll and Commissioners and/or advisors regarding Line 147 and the repressurization hearing (R.11-11-019) before the CPUC that occurred between December 6, 2013, and December 19, 2013. For each communication, provide the following information:

- The date, time, and location of the communication, and whether it was oral, written, or a combination and medium of communication;
- The identities of each decisionmaker (or Commissioner's personal advisor) involved, the person initiating the communication, and any persons present during such communication; and
- A description of the communication and its content, to which description shall be attached a copy of any written, audiovisual, or other material used for or during communication.

EXHIBIT 4

Ex Parte OII – Protocol for Responding to Data Requests

Review PG&E participants’ emails, looking for emails that could be part of or concern the same chain for a period starting *3 days before and ending 3 days after* the email.

Review PG&E participants’ emails for emails that could relate to the future or past meeting or communication for a period starting *3 days before and ending 3 days after* the future or past meeting or communication date identified in the email.

If when applying the above protocol, additional communications with CPUC decisionmakers or advisors are identified concerning the same topic, the above protocol will be applied to the dates and participants involved in the additional communications as well.

Interview participants who are current employees and seek interviews from participants who are former employees to pose the questions set forth in the Data Requests.

The PG&E participants subject to the Protocol for each Communication are as follows:

Tab	Participants
2-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas
2-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Hallisey, Jerry*
2-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Doll, Laura • Hallisey, Jerry*
2-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Kennedy, Susan*
2-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas
2-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doll, Laura
2-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian
2-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian
2-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dietz, Sidney
2-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Erik, Jacobson • Allen, Meredith

2-11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas
2-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dowdell, Jennifer • Yura, Jane • Christopher, Melvin • Cherry, Brian • Jacobson, Erik
2-13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas
2-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bottorff, Thomas • Earley, Anthony
2-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Doll, Laura
2-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Allen, Meredith
2-17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laura, Doll • Yura, Jane • Soto Jr., Jesus
2-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Doll, Laura
2-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas
2-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Hughes, John
2-21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Doll, Laura • Christopher, Melvin • Brown, Rick
2-22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Doll, Laura
2-23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cherry, Brian • Bottorff, Thomas • Doll, Laura • Singh, Sumeet

2-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cherry, Brian• Bottorff, Thomas• Doll, Laura• Christopher, Melvin
------	--

* This individual was not employed at PG&E and therefore his/her emails are not within PG&E's control. PG&E will seek to obtain relevant emails from the individual for review and seek an interview from this individual to pose the questions set forth in the Data Request.