

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



FILED

1-23-17
04:59 PM

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric
Company for Authority, Among Other Things,
to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and
Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2017.
(U39M)

Application 15-09-001
(Filed September 1, 2015)

**LATE-FILED EX PARTE NOTICE OF
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK**

January 23, 2017

Hayley Goodson

Staff Attorney
The Utility Reform Network
785 Market Street, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (415) 929-8876
Fax: (415) 929-1132
E-mail: hayley@turn.org

LATE-FILED EX PARTE NOTICE OF THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

Pursuant to Rules 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) submits this late-filed notice of ex parte communication.

On January 11, 2017, TURN Staff Attorney Hayley Goodson was speaking as TURN's representative on a panel entitled "Exploring the pros and cons of a 3-year vs 4-year GRC cycle" at a publicly noticed workshop held in proceeding R.13-11-006. The workshop took place in the Commission's Auditorium at 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, 94102. Ms. Goodson was on the panel from 1:45 PM until approximately 3:00 PM. During some or all of this time, President Picker's energy advisor David Peck was in attendance at the workshop. Other Commissioner's advisors or persons meeting the definition of "decisionmaker" under Article 8 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure may have also been in the Auditorium or participating by teleconference.

To illustrate the difference a 3-year versus 4-year GRC cycle can make for ratepayers, Ms. Goodson mentioned an article published on SFGate.com that morning reporting that PG&E had announced significant layoffs and reductions in contractors, which would save \$300 million a year. Ms. Goodson suggested that, to the extent these reductions are not reflected in the forthcoming outcome in PG&E's Test Year 2017 GRC, A.15-09-001 (a matter upon which Ms. Goodson offered no comment), ratepayers will not see the benefits until the Commission considers PG&E's cost of service in PG&E's next GRC. Under a 3-year GRC cycle, ratepayers would wait three years to see such cost reductions (if any) reflected in rates, while under a 4-year cycle, the lag would be four years. While Ms. Goodson used this example to illustrate why TURN prefers 3-year GRC cycles over 4-year cycles as a general matter, TURN submits this ex

parte notice out of an abundance of caution because the length of PG&E's 2017 GRC cycle is a matter currently pending before the Commission in A.05-09-001.

Also, when PG&E representative Shelly Sharp responded to a question from Energy Division staff later in the afternoon and indicated PG&E's and ORA's support for a 4-year cycle in PG&E's 2017 GRC,¹ Ms. Goodson may have indicated TURN's disagreement.

Date: January 23, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____/s/_____
Hayley Goodson
Staff Attorney

The Utility Reform Network
785 Market Street, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94103
Phone: (415) 929-8876
Fax: (415) 929-1132
Email: hayley@turn.org

¹ PG&E filed a notice of ex parte communication disclosing this statement by Ms. Sharp on January 17, 2017.