

From: Cherry, Brian K  
Sent: 4/18/2011 10:16:13 AM  
To: Post, Jennifer (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=JLKm); 'Greene, Eric' (eric.greene@cpuc.ca.gov)  
Cc: Yee, Frances (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=FSC2); [Redacted]  
[Redacted] Manheim, William (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=WVM3); Patrizio, Mark (Law) (/O=PG&E/OU=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=MDP5)  
Bcc:  
Subject: RE: A.10-01-022 DCPD license extension Letter to ASLB

Thanks Eric. I couldn't agree more.

**From:** Greene, Eric [mailto:eric.greene@cpuc.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 18, 2011 10:04 AM  
**To:** Post, Jennifer (Law)  
**Cc:** Cherry, Brian K; Yee, Frances; Patrizio, Mark (Law); Manheim, William (Law); [Redacted]  
**Subject:** RE: A.10-01-022 DCPD license extension Letter to ASLB

Jennifer:

Thanks for sending the requested letter. The April 12 letter from [Redacted], which attaches the April 10 letter from PG&E to the NRC, clearly states,

“In the attached letter, PG&E has requested that the NRC confirm that it will ‘delay the final processing’ of the DCPD license renewal application, ‘such that the renewed operating licenses, if approved, would not be issued until after PG&E has completed the 3-D seismic studies and submitted a report to the NRC addressing the results of those studies.’

PG&E has not requested any suspension or delay in the NRC Staff’s ongoing safety and environmental reviews of the DCPD license renewal application.... PG&E is also not requesting any delay in the schedule for this licensing hearing process....”

It appears to me that since April 10, there have been a flurry of articles in various newspapers, other information circulated by intervener groups, statements by other state agencies and legislators, that misrepresent the facts or misquote PG&E’s actions, or take words out of context that imply that PG&E is seeking a delay or halt to the DCPD relicensing process at the Federal level. The April 12 letter from [Redacted] very clearly states PG&E’s intentions and requested actions. I feel this well-written letter needs to become part of the A.10-01-022 record in some manner.

I suspect that many on the outside, in the public, or at the legislature, do not fully realize that the

relicensing effort is about a 3-4 year process, and that PG&E is expending a large amount of resources to address all the safety and environmental information needed to be presented before the ASLB. Even as a worst case scenario, should the NRC decide not to grant the relicensing for DCP, which is highly unlikely, PG&E will still have spent thousands of hours and resources (\$80 - \$85 million or more) over the 3-4 years in this relicensing effort. I have heard Senator Sam Blakeslee and the A4NR say that ratepayers should not be burdened with paying these monies for re-licensing now. But to me, PG&E is incurring the expenses, which are legitimate, and will continue to incur expenses as the process moves forward.

Thanks.

Eric

**From:** Post, Jennifer (Law) [mailto:JLKm@pge.com]

**Sent:** Monday, April 18, 2011 7:15 AM

**To:** Greene, Eric

**Cc:** Cherry, Brian K; Yee, Frances; Patrizio, Mark (Law); Manheim, William (Law); Redacted

**Subject:** RE: A.10-01-022 DCP license extension Letter to ASLB

Eric:

Here is the letter we sent to the NRC. At this point, the letter may be included in our Opposition to CARE's Motion to Suspend the proceeding. It may otherwise have been included in any motion the parties filed to re-set the hearing date. We have a call with the settling parties tonight to discuss path forward.

Jennifer

**From:** Greene, Eric [mailto:eric.greene@cpuc.ca.gov]

**Sent:** Friday, April 15, 2011 1:44 PM

**To:** Post, Jennifer (Law)

**Cc:** Cherry, Brian K; Yee, Frances

**Subject:** A.10-01-022 DCP license extension Letter to ASLB

Can you electronically send to me a copy of PG&E's letter dated April 12, 2011 to the ASLB

regarding the license renewal application for DCP? Attached to this letter is a copy of the April 10, 2011 letter sent by PG&E to the NRC requesting deferral of approval of the DCP operating license.

Does PG&E intend to somehow get this correspondence into the record for A.10-01-022, perhaps by way of ex-parte communication or other? The April 12<sup>th</sup> letter to the ASLB clearly states, "PG&E has not requested any suspension or delay in the NRC Staff's ongoing safety and environmental reviews of the DCP license renewal application." I am aware that the hearings that had been scheduled for A.10-01-022 that were scheduled for April 13, 2011 were taken off the CPUC calendar, and no further communication has been issued by the assigned ALJ regarding testimony, rebuttal testimony, correspondence, and communication.

Thanks.

Eric Greene

CPUC – Energy Division

415-703-5560 [eg1@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:eg1@cpuc.ca.gov)