50-275/323

1 JAMES L. LOPES (No. 63678) WILLIAM J. LAFFERTY (No. 120814) 2 HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CÁNADY, FALK & RABKIN 3 A Professional Corporation Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4065 4 Telephone: 415/434-1600 5 Facsimile: 415/217-5910 6 ROGER J. PETERS (No. 77743) CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER (No. 140915) 7 STEVEN W. FRANK (No. 159334) PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 8 P.O. Box 7442 San Francisco, California 94120 9 Telephone: 415/973-7000 Facsimile: 415/973-5520 10 Attorneys for Debtor and Debtor In Possession 11 PACIFÍC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 12 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 13 HOWARD RICE VEMEROVSKI CANADY NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 16 17 Case No. 01 30923 DM In re 18 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC Chapter 11 Case COMPANY, a California corporation, 19 October 29, 2001 Date: Time: 9:30 a.m. Debtor. 235 Pine Street, 22nd Floor 20 Place: Federal I.D. No. 94-0742640 San Francisco, California 21 Judge: Hon. Dennis Montali 22 23 DECLARATION OF ROY M. KUGA IN SUPPORT OF PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S MOTION REGARDING REQUEST BY CALIFORNIA 24 DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND ORDER BY CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION THAT PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 25 ENTER INTO SERVICING AGREEMENT WITH THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES 26 1001 Add Kols Oge Mail Center 27 28

DECLARATION OF ROY M. KUGA IN SUPPORT OF PG&E'S MOTION

HOWARD RICE EMEROVSKI

EMEROVSKI 14 CANADY 14 ENLK GRABKIN

## I, ROY M. KUGA, declare as follows:

- 1. I am a director of Gas and Electric Supply at Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), a position I have held for the last year. I have been with PG&E for 20 years. I make this declaration in support of PG&E's "Motion Regarding Request By California Department of Water Resources and Order By California Public Utilities Commission that Pacific Gas and Electric Company Enter Into Servicing Agreement With The California Department of Water Resources."
- 2. PG&E has been, and is currently, making payments to DWR consistent with California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") Decisions 01-03-081, 01-03-082, and 01-05-064. Since the issuance of these decisions, PG&E has been paying the California Department of Water Resources ("DWR") at the generation-related rate authorized by the CPUC, on a daily basis (and under a full reservation of rights), for power DWR purchased and provided to PG&E's customers. Depending on the period at issue, PG&E has paid DWR at the applicable generation-related rate, ranging from 5.471 cents/kWh to 9.987 cents/kWh. To date, PG&E has transferred to DWR over \$1 billion for power it purchased beginning in mid-January 2001.
- 3. On May 2, 2001, DWR submitted its proposed revenue requirement to the CPUC to recover its cost of procuring power for the customers of PG&E, Southern California Edison ("SCE") and San Diego Gas & Electric Company ("SDG&E"). On July 23, 2001, DWR filed a revised request with the CPUC, extending its revenue requirement through December 31, 2002, and seeking a total recovery of \$13.072 billion, of which DWR attributed \$5.197 billion to PG&E. After a number of parties, including PG&E, filed lengthy data requests with the CPUC questioning the accuracy and reasonableness of DWR's July 23, 2001 revenue requirement request, DWR filed a third revenue requirement request on August 7, 2001. In this request, DWR increased its estimate of power that it would purchase on PG&E's behalf, and the total revenue recovery sought from PG&E from \$5.197 billion to \$5.927 billion, over the relevant two-year period. Numerous parties, including PG&E,

4.

1

6

4

9

7

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27

28

continued to protest the DWR request as inaccurate, unreasonable and not sufficiently documented.

On August 27, 2001, the CPUC held a press conference in Sacramento, announcing that it would issue for comment a draft decision revising DWR's requested revenue requirement to shift over \$600 million in DWR power costs from Southern California customers of SCE and SDG&E to Northern and Central California customers of PG&E. The CPUC proposed to require PG&E customers to pay rates for DWR power that were 39% to 55% higher than rates paid by customers of SCE and SDG&E for such power, and proposed that the costs shifted to PG&E's customers be recovered without any change in PG&E's overall retail electric rates, thus further reducing the revenues available for recovery of PG&E costs after remittances to DWR. Numerous parties, including PG&E and most consumer groups, protested the CPUC cost-shifting proposal as lacking any record support. Among other things, the draft decision would require PG&E to pay DWR an additional 40 cents per kWh on power that DWR provided to PG&E customers between June 1, 2001 and September 15, 2001, for which PG&E has already remitted funds to DWR, for a total of \$166 million in additional funds. Going forward, the net effect of the draft decision for the period June 1, 2001 to December 31, 2002, would be to divert from PG&E to DWR over \$1.5 billion in projected revenues for PG&E-supplied power to which PG&E would otherwise be entitled under prior CPUC decisions, a burden that would fall directly on PG&E's bankruptcy estate, its creditors and its shareholders. The CPUC initially proposed to act on its cost-shifting proposal at its September 6, 2001 meeting, but did not issue the draft decision until September 4, 2001. The CPUC originally calendared its hearing on the draft decision for September 20, 1001. The CPUC recently postponed action on the draft decision until no earlier than October 11, 2001.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 24th day of September 2001, at San Francisco, California.

ROY M. KUGA WD 092101/1-1419907/946130/v1

DECL. OF ROY M. KUGA ISO MOTION RE SERVICING AGREEMENT BTWN DWR AND PG&E