

1 JAMES L. LOPES (No. 63678)  
2 GARY M. KAPLAN (No. 155530)  
3 MARK BARTHOLOMEW (No. 210883)  
4 HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY,  
5 FALK & RABKIN

50-275/1323

6 A Professional Corporation  
7 Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor  
8 San Francisco, California 94111-4065  
9 Telephone: 415/434-1600  
10 Facsimile: 415/217-5910

11 Attorneys for Debtor and Debtor in Possession  
12 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

13 — and —

14 Attorneys for Co-Objector PG&E CORPORATION  
15 listed on attached Counsel Page

16 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
18 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

19 HOWARD  
20 RICE  
21 NEMEROVSKI  
22 CANADY  
23 FALK  
24 & RABKIN  
25 A Professional Corporation

26 In re

Case No. 01-30923 DM

27 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
28 COMPANY, a California corporation,

Chapter 11 Case

Debtor.

Date: November 27, 2002

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Place: 235 Pine Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, California

Judge: Hon. Dennis Montali

Federal I.D. No. 94-0742640

29 DECLARATION OF JAMES L. LOPES IN SUPPORT OF PG&E'S OPPOSITION TO  
30 JOINT MOTION OF THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS  
31 AND THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
32 FOR AN ORDER APPROVING (1) PROCEDURES FOR RESOLICITATION  
33 OF PREFERENCES CONCERNING COMPETING PLANS OF REORGANIZATION  
34 FOR THE DEBTOR, (2) SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURES IN  
35 CONNECTION THEREWITH, AND (3) PROPOSED FORM OF BALLOT

36 J. LOPES DECL. ISO PG&E'S OPP. TO MOT. FOR ORDER AUTH. RESOLICITATION OF PREFERENCES

37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

Additional Counsel Page

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DEWEY BALLANTINE LLP  
Two Houston Center  
909 Fannin Street, Suite 1100  
Houston Texas 77010  
Telephone: (713) 576-1500

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, New York 10153  
Telephone: (212) 310-8000

Attorneys for PG&E CORPORATION

Attorneys for PG&E CORPORATION

HOWARD  
RICE  
NEMEROVSKI  
CANADY  
FALK  
& RABKIN  
A Professional Corporation

1 I, James L. Lopes, declare as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice in the State of California and before this  
3 Court. I am a director at the law firm of Howard, Rice, Nemerovski, Canady, Falk &  
4 Rabkin, A Professional Corporation ("Howard, Rice"), attorneys for Pacific Gas and Electric  
5 Company, the debtor and debtor in possession in the above-captioned bankruptcy case (the  
6 "Debtor"). I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein, and, if called as a witness,  
7 could and would testify competently thereto under oath.

8 2. I submit this declaration in support of the joint opposition (the "Opposition") by  
9 the Debtor and the co-proponent of its plan of reorganization, PG&E Corporation, to the  
10 Joint Motion of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors ("OCC") and the California  
11 Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") for an Order Approving (1) Procedures for  
12 Resolicitation of Preferences Concerning Competing Plans of Reorganization for the Debtor,  
13 (2) Supplemental Disclosures in Connection Therewith, and (3) Proposed Form of Ballot.

14 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit 1 are true and correct copies of relevant pages from  
15 the (official) Transcript of the September 20, 2002 hearing which I attended in the above-  
16 captioned case obtained by Howard, Rice.

17 4. Attached hereto as Exhibit 2 are true and correct copies of relevant pages from  
18 the (official) Transcript of the May 15, 2002 hearing which I attended in the above-  
19 captioned case obtained by Howard, Rice.

20 5. Attached hereto as Exhibit 3 are true and correct copies of relevant pages from  
21 the (unofficial) Transcript of the November 18, 2002 hearing which I attended in the above-  
22 captioned case (containing the testimony of Gary M. Cohen, counsel for the CPUC) obtained  
23 by Howard, Rice.

24 6. Attached hereto as Exhibit 4 are true and correct copies of relevant pages from  
25 the (unofficial) Transcript of the November 19, 2002 hearing which I attended in the above-  
26 captioned case (containing the testimony of Gary M. Cohen, counsel for the CPUC) obtained  
27 by Howard, Rice.

28 7. Attached hereto as Exhibit 5 is a true and correct copy of correspondence dated

1 November 19, 2002 from Standard & Poor's to counsel for the CPUC and OCC obtained by  
2 Howard, Rice.

3 8. Attached hereto as Exhibit 6 is a true and correct copy of correspondence dated  
4 November 18, 2002 from Fitch Rating to counsel for the OCC obtained by Howard, Rice.

5 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and  
6 the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 22<sup>nd</sup> day  
7 of November, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

8  
9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 JAMES L. LOPES

13 HOWARD  
14 RICE  
15 NEMEROVSKI  
16 CANADY  
17 FALK  
18 & RABKIN  
19 A Professional Corporation

28 WD 112202/1-1419973/1039185/v1

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

--o0o--

In Re:	)	Case No. 01-30923-DM
	)	
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC	)	San Francisco, California
COMPANY,	)	Friday, September 20, 2002
	)	2:59 P.M.
Debtor.	)	
	)	Chapter 11

Hearing re: (1) motion for order (1) authorizing the re-solicitation of votes and preferences for movants' amended plan of reorganization for the debtor, (2) approving movants' supplemental disclosure in connection therewith, (3) approving movants' proposed form of ballot, and (4) authorizing inclusion of the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' revised report and recommendation in the solicitation package and joint motion by CPUC and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors; and (2) motion by City of Palo Alto to compel implementation of equitable procedures regarding data room, or in the alternative, for relief from discovery order deadlines.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES:

For Debtor:

JAMES L. LOPES  
GARY M. KAPLAN  
STEVEN N. SHERR  
Howard, Rice, Nemerovski,  
Canady, Falk & Rabkin  
Three Embarcadero Center  
Seventh Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4065  
(415) 434-1600

For PG&E Corporation:

MICHAEL P. KESSLER  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges  
767 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10152  
(212) 310-8000

For Official Committee of  
Unsecured Creditors:

PAUL S. ARONZON  
ROBERT JAY MOORE  
MICHAEL H. DIAMOND  
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy  
601 South Figueroa Street  
Suite 3000  
Los Angeles, CA 90017.  
(213) 892-4307

For Unofficial Committee of  
of First Interest  
Bondholders, Class 3:

RICHARD G. MASON  
Wachtell, Lipton, Rosen & Katz  
51 West 52nd Street  
New York, NY 10019-6150  
(212) 403-1000

For CPUC:

BRIAN S. HERMANN  
WALTER RIEMAN  
ROBERTA A. KAPLAN  
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton  
& Garrison  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019-6064  
(212) 373-3209

For The City of Palo Alto:

G. LARRY ENGEL  
Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison  
One Market Plaza  
Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94123  
(415) 442-0900

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES (Cont.):

For the Financial Creditors: JAMES SPIOTTO  
Chapman and Cutler  
111 West Monroe Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 845-3000

For NCPA: MARK GORTON  
McDonough, Holland & Allen  
555 Capitol Mall, Ninth Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 444-3900

For California State Agencies: PAUL PASCUZZI  
Felderstein, Willoughby &  
Pascuzzi  
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 1450  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 329-7400

Court Recorder: LORENA PARADA  
U.S. Bankruptcy Court  
235 Pine Street, 23rd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
(415) 268-2366

Transcription Service: V/ARS, Inc.  
6905 Vicksburg Place  
Stockton, CA 95207  
(209) 472-2433

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording;  
transcript produced by transcription service.

1 mean, I realize that you're arguing that we shouldn't re-  
2 solicit the preference vote, but I can't disagree that there is  
3 a significant change of events here.

4 MR. LOPES: Well, Your Honor, I think the Court has  
5 expressed many times an interest in this preference issue, and  
6 its been something that has caused concern, and its not at all  
7 clear to me that you need to go out and have a plebiscite of  
8 creditors to determine their preference.

9 I mean, the 1129(c) says that the Court shall take  
10 into account the preferences of creditors. And the initial  
11 ballot went out, and you've got a pretty good idea of what the  
12 preferences of creditors were by reason of the yes/no votes.

13 But things do change. There is news. There had been  
14 significant developments --

15 THE COURT: Right.

16 MR. LOPES: -- with respect to both plans. And I  
17 don't know that the Court needs to go resolicit. There are  
18 very sophisticated creditors in this case who are owed a lot of  
19 money and can very easily make their preferences known to this  
20 Court, and I suspect by the time we get to the confirmation  
21 hearing, and concluding the confirmation hearing, if -- it only  
22 comes into play if the Court confirms -- is able to confirm two  
23 plans.

24 THE COURT: I know that well.

25 MR. LOPES: I suspect the Court will have a pretty

1 of what I think is progress with the Commission and the  
2 committee improving the plan, but that's not to say that the  
3 debtor's interests aren't being considered here too.

4 ~~My concern here is that there has to be some~~  
5 ~~finality~~ and although you get to a point where it's harder to  
6 pay creditors more than they're owed, or more than the  
7 controlling law says they have to be paid, but I am troubled by  
8 the fact that there is a risk that as competing proponents  
9 alter their treatment, it's sort of a one-up the other side,  
10 and re-solicit.

11 And that's not to say that that's what the debtor  
12 would choose to do. The debtor isn't asking to re-solicit just  
13 because it's reaching settlement agreements with certain of its  
14 objecting parties.

15 But I'm worried about the process, and to me, the  
16 process of voting and having a bit of finality to it is very  
17 important. That being said, I recognize that the Commission  
18 perhaps took its best shot when it took it, and it went to  
19 vote, and if it had made the progress that it made with  
20 the -- to date now with the committee and we could go back in  
21 time with the now co-sponsored plan with what appear to be  
22 improvements, that might have changed the result.

23 But I -- consistent with my notion about finality, I  
24 think you've got to close the voting booth at some point and  
25 see where you go from there. If the objections to the

1 Commission/Committee plan are overruled, then it was  
2 unnecessary to get more votes to deal the acceptances.

3 The Commission plan made it through with the minimum  
4 number, admittedly by a close call, but nevertheless, it's as  
5 good as, you know, a win is a win, and it got the impaired  
6 classes accepting.

7 So as I questioned Mr. Hermann, I've continued to ask  
8 myself why is it so important to get the votes of the classes,  
9 and my comments here now are the votes of the classes on the  
10 plan, not the -- what we've been calling the preference.

11 The preference vote, or the determination of the  
12 preference is very critical. The methodology for getting that  
13 preference ascertained is something I'll address in a moment.  
14 My point is that I don't see a need to have any re-solicitation  
15 of the creditor universe generally at this point.

16 The committee joining as a proponent is relevant, it  
17 may -- and important, and significant, and it may be relevant  
18 as a preference matter, but it is not in my mind relevant to  
19 the accept or reject decision based upon treatment,  
20 particularly when the committee, in fact, recommended  
21 acceptance of the Commission's plan, and yes, it also  
22 recommended acceptance of the debtor's plan. It did not  
23 recommend a preference vote at that time.

24 But to me, although I stated two or three times now  
25 that it may be significant that the committee has chosen to

1 that the plan is objectionable and should be defeated, I can  
2 take those arguments in due course.

3 I don't think there is any need or any purpose to be  
4 served by soliciting the vote of Class 3 at this point.

5 So I was tempted initially to permit the limited  
6 solicitation that the debtor in its papers acknowledged would  
7 be somewhat less burdensome. But I finally decided that it is  
8 simply not appropriate, and I make this observation for the  
9 following reason:

10 ~~I think finality is important, and I think a lack of~~  
11 ~~confusion is important.~~ And to try to figure out, well, who's  
12 going to vote in what class, those who voted this way, or not  
13 that way, or those who expressed a preference are not that way,  
14 or those who voted against the Commission's plan, but not who  
15 voted for the debtor's plan, while that's not a Class 3  
16 analysis, it is relevant to my decision generally to say I'm  
17 not going to approve any re-solicitation of the classes.

18 Focusing on Class 3 specifically, I don't, for the  
19 reason I stated, I accept the technical argument that an  
20 improvement -- excuse me, an improvement of position is an  
21 impairment, and impaired classes vote, but I countered that  
22 with the policy that says, if there's no material change and  
23 adverse change, there's no need to re-vote.

24 I'll take my chances that Class 3 makes an argument  
25 that they've been denied the right to vote, but to me, you

1 don't need to vote if -- under these circumstances, in this  
2 time frame. That leaves me --

3           And furthermore, although again, I don't mean to be  
4 facetious about it, I don't fully understand why it is so  
5 important to pick up some votes of classes unless there is a  
6 significant improvement to get rid of the risk of cram-down.  
7 But I don't think that justifies the confusion and the expense  
8 that will follow with a re-solicitation.

9           Now I turn to the preference vote. I am persuaded  
10 that at some point there should be a disclosure and a  
11 dissemination of information to the creditors to express their  
12 preference again.

13           Mr. Lopes argues that it doesn't have to be the  
14 mechanical method of doing it by a ballot. While that's  
15 technically true, ~~the rules do contemplate that as we adopted~~  
16 ~~in the initial vote in this case, that it's a way to collect~~  
17 ~~the preferences by doing it as part of the accept and reject~~  
18 ~~decision. That's Rule 3018(b).~~

19           My problem is, ~~as was evident from the discussion, is~~  
20 ~~this is such a moving target.~~ I didn't know until counsel told  
21 me 45 minutes ago that the Ninth Circuit's been asked to stay  
22 Judge Walker's decision.

23           While it's important as the debtor has argued that  
24 Judge Walker's decision perhaps should be disclosed, similarly  
25 a stay of it should be disclosed, and what if the circuit

1 reviews it on the merits, and decides that should be disclosed?

2 And what if something else happens? That should be disclosed.

3 What I'm perhaps more persuaded by is Mr. Aronzon's  
4 suggestion, and so I can bring my comments to a close, I'm  
5 going to take Mr. Aronzon's suggestion.

6 And that is, I'm going to permit a period of time to  
7 run for the assembly of some appropriate, full disclosure of  
8 the terms of the new -- what I'll call the new plan, the  
9 revised Committee/Commission plan not in the traditional  
10 disclosure statement format, but in some way to allow the  
11 universe of voters to express in a formal structured way,  
12 rather than a just, you know, maybe they'll let us know way, to  
13 express their vote.

14 I want that vote to come in certainly by the time we  
15 realistically we think the confirmation trial will be ended. I  
16 don't know when the -- I'm assuming also the confirmation trial  
17 will start on schedule. There are some that want me to delay  
18 it At the moment, I'm not delaying it. If I'm persuaded to  
19 delay it in the future, we'll adjust.

20 But as of now, I want, Mr. Aronzon, you and the  
21 others to work on a procedure in your mind that is not unlike  
22 what you outlined, so that there is an ample opportunity to  
23 review the adequacy of, what for convenience, I'm going to call  
24 the preference disclosure. But it doesn't and shouldn't look  
25 like a disclosure statement, or what we as bankruptcy people

1 know to be a disclosure statement.

2           It's got to be something, and I don't know what, and  
3 I'll leave that to your creative talents to come up with the  
4 right answer, and I guess like everything else, we have to have  
5 a hearing on it. But I think what I would prefer is that you  
6 go back to the drawing board and figure out what it's going to  
7 take, and we will, obviously, having just observed that we have  
8 a moving target here, at some point we have to, you know, meet  
9 the deadline, as the journalists might say.

10           And -- but it's not now. So I'm -- in summary, I'm  
11 going to deny this motion on the re-solicitation generally.  
12 I'm going to grant it in part, ~~that is to say to have a re-~~  
13 ~~solicitation of all creditors who were solicited in the first~~  
14 ~~place to express their preference in the plan,~~ and I'm going to  
15 order, as I say, I will order that the current vote  
16 be -- remain confidential.

17           And I do that in part because since I've made my mind  
18 up that there's going to be a re-solicitation of preference, it  
19 could only do mischief to have any public dissemination of a  
20 vote that frankly, I'm going to just -- or vote's the wrong  
21 word -- from an expression of preference that I think I'm not  
22 going to pay attention to.

23           So that's not a perfect solution for everybody, but  
24 that's the way I think we have to come out on this, and that's  
25 what I'll do.

1 THE CLERK: I think we have both, let me check.

2 (Pause)

3 THE CLERK: 1:30.

4 THE COURT: Okay. 1:30 is the protective order and  
5 may or may not be the Warburg. I'm not pre-deciding the timing  
6 of the Warburg motion, and it may well be that there's no need  
7 to rush it. I don't like rushing these things either.

8 Okay. Bye everybody, have a nice weekend. Thank you  
9 for you're time.

10 ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

11 MR. ENGEL: We appreciate your --

12 (Whereupon the hearing in the above-entitled matter was  
13 adjourned at 5:40 p.m.)

14 --o0o--

15 CERTIFICATE

16 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from  
17 the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-  
18 entitled matter.

19

20 Patricia A. Petrilla

October 4, 2002

21 Patricia A. Petrilla, Transcriber

22 AAERT CERT\*00113

23

24

25

# COPY

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

--oOo--

In Re:	)	Case No. 01-30923-DM
	)	
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC	)	San Francisco, California
COMPANY,	)	Wednesday, May 15, 2002
	)	9:30 A.M.
Debtor.	)	
	)	Chapter 11

1. CPUC's Disclosure Statement
2. Motion by PG&E and the CPUC for order 1) approving notices of nonvoting status, notices to parties to executory contracts, and notice to state agencies; and 2) approving voting solicitation procedures, form of voting ballots, voting timetable, and tabulation procedures regarding plans of reorganization
3. S/C Debtor's plan

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Debtor and Debtor-in-Possession:

JAMES L. LOPES  
JANET A. NEXON  
Howard, Rice, Nemerovski,  
Canady, Falk & Rabkin  
Three Embarcadero Center  
7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4065  
(415) 434-1600

MR. KORNBERG: Your Honor, we did agree to the procedure that Mr. Kessler described because we thought that was practical. I think in a perfect world, maybe creditors unimpaired under both plans would be able to express a preference by means of ballot or a ballot like item.

But I don't think that works here for the reason that Mr. Lopes described which is it would I believe increase exponentially the expense of sending out plans --

THE COURT: Why?

MR. KORNBERG: -- and I think you do have to send them out because I don't think you can assume that all of these kinds of creditors will have ready access to the Internet.

And I think -- I did think that the parties that really care will find their way to this courtroom and express a preference in connection with the confirmation hearings Mr. Kessler described. So I just think the practical result is the one that we've adopted here, and those that are really significantly affected and have a strong preference I think will be heard in the confirmation process.

THE COURT: Well, I think what I've just heard from both sides is that if Deutsche Bank wishes to submit something saying we prefer this plan over that plan, no one's going to strike it and -- move to strike it and say you can't do that. I'm not.

I'll add it to the list. I don't know what else we

1 THE COURT: Okay. Well, you'll coordinate with  
2 Mr. Lopes and get him to sign off on the order --

3 MR. HERMANN: Yes.

4 THE COURT: -- and we'll take it from there. Okay.

5 MR. KORNBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.

6 MR. HERMANN: Thank you, Your Honor.

7 (Whereupon, the hearing, in the above-entitled matter was  
8 adjourned at 12:52 p.m.)

9 ---o0o---

10 CERTIFICATE

11 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript,  
12 from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the  
13 above-entitled matter.

14

15

16

*Mary C. Clark*

May 22, 2002

17

Mary C. Clark, Transcriber  
AAERT CET\*\*00214

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

--oOo--

In Re:	)	Case No. 01-30923-DM
	)	
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC	)	San Francisco, California
COMPANY,	)	Monday, November 18, 2002
	)	9:30 a.m.
Debtor.	)	
	)	Chapter 11
_____		Confirmation Hearing
		Day 1

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Debtor:	JAMES LOPES
	Howard, Rice, Nemerovski,
	Canady, Falk & Rabkin
	Three Embarcadero Center,
	7th Floor
	San Francisco, CA 94111-4065
	(415) 434-1600
	STEPHEN C. NEAL
	Cooley Godward
	One Maritime Plaza, 20th Floor
	San Francisco, CA 94111
	(415) 693-2000
	CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER
	Pacific Gas and Electric
	Company
	77 Beale Street
	San Francisco, CA 94105
	(415) 973-6695

Proceedings recorded by electronic digital sound recording.  
Transcript produced by transcription service.

1 MR. NEAL: Thank you, Your Honor.

2 CROSS-EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. NEAL:

4 Q. Mr. Cohen, I'm Stephen Neal. I represent PG&E. I'm  
5 going to come back a little later to your last answer, that is  
6 to your belief that the Commission has the legal authority to  
7 bind itself, and I'm going to come back later and talk to you  
8 some about the bases for that belief.

9 But first of all, you would agree that the reorganization  
10 plan which has been put -- the reorganization agreement which  
11 has been put forth as part of the joint plan proposed by the  
12 PUC and the OCC is a critical part of the joint plan.

13 A. Actually, Mr. Neal, in my opinion, it need not be, but I  
14 have been told by certain representatives of creditors and  
15 other folks in the financial community that it is.

16 Q. Okay. Fair enough. So regardless of what you believe,  
17 you at least understand that the reorganization agreement was  
18 critical to the OCC becoming a joint proponent of the plan.

19 A. It was, yes.

20 Q. And you understand that the reorganization agreement is  
21 critical to the evaluation that's taking place right at the  
22 rating agencies concerning your plan.

23 A. I guess I can't speak completely as to what is critical  
24 or isn't as to the rating agencies. I know that they have  
25 asked -- well, one of them, Standard & Poor's, has asked for a

1 this statement by Mr. Neal, so there's really nothing in  
2 evidence about it, so --

3 THE WITNESS: My understanding of (iii) is that in  
4 setting rates for PG&E, a factor for the Commission to consider  
5 during the time that these securities are outstanding is  
6 whether those rates facilitate achieving and maintaining  
7 investment grade credit ratings.

8 BY MR. NEAL:

9 Q. Because it's a factor to be considered, but there's  
10 nothing mandatory in 2.2(iii)?

11 A. I think it's mandatory that the Commission set rates to  
12 facilitate achieving and maintaining investment grade credit  
13 ratings. I don't think that (iii) directs the Commission as to  
14 how exactly to do that, but it states that -- it's mandatory  
15 that the Commission do it.

16 Q. Does it direct the Commission to do anything in  
17 particular that we would have the ability to come in here and  
18 ask this Court to enforce?

19 A. I don't know. I think you'd have to -- it would depend  
20 on what the Commission did or didn't do. I can't speculate.

21 Q. As you sit here today, can you identify anything that the  
22 words to facilitate achieving and maintaining investment grade  
23 ratings mandate the Commission to do under the reorganization  
24 agreement that we would have the ability to come in and ask  
25 this Court to enforce if they failed to do it?

1 the specific provision (iii) about maintaining investment grade  
2 credit ratings is not something that the law requires the  
3 Commission to consider in setting rates. So that is -- there  
4 is an addition of a factor there that is not something that the  
5 Commission would necessarily be required to consider.

6 But otherwise what I've said to the rating agencies is  
7 that I think that (ii) essentially embodies costs of service  
8 rate making and I think that (i) essentially embodies a notion  
9 that if the Commission authorizes the issuance of securities  
10 and finds that issuing those securities is just and reasonable,  
11 that it will permit the issuer to recover the cost of the  
12 securities.

13 Q. You have unequivocally told the rating agencies that the  
14 reorganization agreement, quote, requires CPUC to do what it is  
15 already obligated to do under state law, close quote; correct?

16 A. I think that was probably a heading on a presentation  
17 that we made to them, yes.

18 Q. It was a presentation that you made on October 31st and  
19 November 1 to both Moody's and S&P; correct?

20 A. Right. And Fitch.

21 Q. Yeah. Let's put up Tab 3 for a minute, page 19. Tab --  
22 let's put up the first page first.

23 This is -- this Joint Plan Exhibit 48 is a quarterly  
24 update to the rating agencies provided by the State of  
25 California Public Utilities Commission for the fourth quarter

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

--oOo--

In Re:	)	Case No. 01-30923-DM
	)	
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC	)	San Francisco, California
COMPANY,	)	Tuesday, November 19, 2002
	)	9:30 a.m.
Debtor.	)	
	)	Chapter 11
	)	
	)	Confirmation Hearing
	)	Day 2

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Debtor:	JAMES LOPES
	Howard, Rice, Nemerovski,
	Canady, Falk & Rabkin
	Three Embarcadero Center,
	7th Floor
	San Francisco, CA 94111-4065
	(415) 434-1600
	STEPHEN C. NEAL
	Cooley Godward
	One Maritime Plaza, 20th Floor
	San Francisco, CA 94111
	(415) 693-2000
	CHRISTOPHER J. WARNER
	Pacific Gas and Electric
	Company
	77 Beale Street
	San Francisco, CA 94105
	(415) 973-6695

Proceedings recorded by electronic digital sound recording.  
Transcript produced by transcription service.

1 the Southern Cal decision on your plan?

2 A. I remember saying that there are a lot of legal cases in  
3 various courts at various stages of review and consideration  
4 and that it was my view that it was likely that no plan could  
5 become effective until some of that legal certainty has been  
6 resolved.

7 Q. Have you ever told the rating agencies that you plan could  
8 not be confirmed if the California Supreme Court agrees with  
9 the Ninth Circuit?

10 A. I probably told the rating agencies that our plan as  
11 currently written if the California Supreme Court agrees with  
12 the Ninth Circuit can't be confirmed because it calls for the  
13 use of cash that the California Supreme Court could say under  
14 certain circumstances we can't use.

15 Q. Have you received any letters from S&P since you took the  
16 stand yesterday?

17 A. Not that I'm aware, no.

18 Q. Okay. As far as you know, there's still no letter in from  
19 Standard & Poor's?

20 A. As far as I know.

21 Q. You now have actually signed your November 15th letter.  
22 Your draft letter is now a final letter, is it not?

23 A. It is.

24 THE COURT: I'm sorry. The November 15th draft,  
25 Mr. Neal, is that what you said?

11/19/2002 11:33 0027330024  
55 Water Street  
New York, NY 10041-0003  
Tel 212 418 7667  
212 418 2154  
ronald\_baronc@sandp.com

Ronald M. Baronc  
Managing Director  
Utilities, Energy, & Project Finance  
Corporate & Government Ratings

## Standard & Poor's

A Division of The McGraw-Hill Companies 

California Public Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298  
Attention: Gary M. Cohen, Esq.

Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors  
In re: Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
c/o Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP  
601 South Figueroa Street, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5735  
Attention: Paul S. Aronson, Esq.

November 19, 2002

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Pursuant to your request, Standard & Poor's has performed a credit assessment of \$7.845 billion principal amount senior secured debt, \$1 billion principal amount senior unsecured debt and \$832 million par amount preferred stock ("Securities") anticipated to be issued or reinstated by Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E") in connection with its emergence from bankruptcy should the proposed Plan of Reorganization ("CPUC Plan") jointly filed in the Chapter 11 bankruptcy proceedings of PG&E by the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors ("OCUC") be adopted.

In arriving at this credit assessment, we have had discussions with the CPUC and its advisors, as well as with representatives of the OCUC. We have reviewed materials supplied to us by representatives of the CPUC and the OCUC including, but not limited to:

- The CPUC Plan;
- The Reorganization Agreement appended to the CPUC Plan;
- Regulations promulgated by the present Commission in furtherance of the CPUC Plan;
- The financial model ("Model") including financial forecasts and assumptions jointly supplied to Standard & Poor's by representatives of the CPUC and OCUC;

CPUC 25741

Received Nov-18-02 05:46pm

From-5627330024

To-COOLEY GODWARD LLP

Page 02

EXHIBIT 5

California Public Utilities Commission  
November 19, 2002  
Page 2 of 5

- Details of the "regulatory asset" proposed to be created by the CPUC and its related amortization schedule;
- CPUC's and OCUC's Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Confirmation of First Amended Plan of Reorganization Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code for Pacific Gas and Electric Company dated August 30, 2002, as amended;
- Declaration of Paul S. Aronzon dated November 6, 2002 and the exhibits appended thereto;
- PG&E's Trial Brief in Opposition to the CPUC and OCUC Plan dated November 8, 2002; and
- Such other materials as we have deemed appropriate.

Based upon our review of the foregoing materials, it is Standard & Poor's credit assessment that the \$7.845 billion principal amount senior secured debt -- but not the \$1 billion principal amount senior unsecured debt or the \$932 million par amount preferred stock -- exhibits indicia of marginal investment grade credit quality based upon our credit metrics. Our conclusion with respect to the secured debt reflects the benefits of the over-collateralization provided by the assets pledged to secure the debt. The Issuer Credit Rating of PG&E under the CPUC Plan, however, has been determined to be speculative grade. Please note that the ultimate assignment of investment grade ratings on the \$7.845 billion principal amount senior secured debt hinges on the satisfaction of each of the issues cited in this letter and on the conditions below having been met.

A credit assessment is not a rating. A credit assessment is solely a credit opinion based on the facts and circumstances presented to us by CPUC and OCUC. In this case a credit assessment is warranted by the quantity and quality of the information provided to us and issues associated with the reliability of the Model. Please note, however, that as the Model is refined and supplemented a more definitive outcome may be possible.

This credit assessment should be understood as qualified by the fact that (i) additional information or changes to the information previously presented to us may result in credit risk stronger or weaker than that suggested by the credit assessment and, consequently, a different definitive rating; (ii) the credit assessment is not a prediction of the actual future performance of the Securities; (iii) Standard & Poor's does not warrant or endorse suitability of the credit assessment for any particular purpose or use; (iv) the credit assessment is provided without any express or implied warranties whatsoever; (v) the credit assessment is based solely on information provided to us by CPUC and OCUC and does not represent an audit by Standard & Poor's; (vi) Standard & Poor's relied upon CPUC and OCUC, their accountants, counsel and other experts for the accuracy and completeness of the information submitted in connection with the credit assessment; (vii) the credit assessment shall not be construed to have been undertaken with the rigor and level of detail required for Standard & Poor's to provide a definitive rating opinion; and (viii)

CPUC 25742

California Public Utilities Commission  
November 19, 2002  
Page 3 of 5

Standard & Poor's does not and cannot guarantee the accuracy, completeness or timeliness of the information relied upon in connection with the credit assessment or the results obtained from the use of such information. Please note that the credit assessment speaks only as of the date hereof and is not subject to surveillance or update. As noted, a more comprehensive analysis might lead to an outcome different than the credit assessment. In addition, the credit assessment does not address the validity of the assumptions made by CPUC and OCUC in preparing the Model.

Standard & Poor's credit assessment is predicated upon the satisfaction of the following conditions:

- a) The CPUC Plan is confirmed by January 31, 2003 and is implemented substantially in its current form with all preconditions to the CPUC Plan's confirmation and implementation being satisfied and not waived;
- b) All financial targets set forth in the Model are justified by provable assumptions and are substantially attained without any material deviation from the projected results;
- c) PG&E can access capital markets to the extent forecast, that PG&E can secure the assumed liquidity facilities, that forecast cash balances are available to discharge a portion of creditors' claims as contemplated, and that owned and contracted electric generation dispatches at prices and quantities consistent with the forecast;
- d) The Securities are amortized as forecast and interest costs do not materially exceed projected levels;
- e) Receipt of evidence of (i) the methodology employed by CPUC in preparing the Model and (ii) the propriety of the consolidation by CPUC of elements of the financial and operational forecasts for the four companies proposed to succeed the debtor as reflected in PG&E's proposed reorganization plan;
- f) Receipt of evidence that the Model reflects all decisions of the CPUC rendered subsequent to the filing by PG&E of its proposed reorganization plan;
- g) All CPUC regulations necessary to the implementation of the CPUC Plan and necessary for the maintenance of investment grade ratings on the Securities have been promulgated by the CPUC prior to the sale of the Securities;
- h) Receipt of a legal opinion from independent California counsel satisfactory in form and substance to Standard & Poor's to the effect that the Reorganization Agreement and the regulations referred to in the preceding paragraph will bind the CPUC throughout the life of the Securities;
- i) Receipt of a judicial determination that the Reorganization Agreement and the regulations referred to in paragraph (g) will bind the CPUC throughout the life of the Securities;
- j) The regulations referred to in paragraph (g) include, but are not limited to, the timely creation of the "regulatory asset" provided for in the CPUC Plan, and mechanisms that compel the CPUC to timely reconcile any imbalances between revenues and cash expended for fuel and electricity procurement;

CPUC 25743

California Public Utilities Commission  
November 19, 2002  
Page 4 of 5

- k) The regulatory asset (i) can be demonstrated to increase PG&E's rate base by the full amount presented in the financial forecast, (ii) is amortized in a time frame consistent with the Model, and, (iii) throughout the life of the Securities, neither the amortization nor the creation of the regulatory asset may be altered by the CPUC if such modification would compromise the Securities' projected financial performance or erode their credit quality;
- l) Receipt of any other regulatory approvals beyond those described in paragraphs (g), (j) and (k), whether state or federal, that are necessary for the implementation of the CPUC Plan and the realization of the projections contained in the Model are timely achieved by PG&E and/or CPUC, as the case may be;
- m) The "Reorganization Agreement," as defined in the Plan, is (i) executed in the form presented to us, (ii) validly adopted by the CPUC, (iii) approved by the bankruptcy court and (iv) pursuant to its terms, binding upon the CPUC throughout the life of the Securities;
- n) The quantum of claims made against the bankruptcy estate are substantially as estimated in the CPUC Plan;
- o) The Utility Reform Network appeal to the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals that challenges on both procedural and substantive grounds the settlement agreement reached between CPUC and Southern California Edison in Southern California Edison's "filed rate doctrine" litigation, does not establish legal precedents that defeat or diminish CPUC's capacity to validly execute a binding Reorganization Agreement or to act as a co-proponent of the Plan, does not impair cash balances forecast to be available for the satisfaction of creditors' claims, or diminish or defeat PG&E's entitlement to recover historical power procurement costs;
- p) Prior to the assignment of financial responsibility for any DWR contracts to PG&E, CPUC shall deem all costs associated with such DWR contracts to be prudent and recoverable in rates by PG&E, such a determination will be a precondition to the transfer of financial responsibility for DWR contracts to PG&E, and the determination shall be binding upon the CPUC throughout the life of the Securities;
- q) Evidence that the amount of collateral that PG&E must post to procure residual net short power or other electricity is consistent with the levels that have been forecast in the CPUC Plan and procurement costs are recoverable in rates;
- r) Evidence that should CPUC reject any or all of PG&E's proposed electric procurement plans, or portions thereof, PG&E will be able to secure alternative wholesale electric supplies at prices acceptable to the CPUC and the costs associated with such electric supply are recoverable in rates;
- s) Evidence that CPUC has developed and implemented a methodology for the prospective approval of the prudence and reasonableness of PG&E risk management and risk tolerance activities and evidence that the CPUC will permit as a ministerial matter the recovery of PG&E's costs of securing risk management tools and also permit the recovery of costs associated with that portion of the power and fuel portfolio that is not hedged; and

CPUC 25744

California Public Utilities Commission  
November 19, 2002  
Page 5 of 6


- t) Evidence that the CPUC Plan will not be amended to include restrictions on dividends to PG&E Corp, the parent of PG&E.

You may use this credit assessment in connection with proceedings in *In re: Pacific Gas and Electric Company*. Standard & Poor's reserves the right to publish this credit assessment and the conditions attendant thereto and to advise its own clients, subscribers, and the public thereof.

CPUC and OCUC understand that Standard & Poor's has not consented to, and will not consent to, being named an "expert" under the federal securities laws, including without limitation, Section 7 of the Securities Act of 1933. In addition, it should be understood that the credit assessment is neither a "market" rating nor a recommendation to buy, hold, or sell the instruments.

We are pleased to have been of service to CPUC and OCUC. If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Very truly yours,



CPUC 25745

11/18/2002 17:58 5627330024

NOV 18 2002 19:31 FR PWRW & G


Nov-18-02 05:18pm From=FITCH INC

212 373 2262 TO 9-4920372

1 611 413 8120

1-174

PAGE 02/03



# Fitch Ratings

One State Street Plaza  
New York, NY 10004

T 212 908 0500 / 200 75 FITCH  
www.fitchratings.com

November 18, 2002

Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors  
in the Chapter 11 Proceedings of Pacific Gas  
and Electric Company (the "Committee")  
c/o Paul S. Aronzon, Esq.  
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP  
601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Re: Credit Assessment for Joint Plan of Reorganization,  
Reorganized Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

You have requested that Fitch Ratings assess the creditworthiness and indicative credit ratings of certain proposed securities to be issued by Reorganized Pacific Gas & Electric Co. (RPGE) pursuant to the Joint Plan of Reorganization proposed by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (Committee). The Proposed Securities are:

- \$5,773 million new First Mortgage Bonds
- \$1,500 million new Secured Bank Term Loan Agreement
- \$1,000 million new unfunded Senior Secured Revolving Credit Facilities (collectively with the Term Loan agreements, the "Senior Secured Loans")
- \$1,000 million new Senior Unsecured Bonds
- \$ 500 million new Preferred Securities

212 373 2262 TO 9-4920372  
P. 22/05

# Fitch Ratings

This credit assessment does not constitute a credit rating by Fitch of the Proposed Securities outlined above and is not meant for publication or distribution other than in the normal procedures of the US Bankruptcy Court in the bankruptcy proceedings of Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Please note that our procedures for issuing a credit rating differ from the procedures used by us in issuing this credit assessment, but the rating criteria employed are consistent with those used by Fitch Ratings in its normal credit ratings.

This letter is to advise you that, based upon our analysis, which included the review of summaries of the proposed Reorganization Plan and Agreement provided by the California Public Utilities Commission, financial projections for RPGE provided by UBS, information filed by PG&E Corporation with the Securities and Exchange Commission, and publicly available information regarding California laws affecting electric utility tariffs, power procurement and procurement cost recovery, Fitch's assessment of the creditworthiness of Reorganized Pacific Gas & Electric is in the general category of 'BBB'. This is an underlying rating, reflecting the credit of RPGE before taking into consideration two additional factors that would affect the actual ratings of securities to be issued in the transaction. These two factors are: (i) the features of the individual securities (collateral, seniority or subordination, and covenants); and (ii) the financial condition and credit standing of RPGE's parent. Fitch's rating criteria constrains the ratings of a regulated utility subsidiary of a parent company with weaker financial profile, as will be illustrated below.

At the present time, Fitch Ratings does not publish credit ratings of Pacific Gas & Electric's parent PG&E Corp., but we do maintain indicative ratings. Currently, our indicative rating of PG&E Corp. are in the range of 'CCC to B-'. For the purpose of assessing the likely constraint posed by the parent rating on the ratings of the Proposed Securities to be issued under the Alternate Plan of Reorganization, we considered that the likely range of indicative ratings of PG&E Corp. is from a low of 'B-' to a high of 'BB'. The parent's actual credit standing at the time of RPGE's reorganization will depend upon the circumstances of PG&E Corp.'s subsidiary PGE National Energy Group and upon a more detailed understanding of the tax position of the PG&E Corp. and other matters that would affect the parent company cash flow and ability to cover parent level obligations.

The grid on the following page represents the expected ratings of the Proposed Securities, taking into consideration a range of possible ratings for the parent company and the likely ratings for different classes of instruments proposed to be issued.

# Fitch Ratings

However, Fitch Ratings has not considered the possibility of any special structuring or changes of ownership or corporate structure that could be designed to further insulate the credit of RPGE from that of PG&E Corporation.

<u>Indicative ratings of proposed RPGE Securities</u>	Underlying ratings before considering parent credit quality	Security ratings if parent rating is BB or higher	Security ratings if parent rating is 'BB-'	Security ratings if parent rating is 'B' or 'CCC'	Security ratings with parent in default (DDD to D category), no higher than:
Sr. Secured Loans and First Mortgage Bonds	BBB	BBB	BBB-	BB+	BB+
Sr. Unsecured Debt	BB+	BB+	BB+	BB-	BB-
Preferred Securities	BB-	BB-	BB-	B	B

While we have not specifically assessed the terms of the \$900 million securitized credit facility proposed in the Joint Plan of Reorganization, we expect that a bankruptcy remote entity could be structured to achieve very high ratings (typically 'AAA'), assuming a portfolio of utility receivables of a size and quality consistent with and a structure that complies with our criteria for such facilities and entities.

This credit assessment is based on the documents and information provided to us as of the date of this letter by the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors and the California Public Utilities Commission and their experts and agents and the assumptions discussed above. Fitch did not verify the truth or accuracy of any such information and does not take responsibility for the appropriateness of the information provided to us and used in the analysis.

Because this is only a general assessment of the creditworthiness of the proposed securities of Reorganized Pacific Gas & Electric and not an actual credit rating, there can be no assurance that an actual credit rating for the Proposed Securities, if issued by Fitch, will be the same as this assessment or that the assessment will not materially change over time. For example, if, for any reason, there are material changes in the documents, financial projections or actual results of operations, the credit rating of the Proposed Securities is likely to differ from this assessment.

# FitchRatings

This credit assessment is not a recommendation to buy, sell, or hold any security or to enter into any agreement or arrangement relating to the Proposed Securities to be issued by RPGE. This credit assessment does not comment on the adequacy of market price, the suitability of any security, investment or other arrangement for a particular party, or the tax-exempt nature or taxability of payments made in respect of any security.

This credit assessment does not constitute consent by Fitch to the use of its name as an expert in connection with any registration statement or other offering document filed under, or prepared in accordance with, the U.S. federal securities laws, the Financial Services Act 1986 or any other domestic or international securities law applicable.

Fitch does not represent, warrant or guarantee, and the Committee acknowledges that Fitch does not represent, warrant or guarantee (i) that it is providing any financial advice, auditing, accounting, appraisal, valuation or actuarial services, (ii) the accuracy, correctness, integrity, completeness or timeliness of any part of this credit assessment, or (iii) that the information, analyses and assessment contained in, and constituting a part of, this credit assessment will fulfill any of the Committee's particular purposes or needs. Fitch is not responsible for any underwriting, credit, loan, purchase or investment decision, or damages or other losses resulting from use of this credit assessment.

This credit assessment may be shown only in its entirety.

We are pleased to have had the opportunity to provide this assessment to you. If we can be of further assistance, please contact me at (212) 908-0504 or [ellen.lapson@fitchratings.com](mailto:ellen.lapson@fitchratings.com).

Sincerely,



Ellen Lapson, CFA  
Managing Director