JAMES L. LOPES (No. 63678) 1 JEFFREY L. SCHAFFER (No. 91404) 2 JANET A. NEXON (No. 104747) WILLIAM J. LAFFERTY (No. 120814) JUN 2 2 2001 HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY, 3 FALK & RABKIN REENAN EL GABAOY CLERK A Professional Corporation 4 Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4065 5 415/434-1600 Telephone: 415/217-5910 6 Facsimile: Attorneys for Debtor and Debtor in Possession 7 PACIFIC GAS and ELECTRIC COMPANY 8 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 11 No. 01-30923 DM 12 In re 13 PACIFIC GAS and ELECTRIC Chapter 11 Case HOWARD COMPANY, a California corporation, MEROVSKI CANADY EALK Hearing: July 12, 2001 10:00 a.m. Debtor, Time: & RAPKIN 235 Pine Street, 22nd Floor Place: unasional Commission 15 San Francisco, California Federal I.D. No. 94-0742640 16 17 AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY AND TO CONTINUE THE EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR 18 IN POSSESSION ON NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS, AND TO FILE INFORMATION CONCERNING HOURLY RATES OF PROPOSED 19 COUNSEL UNDER SEAL (BANKRUPTCY CODE SECTION 107(B). FEDERAL RULE OF BANKRUPTCY PROCEDURE 9018) 20 21 ISUPPORTING SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF RICHARD L. MEISS AND SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF 22 WILLIAM J. LAFFERTY IN SUPPORT OF AMENDED APPLICATION FILED SEPARATELY 23 24 25 26 27 28

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR

1090

TO THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

On May 16, 2001, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, a California corporation, and the debtor and debtor-in-possession in the within Chapter 11 case ("Applicant" or "PG&E"), filed its Application for Authority to Employ and to Continue the Employment of Special Counsel to Debtor-in-Possession on Non-Bankruptcy Matters (the "Application"). Through the Application, Applicant requested authority pursuant to Section 327(e) of the United States Bankruptcy Code (the "Code") and Rule 2014(a) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure to employ and continue the employment of the law firms listed on Exhibit "A" thereto, as special counsel to Applicant, to perform the services listed thereon and described herein, on the terms and conditions, including waivers of conflicts of interest, set forth therein, including authorizing the employment of these professionals nunc pro tune to the commencement of this Chapter 11 bankruptcy case. For the Court's convenient reference, a true and correct copy of the Application, is attached as Exhibit "A" to the Second Supplemental Declaration of William J. Lafferty In Support Of Amended Application For Authority To Employ And To Continue The Employment Of Special Counsel to Debtor In Possession On Non-Bankruptcy Matters (hereinafter referred to as "Second Supplemental Lafferty" and cited as "Lafferty Supp. Decl."), filed concurrently herewith.

This Amended Application is filed in order to address three issues which were raised by the filing of the Application, and in the Objection To Application To Employ And To Continue The Employment Of Special Counsel To Debtor In Possession On Non-Bankruptcy Matters filed by the Office of the United States Trustee ("UST"), on May 23, 2001, to wit: (1) clarification concerning the identity of the law firms which Applicant proposes to employ, or to continue the employment of, through the Application (the "Non-Bankruptcy Counsel"), (2) resolution of Applicant's request that, for the reasons set forth in the Declaration of Richard L. Meiss In Support of Application For Authority To Employ And To Continue The Employment Of Special Counsel To Debtor In Possession On Non-Bankruptcy Matters ("Meiss Decl."), filed concurrently herewith, the hourly rates of the

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR

Case: 01-30923

Doc #: 1090

Filed: 06/22/2001

Page 2 of 7

13 14

15 16

> 17 18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HOWARD RICE
NEMEROVSKI CANADY BALK
GRABKIN
Anglioni Organion 15

Special Counsel be provided to the Court under seal pursuant to Code Section 107(b)¹ and Rule 9018² of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, and to the UST and to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee"), subject to the provisions of appropriate confidentiality agreements between and among Applicant, the UST and the Committee, but that such information concerning hourly rates not be made generally available in this case, and (3) clarifying that the proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel will agree to file applications for compensation pursuant to Section 330 of the Code, and will otherwise be bound by the Guidelines for Compensation as such may be in place or amended from time to time.

Except as expressly modified hereby, the Application remains in full force and effect, and accurately sets forth the relief requested by the Applicant on this subject. Concurrently with the filing of this Amended Application, and consistent with the directives of the "Case Management Order" approved by the Court in this case, Applicant has also filed its Motion Of Debtor Pacific Gas And Electric To Submit Hourly Rate Of Proposed Special Counsel Under Seal (11 U.S.C. §107(b)) And Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Thereof (the "Motion").

1. <u>Clarification of the Identity of Special Counsel</u>. The Application sought the employment, or continuation of employment, of seventy-four law firms which had rendered services to Applicant on non-bankruptcy matters prior to the commencement of Applicant's Chapter 11 bankruptcy case on April 6, 2001. In support of the Application, Applicant also filed the Declaration of William J. Lafferty (the "Lafferty Declaration"), to which were attached as a group exhibit copies of the twenty-four declarations, pursuant to Section 327(e)

¹Section 107(b) provides in pertinent part that "On request of a party in interest, the bankruptcy court shall, and on the bankruptcy court's own motion, the bankruptcy court may—(1) protect an entity with respect to a trade secret, or confidential research, development or commercial information."

²Rule 9018 provides in pertinent part that "On motion or on its own initiative, with or without notice, the court may make any order which justice requires (1) to protect the estate or any entity in respect of any trade secret or other confidential research, development or commercial information."

of the Bankruptcy Code (the "Code") and Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 2014 (the "Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations"), of those of the proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel who had been able to deliver such declarations to Applicant on or before May 15, 2001. Subsequent thereto, on or about June 1, 2001, Applicant also filed the Supplemental Declaration of William J. Lafferty (the "Supplemental Lafferty Declaration"); to which were attached as a group exhibit thirty-eight additional Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations which had been received between the filing of the Application and the date of the Supplemental Lafferty Declaration.

Applicant is informed and believes that it has now received Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations from each proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel which is willing and able to become employed as special counsel to Applicant pursuant to Code Section 327(e) and Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 2014. Accordingly, Applicant hereby amends its Application to limit its request to employ proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel to those firms listed on Exhibit "A" hereto. For additional clarity, Applicant also submits, as a group exhibit to the Second Supplemental Lafferty Declaration, all of the Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations. Applicant believes that it has thus satisfied the objection of the UST that not all proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel had filed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations. Applicant hereby requests that the Court authorize employment, or the continuation of employment, of the proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel, as set forth and listed on Exhibit "A" hereto. ³

2. <u>Information Concerning Hourly Rates</u>. The Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations presently on file do not contain information concerning the hourly rates of proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel. Applicant's counsel informed the UST that Applicant intended to file the Application and Non-Bankruptcy Counsel Declarations without information concerning the hourly rate, but that Applicant desired to make such information

tord Organiza 15

³If PG&E's needs require the retention of a firm not listed on Exhibit A, it will seek the requisite approval to retain and compensate the firm.

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR

HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANALY EALK FRANKIN

available to the Court, the UST and the Committee, by a filing under seal or by some other means adequate to assure the continued confidentiality of this information. The UST's Objection also requested that the Applicant not be permitted to file such information under seal.

For the reasons set forth in the Motion and in the Meiss Declaration, Applicant believes that it could be substantially harmed by the requirement that it file the hourly rates of Non-Bankruptcy Counsel, and that no important public policy would be served by requiring such a public filing.

Prior to the filing of its Chapter 11 Petition, PG&E regularly engaged and/or retained more than seventy law firms both inside and outside California on a wide variety of legal matters, in areas including, for example, regulatory proceedings, complex commercial transactions and litigation, environmental and property matters and personal injury, property damage and employment litigation.

Because of the large volume and variety of legal services it requires, PG&E strives to obtain the best possible fee arrangements consistent with its needs for specific expertise and high quality representation. PG&E has typically engaged outside counsel through formal or informal competitive processes resulting in negotiated rates for legal services. In order to encourage competition, PG&E typically spreads out its outside legal work, particularly in such high volume areas as commercial and personal injury/property damage defense, among a number of firms and engages multiple firms, for similar types of legal services, within single geographic areas. Depending on its specific needs, negotiating leverage, volume, and other factors, PG&E contracts with outside counsel at a variety of rates for essentially similar services. In some cases, these negotiations have resulted in discounted rates below what the law firms in question charge other similarly situated clients.

In order to obtain the most favorable rate agreements possible, PG&E does not divulge to the firms it engages the rates paid to other firms for similar services. Because of its concerns regarding the confidentiality of these agreements, PG&E treats the agreements as attorney-client privileged and does not provide copies of the actual contracts with outside

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR

.

Case: 01-30923 Doc #: 1090 Filed: 06/22/2001 Page 5 of 7

counsel to anyone other than the pertinent firm.

PG&E is very concerned that the rate agreements it has negotiated with the more than 60 firms it seeks to continue to employ not be made public, for the following reasons:

- The type and volume of outside legal services PG&E requires will not change appreciably as a result of the bankruptcy filing. Therefore, PG&E will continue to require the services of these firms at the best rates available.
- If the rates PG&E has negotiated with its various outside counsel are made public, there is a risk that its ability to get the best possible rates will be jeopardized. This will make it more difficult for PG&E to negotiate for lower rates in the future and/or will risk the loss of the services of some firms, thus decreasing the scope of the competitive market. A disclosure creates an unnecessary risk that PG&E will pay more for the same legal services.
- The complexity and uniqueness of PG&E's business and legal affairs C. makes stability, in regards to its legal representation, very important. The potential loss or dissatisfaction due to rate concerns of firms charging lower rates will be unnecessarily disruptive to PG&E.
- d. PG&E is concerned that it not put firms, with which it has made particularly favorable rate agreements, in a position to have those arrangements revealed to their other clients. If that happens, these firms are likely to be pressured either to raise the rates they charge PG&E or lower those charged to others. Either alternative will be detrimental to PG&E and its ongoing relationships with its outside counsel.

For all of the foregoing reasons, PG&E believes that the information concerning the hourly rates charged by proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel are confidential commercial information which this Court can and should protect by permitting the information to be filed under seal. PG&E recognizes that in order to rule on the Amended Application, the Court must have the information regarding the rates charged PG&E by each of the proposed Non-Bankruptcy Counsel. PG&E proposes to provide this information to the Court under seal. It also wishes to provide this information to the Creditor's Committee, under a

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR -5-

13 14

ginianian 15

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case: 01-30923

Doc #: 1090

Filed: 06/22/2001

Page 6 of 7

12

13

14

= 15

16

confidentiality agreement; and, if possible, to the UST, also under a confidentiality agreement. PG&E believes that further dissemination of this information is unnecessary, and would be damaging to its financial interests.

Clarification concerning Applications for Compensation. The UST 3. expressed concerns that the Application was not sufficiently clear regarding Non-Bankruptcy Counsel's intentions to file applications for compensation pursuant to Section 330 of the Code, and agreement to be bound by the Guidelines for Compensation, filed by the UST, as such may be in effect from time to time. For the record, Applicant confirms that each of the Non-Bankruptcy Counsel will apply for fees pursuant to proper applications for compensation, and will be bound by the Guidelines.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Applicant prays that it be authorized to employ and to continue the employment of the Non-Bankruptcy Counsel to represent Applicant on the various nonbankruptcy matters on which the Non-Bankruptcy Counsel had represented Applicant prior to the commencement of this case, as well as non-bankruptcy matters arising thereafter, as set forth in the Application, this Amended Application, on Exhibit "A" hereto, and the various declarations in support of the Application and this Amended Application, on the terms and conditions described therein.

DATED: June 22, 2001

Respectfully,

HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY. **FALK & RABKIN**

A Professional Corporation

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

23

24

25

26

27

28

WD 062201/1-1419904/924647/v1

-6-

Case: 01-30923

Doc #: 1090

Filed: 06/22/2001

AMENDED APPLICATION FOR AUTHORITY TO EMPLOY SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR

Page 7 of 7