JAMES L. LOPES (No. 63678) 1 JEFFREY L. SCHAFFER (No. 91404) 2 JANET A. NEXON (No. 104747) WILLIAM J. LAFFERTY (No. 120814) 3 HOWARD RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY **FALK & RABKIN** 4 A Professional Corporation Three Embarcadero Center, 7th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4024 5 415/434-1600 Telephone: 6 Facsimile: 415/217-5910 7 Attorneys for Debtor and Debtor in Possession PACIFIC GAS and ELECTRIC COMPANY 8 9 10 11 12 In re PACIFIC GAS and ELECTRIC 13 COMPANY, a California corporation, Debtor. Federal I.D. No. 94-0742640 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

Case No. 01-30923 DM

Chapter 11 Case

September 14, 2004 Date:

1:30 p.m. Time:

Hon. Dennis Montali Judge:

235 Pine Street, 22nd Floor Courtroom:

San Francisco, California

FINAL APPLICATION BY PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO PAY COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES TO SPECIAL COUNSEL TO DEBTOR IN POSSESSION ON NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS, **PURSUANT TO BANKRUPTCY CODE SECTION 330**

[DECLARATION OF WILLIAM J. LAFFERTY AND SUBMISSION OF DECLARATIONS OF SPECIAL COUNSEL FILED CONCURRENTLY HEREWITH

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS)

No. 01-30923 DM

Page 1 of 10 5 Case: 01-30923 Doc #: 15511 Filed: 07/09/2004

TO THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E"), hereby applies, on behalf of the attorneys and law firms employed during the course of PG&E's chapter 11 case as special counsel on non-bankruptcy matters (collectively, the "Special Counsel") pursuant to 11 U.S.C. Section 327(e) (hereinafter, the "Bankruptcy Code"), for final approval of fees paid and expenses reimbursed to Special Counsel for the period April 6, 2001, through April 11, 2004. This Application (the "Application") is made in accordance with the provisions of Section 330 of the Bankruptcy Code, and is supported by the Declaration of William J. Lafferty, and the Declarations of the Special Counsel, which have been filed concurrently herewith.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

As the Court is well aware, PG&E filed a voluntary petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on April 6, 2001 (the "Petition Date"). A trustee was not appointed in this case, and PG&E continued to function as a debtor-in-possession pursuant to Sections 1107 and 1108 of the Bankruptcy Code. On December 22, 2003, this Court entered its order confirming the Plan of Reorganization Under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code for Pacific Gas and Electric Company Dated July 31, 2003, As Modified by Modifications Dated November 6, 2003 and December 19, 2003 (the "Plan"). The Effective Date of the Plan occurred on April 12, 2004. From and after the Effective Date, PG&E operates as the Reorganized Debtor pursuant to the Plan. The period covered by this Application is from the Petition Date until the Effective Date.

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 "Initial Employment Application") on May 16, 2001. In that Initial Employment Application, PG&E set forth facts demonstrating the need (a) to continue the employment of

¹Capitalized terms used herein without definition have the meanings ascribed to them in the Plan.

counsel who had been employed by PG&E on non-bankruptcy matters prior to the Petition Date and (b) to employ certain other counsel from and after the Petition Date, also to assist PG&E on non-bankruptcy matters, as Special Counsel pursuant to the provisions of Section 327(e) of the Bankruptcy Code. For the convenience of the Court and interested parties, a true and correct copy of the Initial Employment Application is attached as Exhibit "A" to the Declaration of William J. Lafferty, filed concurrently herewith (the "Lafferty Declaration").

Briefly summarized, the Initial Employment Application stated that PG&E was an investor-owned utility which provides gas and electric services to more than 4.5 million customers in Central and Northern California serving a total population of about 13 million, and that the scope of PG&E's business operations within the state of California and beyond are extremely broad and complex. In the ordinary course of the conduct of its business prior to the commencement of this bankruptcy case, PG&E regularly employed a large number of law firms and other professionals to assist it in conducting its business affairs and to render legal services on a wide variety of subjects. The Initial Employment Application listed the following categories of non-bankruptcy services on which it expected that Special Counsel would assist PG&E:

- (a) Regulatory Matters: represent and advise PG&E regarding matters before state and federal regulatory agencies, including, for example, the California Public Utilities Commission, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and Canadian federal and provincial agencies. Regulatory matters include rate making, the licensing of facilities, customer relations and complaints, export permits, wholesale supplier issues, and the like.
- (b) Environmental And Land Use Matters: represent and advise PG&E regarding its land rights, environmental obligations and responsibilities, hazardous waste matters, air and water quality matters, California Environmental Quality Act matters, and National Environmental Policy Act matters. Land rights matters include, for example, land rights acquisition, land sales and leasing, clarifying and defending land rights, federal and state land agency matters such as U. S. Forest Service special use permits, State Lands

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS) No. 01-30923 DM

Commission permits, U. S. Corps of Engineers permits, CalTrans encroachment permits, and the like.

- (c) <u>Legislative Matters</u>: advise PG&E regarding compliance with California's Political Reform Act and review and advise PG&E on proposed legislation and regulations at federal, state, and local levels.
- (d) <u>Plaintiff's Matters</u>: represent and advise PG&E with respect to its rights on commercial, insurance coverage, intellectual property, credit and collection, subrogation, business practices, antitrust, U. S. Court of Federal Claims, and other matters where PG&E may have been damaged by the actions, inactions, or omissions of others in the Unites States or elsewhere.
- (e) <u>Defense Matters</u>: represent and advise PG&E with respect to personal injury and property damage matters, employment, employment discrimination, wage and hour, worker's compensation, commercial, subrogation, intellectual property, work place conditions, business practices, antitrust, and other matters where other allege that the actions, in-actions, or omissions of PG&E caused others damage in the United States or elsewhere, to the extent that such matters are not stayed by reason of the provisions of section 362(a)(1) of the United States Bankruptcy Code.²
- of issues such as corporate governance, intellectual property, copyright, telecommunications law, cyberlaw, aviation law, criminal law, admiralty law, insurance law, family law, labor law, mechanics and materialsmen liens, Miller Act liens, wage garnishment law, attachment law, and public agency contracts.

The Initial Employment Application was also supported by an Exhibit "A" attached thereto, a list of the firms which had been employed by PG&E prior to the

²As is also set forth in certain of the Declarations of Special Counsel in support of this Application, during the course of this case, the Court granted relief from stay to numerous parities who had asserted claims against PG&E in non-bankruptcy courts to permit those actions to liquidate the claims against PG&E in the forum in which the action had been commenced, thus necessitating a relatively high level of services rendered by Special Counsel on Defense matters.

commencement of this case on non bankruptcy matters, with information concerning the area(s) in which the firms had provided services, and the historical average monthly billings rendered by each firm to Applicant during the year prior to the commencement of the case.

Due to the volume of the services which PG&E requires at any given time, and consistent with its business strategies concerning the most efficient and effective manner of obtaining legal services on the most competitive basis, from time to time PG&E employs more than one law firm to perform a category (or categories) of services. Consistent with these objectives, prior to the commencement of this case, PG&E considered the hourly rates at which it engaged various firms to be proprietary in nature, and believed that its ability to continue to employ counsel on the most advantageous terms depended upon continuing to keep confidential those hourly rates.

In the course of preparing the Initial Employment Application, PG&E realized that the hourly rates at which a Debtor proposes to engage counsel typically are disclosed either in the employment application, or in the supporting declaration(s) of the counsel proposed to be engaged. However, because it believed that it was critical to treat the hourly rates information as confidential in order to maintain PG&E's competitive advantage in employing counsel, PG&E determined to seek to file under seal the hourly rates information for the proposed Special Counsel.

Initially, counsel for PG&E requested that the Office of the United States Trustee ("UST") agree to permit PG&E to file the hourly rates information under seal. Lafferty Decl. ¶9. However, the UST declined to agree to this request, and on May 23, 2001, filed an Objection to Application to Employ and To Continue the Employment of Special Counsel To Debtor in Possession on Non-Bankruptcy Matters (the "UST Objection"). *Id.* The UST Objection (a) requested clarification concerning the law firms to be employed on non-bankruptcy matters, and the scope of non-bankruptcy services to be rendered to PG&E, (b) requested clarification concerning proposed special counsel's adherence to the Guidelines for Compensation promulgated by the UST, including whether special counsel would file final applications for compensation and (c) objected to PG&E's request to file the

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS) No. 01-30923 DM

4-

Case: 01-30923 Doc #: 15511 Filed: 07/09/2004 Page 5 of 10

information concerning hourly rates for special counsel under seal.

In response thereto, on June 22, 2001, PG&E filed (a) its "Amended Application for Authority to Employ and to Continue the Employment of Special Counsel to Debtor in Possession on Non-Bankruptcy Matters, and to File Information Concerning Hourly Rates of Proposed Counsel Under Seal (Bankruptcy Code Section 107(B), Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9018)" (the "Amended Application") and (b) its "Motion of Debtor Pacific Gas and Electric to Submit Hourly Rates of Proposed Counsel Under Seal (11 U.S.C. §107(b)) and Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof" (the "Motion to File Under Seal"). True and correct copies of the Amended Application and the Motion to File Under Seal are attached as Exhibits "B" and "C," respectively, to the Lafferty Declaration.

On July 12, 2001, the Court conducted a consolidated hearing on the Initial Employment Application, the Amended Application and the Motion to File Under Seal. At the conclusion of the consolidated hearing, the Court granted the Initial Employment Application as amended by the Amended Application and the Motion to File Under Seal. On August 16, this Court entered its (a) Order Approving Amended Application for Authority to Employ and to Continue the Employment of Special Counsel to Debtor in Possession on Non-Bankruptcy Matters, and to File Information Concerning Hourly Rates of Proposed Special Counsel Under Seal (Bankruptcy Code Section 107(B), Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9018) (the "Order Approving Employment") and (b) Order Approving Motion of Debtor Pacific gas and Electric Company To Submit Hourly Rate of Proposed Special Counsel Under Seal (11 U.S.C. §107(b)) (the "Order Re Filing Under Seal"). True and correct copies of the Order Approving Employment and the Order Re Filing Under Seal are attached as Exhibits "D" and "E," respectively, to the Lafferty Declaration.³

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS) No. 01-30923 DM

³On September 17, 2001, this Court entered its "Amended Order Approving Amended Application, etc.". The Amended Order corrected an inadvertent failure to include the firm Thelen, Reed and Priest among the Special Counsel whose employment was approved pursuant to the Amended Application and the Order Approving Employment. In all other respects, the Order Approving Employment remained in full force and effect.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Order Approving Employment and the Order Re Filing Under Seal, this Court authorized PG&E, pursuant to Section 327(e) of the Code, to employ special counsel to PG&E on non-bankruptcy matters, and to compensate such special counsel for non-bankruptcy matters on a current, interim basis, subject to the requirement that a final fee application be filed, and that such a fee application be approved by this Court.

Subsequent to the entry of the Order Approving Employment, PG&E moved, on numerous occasions, to amend the Order Approving Employment by adding special counsel to assist PG&E with additional non-bankruptcy related tasks, as required from time to time (collectively, the "Supplemental Employment Applications"). This Court approved each of the Supplemental Employment Applications. True and correct copies of the various Orders Approving Supplemental Employment Applications are attached as Exhibits "F" through "P" of the Lafferty Declaration. Most recently, on July 8, 2004, PG&E filed its Twelfth Supplement to Application to Employ and Continue the Employment of Special Counsel on Non-Bankruptcy Matters. A true and correct copy of this Twelfth Supplement is attached as Exhibit "Q" to the Lafferty Declaration.

In connection with the Initial Employment Application and the Supplemental Employment Applications, each proposed Special Counsel executed two declarations: (a) a declaration which (i) described the scope of the services which the firm would supply to PG&E, (ii) described other details of the engagement, including the hourly rates proposed to be charged PG&E for the work performed and (iii) disclosed the firm's relationships or connections with other parties in the Case, and any conflicts of interest caused by such relationships or connections; and (b) a declaration which contained all of the information contained in the declaration described in subpart (a) of this paragraph, but omitted information concerning hourly rates. Pursuant to the provisions of the Order Approving Employment, the declaration described in subpart (a) was filed under seal, and the declaration described in subpart (b) was filed in the Court's Case file.

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS) No. 01-30923 DM

Case: 01-30923 Dod

Doc #: 15511

Filed: 07/09/2004

Page 7 of 10

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION AND REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL

During the course of its chapter 11 bankruptcy case, PG&E employed, received services from and paid compensation and reimbursement of expenses to 89 separate firms. Lafferty Decl. ¶15.4 Attached hereto as Exhibit "A" is an "Index of Special Counsel-Total Payments," which lists the name of the Special Counsel, the amount which PG&E believes that the Special Counsel have been paid as compensation and reimbursement of expenses during the period from the Petition Date to the Effective Date (the "Compensation Period"). and the amount which Special Counsel believes it has been paid during the same period.

Concurrent with the filing of this Application, PG&E is also filing Declarations of Special Counsel (the "Special Counsel Declarations")⁵ from the various Special Counsel who were employed by PG&E, rendered services and were compensated during the Compensation Period. These Special Counsel Declarations provide additional support for this Application, specifically, (a) the date on which Special Counsel became employed during the Compensation Period, (b) the nature of the services performed by Special Counsel, (c) a narrative description of the services performed, (d) certification that the Special Counsel complied with the requirements of the Order Approving Employment, and (where relevant) the Supplemental Employment Order, (e) certification that, to the best of their knowledge and belief, on those occasions on which the Order Approving Employment required it be done, that PG&E forwarded copies of their monthly invoices to the UST and counsel to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "Committee") for review, and that, to the best of their knowledge, on no occasion did the UST or the Committee object to

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS) No. 01-30923 DM

Filed: 07/09/2004

Page 8 of 10

12 13

16

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

Case: 01-30923

Doc #: 15511

⁴For a variety of reasons pertaining to its business judgment, from time to time throughout the duration of this case, PG&E determined not to engage, or not to request services from, Special Counsel whose employment had been authorized (but not required) by the Order Approving Employment and the Supplemental Employment Orders.

⁵Because the Special Counsel Declarations are so numerous, and are, in the aggregate, voluminous, PG&E has filed these declarations under a form of "Submission of Declarations of Special Counsel in Support of Final Application for Compensation," which indexes the Special Counsel Declarations alphabetically, by name of firm.

3

6

5

7 8

9

10

11

12

ARD 13

RICE NEMEROVSKI CANADY FALK & RABKIN

> 15 16

> > 17

18 19

2021

22

23

2425

26

27

28

their fees or expenses and (f) the amount which Special Counsel believes it has been paid during for service rendered during the Compensation Period.⁶

The information set forth in the Index of Special Counsel and the Declarations of Special Counsel is subject to two clarifications. First, the amounts set forth in the Index of Special Counsel and the Declarations of Special Counsel do not include amounts which pertain to services rendered during the last stages of the Compensation Periods, and which have not been paid as of the date of filing this Application. These fees and expenses remain unpaid either because they are required to be reviewed by the UST and the Committee per the terms of the Order Approving Employment, and the review period has not yet expired⁷, or because the payment has simply not been processed by PG&E. Attached as Exhibit "B" hereto is a "Schedule of Payments to Be Made" which lists, to the best of PG&E's current knowledge, the Special Counsel with outstanding invoices and the amount of such invoices. PG&E expects that these amounts will be paid in the ordinary course, prior to the hearing on this Application.

Second, although PG&E and Special Counsel have made diligent efforts to reconcile the amounts which the Special Counsel believe they have been paid during the Compensation Period with the amounts which PG&E believes it has paid during that period, inevitably, with the number of firms involved and the irregular commencement and cut-off dates of the Compensation Period, some discrepancies exist. Many of these discrepancies are quite small, and, in light of the total amounts paid to the subject firm, are de minimus in amount. Given the fact that all Allowed Claims are being paid in full in this case (with interest), and considering the likely cost of the effort required to reconcile small

⁶Consistent with the provisions of and the rationale underlying the Order Approving Employment, the Special Counsel Declarations do not include Special Counsels' invoices, nor does PG&E propose to file Special Counsels' invoices with the Court. Of course, if the Court or the UST desires to review any invoice(s), PG&E and Special Counsel will make any such requested invoices available to the Court or the UST.

⁷True and correct copies of the cover letters from Richard Meiss, in-house counsel to PG&E, dated June 23, June 29, and June 30, 2004, transmitting invoices to the UST and Committee, are attached as Exhibits "R" and "S" to the Lafferty Declaration.

discrepancies, PG&E has determined not to pursue any discrepancy less than either approximately one percent (1%) of the total amount billed by the special counsel or \$1000. PG&E is working to reconcile the other discrepancies, and hopes to have such reconciliation complete prior to the date on which Notice of Hearing of this Application is sent to creditors and interested parties. PG&E will file a Supplement to this Application describing the resolution of any such discrepancies. CONCLUSION Special Counsel rendered valuable non-bankruptcy services to PG&E during the course of this case. Without these non-bankruptcy services, PG&E would not have been able to operate its business and to fulfill its duties as a utility responsible for providing gas and electric services to approximately 4.5 Million customers throughout Northern California. WHEREFORE, PG&E prays that this Court approve the payment of compensation and reimbursement of expenses to Special Counsel, as set forth herein, and as reflected on Exhibits "A" and "B" to this Application, pursuant to Section 330 of the Bankruptcy Code. DATED: July 9, 2004 Respectfully, JAMES L. LOPES JEFFREY L. SCHAFFER JANET A. NEXON WILLIAM J. LAFFERTY HOWARD, RICE, NEMEROVSKI, CANADY, FALK & RABKIN A Professional Corporation Attorneys for Reorganized Debtor and Debtor in Possession PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC **COMPANY** WD 070904/2-141990004/Y6/1159391/v1

FINAL FEE APPL FOR SPECIAL COUNSEL (NON-BANKRUPTCY MATTERS) No. 01-30923 DM

Doc #: 15511 Case: 01-30923

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Filed: 07/09/2004

Page 10 of 10