



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
03-09-11
04:59 PM

Application of Pacific Gas & Electric Company for Approval of its 2010 Rate Design Window Proposal for 2-Part Peak Time Rebate and Recovery of Incremental Expenditures Required for Implementation.

Application 10-02-028
Filed February 26, 2010

(U 39 E)

NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION AND, IF REQUESTED (and checked), ALJ RULING ON SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

Customer (party intending to claim intervenor compensation): The Greenlining Institute ("Greenlining")			
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Peevey		Assigned ALJ: Katherine MacDonald	
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, III and IV of this Notice of Intent (NOI) is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this NOI and has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).			
Signature: /s/ Stephanie C. Chen			
Date:	March 9, 2011	Printed Name:	Stephanie C. Chen

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

(To be completed by the party ("customer") intending to claim intervenor compensation)

A. Status as "customer" (see Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b)): The party claims "customer" status because it (check one):	Applies (check)
1. Category 1: Represents consumers, customers, or subscribers of any electrical, gas, telephone, telegraph, or water corporation that is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission (§ 1802(b)(1)(A))	
2. Category 2: Is a representative who has been authorized by a "customer" (§ 1802(b)(1)(B)).	
3. Category 3: Represents a group or organization authorized pursuant to its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers, to represent "small commercial customers" (§ 1802(h) who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation (§ 1802(b)(1)(C)), or to represent another eligible group.	X
4. The party's explanation of its customer status, economic interest (if any), with any documentation (such as articles of incorporation or bylaws) that supports the party's "customer" status. Any attached documents should be identified in Part IV.	

Greenlining’s members and constituents are purchasers of telecommunications and energy services from utilities in California, qualifying Greenlining to file this NOI as “customers” pursuant to PU Code § 1802(b). Greenlining will represent low-income and minority residential and small business utility customers in this proceeding. In compliance with D. 98-04-059, Conclusion of Law 5 and Finding of Fact 12, Greenlining estimates that it represents a constituency that is divided 75% and 25% between residential customers and small business customers, respectively. These percentages represent Greenlining’s best estimates only.

Article II, Section 17 of Greenlining’s by-laws authorizes it to represent the “interests of low income communities, minorities, and residential ratepayers” before regulatory agencies and courts. Copies of the by-laws of Greenlining are attached to an NOI filed on March 5, 2010 in R.10-02-005.

B. Timely Filing of NOI (§ 1804(a)(1)):	Check
1. Is the party’s NOI filed within 30 days after a Prehearing Conference? Date of Prehearing Conference: <u>February 8, 2011</u>	Yes <u>X</u> No <u> </u>
2. Is the party’s NOI filed at another time (for example, because no Prehearing Conference was held, the proceeding will take less than 30 days, the schedule did not reasonably allow parties to identify issues within the timeframe normally permitted, or new issues have emerged)?	Yes <u>X</u> No <u> </u>
2a. The party’s description of the reasons for filing its NOI at this other time: This NOI is filed within 30 days of the second prehearing conference in this proceeding. The first PHC was held on June 25, 2010, and the then-active intervenor parties filed notices of intent within 30 days of that date. At that time Greenlining did not intend to be an active party to the proceeding. Subsequently, in a ruling issued October 6, 2010, the procedural schedule set forth in the Scoping Memo was suspended indefinitely, to allow for this matter to be considered alongside A.10-08-005 (PG&E’s application for default residential time-variant pricing). The alignment of this application with the default rate presented in that application renews Greenlining’s investment in this proceeding and its outcome. As such, Greenlining calculates the time in which to file this NOI from the date of the second PHC, rather than the first.	
2b. The party’s information on the proceeding number, date, and decision number for any Commission decision, Commissioner ruling, or ALJ ruling, or other document authorizing the filing of its NOI at that other time:	

PART II: SCOPE OF ANTICIPATED PARTICIPATION

(To be completed by the party (“customer”) intending to claim intervenor compensation)

A. Planned Participation (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)(i)):

- The party’s description of the nature and extent of the party’s planned participation in this proceeding (as far as it is possible to describe on the date this NOI is filed).

Greenlining intends to fully participate in all aspects of the proceeding including, but not limited to, (1) providing expert witness testimony; (2) issuing data requests, and responding to any propounded on Greenlining; (3) cross examination of PG&E and other witnesses; (4) active participation in Public Participation Hearings, if any are held, including outreach and promotion; (5) briefing and providing comment on the Proposed and any Alternate Decisions; (6) engaging in settlement discussions, should any arise and be relevant to Greenlining’s concerns; and (7) addressing any other matter that arises within the course of the proceeding.

- The party’s statement of the issues on which it plans to participate.

Greenlining is interested generally in keeping costs low for ratepayers, especially low-income ratepayers, while maximizing energy savings for individual customers as well as system-wide. Because the 2-part program provides larger rebates for customers who have qualifying enabling technology, rate design is of interest to Greenlining because low-income customers are less likely to have enabling technology. Also, effective customer engagement is essential to achieving both cost- and energy-saving goals. It is possible that Greenlining will identify other areas relevant to the interests of its constituencies as the proceeding unfolds. However, at this time Greenlining plans to focus on:

- A. Rate Design for Residential Customers (as described above)
- B. Low Income and Limited-English Proficient (LEP) Customer Engagement

Greenlining estimates that its participation on the aforementioned issues will be distributed approximately as follows. This is only an initial estimate.

- General Matters – 20%
- Rate Design for Residential Customers – 40%
- Low Income and LEP Customer Engagement – 40%

Greenlining will coordinate with DRA and other intervenors in a manner that ensures maximum coverage of issues and reduced duplication of effort.

B. The party's itemized estimate of the compensation that the party expects to request, based on the anticipated duration of the proceeding (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)(ii)):				
Item	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	#
ATTORNEY FEES				
Samuel S. Kang	10	\$280	\$2,800	
Stephanie C. Chen	30	\$220	\$6,600	
Enrique Gallardo	20	\$350	\$7,000	
Ryan Young	80	\$150	\$12,000	
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	\$28,400	
EXPERT FEES				
Expert 1	10	\$160	\$1,600	
		<i>Subtotal:</i>	\$1,600	
OTHER FEES				
		<i>Subtotal:</i>		
COSTS				
Administrative Costs: postage, photocopies, printing, deliveries, supplies, telephone, facsimiles.				
Travel				
		<i>Subtotal:</i>		
TOTAL ESTIMATE \$:			\$30,000	
Comments/Elaboration (use reference # from above): Greenlining has not yet designated an individual to provide expert testimony.				
When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows to table as necessary. Estimate may (but does not need to) include estimated claim preparation time. Claim preparation is typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.				

PART III: SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

(To be completed by party ("customer") intending to claim intervenor compensation; see Instructions for options for providing this information)

A. The party claims "significant financial hardship" for its claim for intervenor compensation in this proceeding on the following basis:	Applies (check)
1. "[T]he customer cannot afford, without undue hardship, to pay the costs	

of effective participation, including advocate’s fees, expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs of participation” (§ 1802(g)); or	
2. “[I]n the case of a group or organization, the economic interest of the individual members of the group or organization is small in comparison to the costs of effective participation in the proceeding” (§ 1802(g)).	
3. A § 1802(g) finding of significant financial hardship in another proceeding, made within one year prior to the commencement of this proceeding, created a rebuttable presumption of eligibility for compensation in this proceeding (§ 1804(b)(1)).	X
ALJ ruling (or CPUC decision) issued in proceeding number: R.09-08-009 Date of ALJ ruling (or CPUC decision): January 10, 2011	

B. The party’s explanation of the factual basis for its claim of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)) (necessary documentation, if warranted, is attached to the NOD):

**PART IV: THE PARTY’S ATTACHMENTS DOCUMENTING SPECIFIC
ASSERTIONS MADE IN THIS NOTICE**

(The party (“customer”) intending to claim intervenor compensation identifies and attaches documents (add rows as necessary.) Documents are not attached to final ALJ ruling.)

Attachment No.	Description
1	Certificate of Service

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING¹
(ALJ completes)

	Check all that apply
1. The Notice of Intent (NOI) is rejected for the following reasons:	
a. The NOI has not demonstrated status as a “customer” for the following reason(s):	
b. The NOI has not demonstrated that the NOI was timely filed (Part I(B)) for the following reason(s):	
c. The NOI has not adequately described the scope of anticipated participation (Part II, above) for the following reason(s):	
2. The NOI has demonstrated significant financial hardship for the reasons set forth in Part III of the NOI (above).	
3. The NOI has not demonstrated significant financial hardship for the following reason(s):	
4. The ALJ provides the following additional guidance (see § 1804(b)(2)):	

¹ An ALJ Ruling will not be issued unless: (a) the NOI is deficient; (b) the ALJ desires to address specific issues raised by the NOI (to point out similar positions, areas of potential duplication in showings, unrealistic expectations for compensation, or other matters that may affect the customer’s claim for compensation); or (c) the NOI has included a claim of “significant financial hardship” that requires a finding under § 1802(g).

IT IS RULED that:

	Check all that apply
1. The Notice of Intent is rejected.	
2. Additional guidance is provided to the customer as set forth above.	
3. The customer has satisfied the eligibility requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a).	
4. The customer has shown significant financial hardship.	
5. The customer is preliminarily determined to be eligible for intervenor compensation in this proceeding. However, a finding of significant financial hardship in no way ensures compensation.	

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

**Attachment 1:
Certificate of Service by Customer**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing **NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION** by (check as appropriate):

- hand delivery;
- first-class mail; and/or
- electronic mail

to the following persons appearing on the official Service List:

nsuetake@turn.org	regrelcpuccases@pge.com
bruce.reed@sce.com	J4LR@pge.com
liddell@EnergyAttorney.com	chris@emeter.com
gxh@cpuc.ca.gov	erasmussen@marinenergyauthority.org
norman.furuta@navy.mil	brbarkovich@earthlink.net
nes@a-klaw.com	gayatri@jbsenergy.com
SAW0@pge.com	cmkehrein@ems-ca.com
epoole@adplaw.com	abb@eslawfirm.com
wbooth@booth-law.com	rmccann@umich.edu
stephaniec@greenlining.org	kmills@cbbf.com
pucservice@dralegal.org	niki.bawa@cpuc.ca.gov
mrw@mrwassoc.com	agc@cpuc.ca.gov
khojasteh.davoodi@navy.mil	ctd@cpuc.ca.gov
sue.mara@rtoadvisors.com	cjb@cpuc.ca.gov
AGL9@pge.com	dlf@cpuc.ca.gov
KBC2@pge.com	kk3@cpuc.ca.gov
MRW4@pge.com	rl4@cpuc.ca.gov
cem@newsdata.com	scr@cpuc.ca.gov

Executed this 9th day of March, 2011, at Berkeley, California.

/s/ Stephanie Chen

**Stephanie Chen
The Greenlining Institute
1918 University Ave, Second Floor
Berkeley, CA 94704**