



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FILED
10-05-16
04:59 PM

<p>Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission’s Own Motion Into the Operations and Practices of Southern California Edison Company; Notice of Opportunity For Hearing; and Order to Show Cause Why the Commission Should Not Impose Fines and Sanctions For Major Power Outages In the City of Long Beach on July 15 to July 20, 2015, and on July 30 to August 3, 2015.</p>	<p>Investigation 16-07-007 (Filed July 14, 2016)</p>
---	--

NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION AND, IF REQUESTED (and checked), ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING ON Center for Accessible Technology’s SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP

NOTE: After electronically filing a PDF copy of this Notice of Intent (NOI), please email the document in an MS WORD format to the Intervenor Compensation Program Coordinator at Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Customer (party intending to claim intervenor compensation):	
Center for Accessible Technology	
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Administrative Law Judge: Michelle Cooke
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.	
Signature:	/S/ Melissa W. Kasnitz
Date: October 5, 2016	Printed Name: Melissa W. Kasnitz

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES
(To be completed by the party (“customer”) intending to claim intervenor compensation)

<p>A. Status as “customer” (see Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b)): The party claims “customer” status because the party is (check one):</p>	<p>Applies (check)</p>
<p>1. A Category 1 customer is an actual customer whose self-interest in the proceeding arises primarily from his/her role as a customer of the utility and, at</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

¹ DO NOT CHECK THIS BOX if a finding of significant financial hardship is not needed (in cases where there is a valid rebuttable presumption of eligibility (Part III(A)(3)) or significant financial hardship showing has been deferred to the intervenor compensation claim).

<p>the same time, the customer must represent the broader interests of at least some other customers.</p> <p>In addition to describing your own interest in the proceeding you must show how your participation goes beyond just your own self-interest and will benefit other customers.</p>	
<p>2. A Category 2 customer is a representative who has been authorized by actual customers to represent them. Category 2 involves a more formal arrangement where a customer or a group of customers selects a more skilled person to represent the customer’s views in a proceeding. A customer or group of customers may also form or authorize a group to represent them, and the group, in turn, may authorize a representative such as an attorney to represent the group.</p> <p>A representative authorized by a customer must identify the residential customer(s) being represented and provide authorization from at least one customer. <i>See D.98-04-059 at 30.</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. A Category 3 customer is a formally organized group authorized, by its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers or small commercial customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation.² Certain environmental groups that represent residential customers with concerns for the environment may also qualify as Category 3 customers, even if the above requirement is not specifically met in the articles or bylaws. <i>See D.98-04-059, footnote at 3.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The party’s explanation of its customer status must include the percentage of the intervenors members who are residential ratepayers or the percentage of the intervenors members who are customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation, and must include supporting documentation: (i.e., articles of incorporation or bylaws).</p> <p>The Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT) is an organization that is authorized by its bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers with disabilities before the Commission; specifically, our bylaws state at Article 2.1(d) that CforAT is “involved in advocacy initiatives to enhance the lives of the disability community, including ways to improve access to technology and increase the ability of people with disabilities to live independently. In particular, CforAT is authorized and urged to actively participate and intervene before government entities, including but not limited to the California Public Utilities Commission, on all matters that it deems appropriate that will affect directly or indirectly the interests of residential customers with disabilities, ratepayers with disabilities, small businesses owned by people with disabilities, including customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical</p>	

² Intervenors representing either a group of residential customers or small commercial customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation, must indicate in Part I, Section A, Item #4 of this form, the percentage of their members who are residential customers or the percentage of their members who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation. The NOI may be rejected if this information is omitted.

<p>corporation.” CforAT is not a membership organization. A copy of CforAT’s bylaws were submitted with our NOI in A.10-03-014, which was filed on August 29, 2011. No changes have been made since that time. An additional copy can be provided upon request.</p>	
<p>Identify all attached documents in Part IV.</p>	
<p>Do you have any direct economic interest in outcomes of the proceeding?³</p> <p>Yes: <input type="checkbox"/> No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>If “Yes”, explain:</p>	

B. Conflict of Interest (§ 1802.3)	Check
1. Is the customer a representative of a group representing the interests of small commercial customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation? [Among other interests, CforAT represents small businesses owned by people with disabilities]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. If the answer to the above question is “Yes”, does the customer have a conflict arising from prior representation before the Commission?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

C. Timely Filing of Notice of Intent (NOI) (§ 1804(a)(1)):	Check
1. Is the party’s NOI filed within 30 days after a Prehearing Conference? Date of Prehearing Conference: 9/6/2016	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2a. The party’s description of the reasons for filing its NOI at this other time: N/A	
2b. The party’s information on the proceeding number, date, and decision number for any Commission decision, Commissioner ruling, Administrative Law Judge’s ruling, or other document authorizing the filing of NOI at that other time:	

³ See Rule 17.1(e).

**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 statement of the issues on which it plans to participate:

As set forth in CforAT’s Motion for Party Status filed on July 22, 2016 in this proceeding, CforAT intends to participate in order to address efforts to improve emergency planning by Southern California Edison (SCE) in the wake of the major power outages in Long Beach that are the subject of the investigation. In particular, CforAT will represent the interests of those SCE customers who have disabilities or are otherwise particularly vulnerable to harm in the event of an extended power outage, and work to ensure that any efforts made to improve SCE’s emergency response and disaster preparedness plans take into account the unique needs of such customers. Additionally, CforAT seeks to ensure that efforts to improve SCE’s communications with the public in the event of an extended power outage include targeted efforts to communicate effectively with customers whose disabilities impact their ability to use standard forms of communication.

The party’s explanation of how it plans to avoid duplication of effort with other parties:

At this time, no other consumer advocates have moved to intervene in this proceeding. To the extent that SED intends to address emergency planning, CforAT understands that it will address the needs of SCE customers in general, and will not have a particular focus on the specialized needs of our constituency. CforAT will work with SED and any other parties that may join the proceeding to address issues of common concern to all customers regarding emergency planning. As noted in our Motion for Party Status, CforAT does not intend to participate on any issues addressing the design and/or maintenance of SCE’s electrical distribution system.

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

CforAT intends to conduct discovery, prepare testimony, participate at hearing and briefing, and otherwise take all necessary steps through the formal litigation process to ensure that SCE develops emergency plans that appropriately take into account the needs of its customers with disabilities. At the same time, CforAT has already initiated discussions with SCE to see if the issues of concern to our constituency may be resolved through settlement.

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, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES				
Melissa W. Kasnitz	90	\$455	\$40,950	See note below
Expert on emergency planning for people with disabilities (TBD)	40	TBD, but estimated at \$275	\$11,000	
<i>Subtotal: \$51,950</i>				
OTHER FEES				
[Person 1]				
[Person 2]				
Subtotal: \$				
COSTS				
Printing and mailing			\$500	
[Item 2]				
<i>Subtotal: \$500</i>				
TOTAL ESTIMATE: \$52,450				
Estimated Budget by Issues:				
<p>CforAT preliminarily identifies the sole issue of our intended focus as emergency planning, particularly as required to ensure that the needs of customers with disabilities are met in emergency situations (including effective communication and planning for extended outages). Our estimate of hours assumes at this time that the issue will be litigated through evidentiary hearings.</p> <p>While this issue will be our sole substantive focus, we expect that we will need to spend some time following the overall development of the proceeding, including work by other parties addressing issues regarding SCE's electrical distribution system.</p> <p>Emergency Preparation: 80% General Participation: 20%</p> <p>This estimate is for time spent by counsel. CforAT expects that 100% of expert time will be spent on the substantive issue of emergency preparation.</p>				
<p><i>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 time is typically compensated at ½ professional hourly rate.</i></p>				

**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 Intervenor Compensation Claim 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
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)).	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 in this proceeding (§ 1804(b)(1)). Commission’s finding of significant financial hardship made in proceeding number: A.10-02-028 Date of Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling (or CPUC Decision) in which the finding of significant financial hardship was made: D.15-12-046, issued on December 21, 2015.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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 NOI:

PART IV: ATTACHMENTS DOCUMENTING SPECIFIC ASSERTIONS MADE IN THIS NOTICE
(The party (“customer”) intending to claim intervenor compensation identifies and attaches documents; add rows as necessary)

Attachment No.	Description
1	Certificate of Service

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING⁴
(Administrative Law Judge completes)

	Check all that apply
--	-----------------------------

⁴ A Ruling needs not be issued unless: (a) the NOI is deficient; (b) the Administrative Law Judge 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 Intervenor Compensation Claim); or (c) the NOI has included a claim of “significant financial hardship” that requires a finding under § 1802(g).

1. The Notice of Intent (NOI) is rejected for the following reasons:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. The NOI has not demonstrated the party's status as a "customer" for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The NOI has not demonstrated that the NOI was timely filed (Part I(B)) for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The NOI has not adequately described the scope of anticipated participation (Part II, above) for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The NOI has demonstrated significant financial hardship for the reasons set forth in Part III of the NOI (above).	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The NOI has not demonstrated significant financial hardship for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The Administrative Law Judge provides the following additional guidance (see § 1804(b)(2)):	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT IS RULED that:

1. The Notice of Intent is rejected.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The customer has satisfied the eligibility requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a).	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The customer has shown significant financial hardship.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Additional guidance is provided to the customer as set forth above.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Administrative Law Judge