

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**  
11-14-16  
01:13 PM

November 14, 2016

**Agenda ID #15335**  
**Ratesetting**

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN INVESTIGATION 12-10-013 ET AL:

This is the proposed decision of the Administrative Law Judge Division. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's December 15, 2016 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

Comments must be filed, pursuant to Rule 1.13, either electronically or in hard copy. Comments should be served on parties to this proceeding in accordance with Rules 1.9 and 1.10. Electronic and hard copies of comments should be sent to the Intervenor Compensation Program at [Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov). The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](http://www.cpuc.ca.gov).

/s/ KAREN V. CLOPTON  
Karen V. Clopton, Chief  
Administrative Law Judge

KVC: avs

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ DIVISION** (Mailed 11/14/2016)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Services and Facilities of Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas and Electric Company Associated with the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station Units 2 and 3.

Investigation 12-10-013  
(Filed October 25, 2012)

And Related Matters.

Application 13-01-016  
Application 13-03-005  
Application 13-03-013  
Application 13-03-014

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN  
COALITION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-11-040**

<b>Intervenor: National Asian American Coalition (NAAC)<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>For contribution to D.14-11-040</b>
<b>Claimed: \$172,170.35</b>	<b>Awarded: \$95,240.18 (~44.68% reduction)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Catherine J.K. Sandoval</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: ALJ Division</b>

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this decision and the instant proceeding, National Asian American Coalition refers to itself as either "National Asian American Coalition" (NAAC) or as "Joint Minority Parties" (JMP). JMP refers to the NAAC, the Ecumenical Center for Black Church Studies, the Los Angeles Latino Chamber of Commerce, and the Chinese American Institute for Empowerment. NAAC is currently the only entity of the JMP with up-to-date bylaws and articles of incorporation on file at the Commission. In addition, NAAC was the only part of JMP to file a Notice of Intent and subsequently this claim for Intervenor Compensation. The awarded monies in this decision is to NAAC, however, many of the contribution(s) cited below are from the JMP.

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	The Final Decision approves an amended and restated settlement agreement which provides resolution of rate recovery issues related to the premature shutdown of San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS). The Joint Minority Parties (JMP) generally did not oppose the settlement and brought to attention several possible modifications and the important issue of community education and outreach, which was overlooked in the approved settlement, but not in the proposed phase 1 decision. The JMP also contributed to the discussion on the proper structuring of third party litigation recovery.
--	--

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	January 8, 2013	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:	n/a	
3. Date NOI filed:	February 6, 2013	February 7, 2013
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, National Asian American Coalition (NAAC) timely filed the notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation.
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.13-11-003	A.11-11-017
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 18, 2014	March 09, 2012
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	n/a	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, NAAC demonstrated appropriate status.
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.13-11-003	A.11-11-017

10. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 18, 2014	March 09, 2012
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	n/a	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, NAAC demonstrated significant financial hardship.
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-11-040	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	November 20, 2014	November 25, 2014
15. File date of compensation request:	1/23/2015	January 23, 2015
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, NAAC timely filed the request for compensation.

## PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

### A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p><b>1. Community Outreach and Education.</b></p> <p>The JMP led the argument for expanding outreach in several ways to meet community concerns about the changes at SONGS.</p> <p>The JMP conducted an in-depth community survey and had many discussions with community members affected by the changes at SONGS in order to gauge how the changes had affected them and how rate changes will affect them in the future.</p> <p>We had our expert testify at the evidentiary hearings and also participated in the PPHs,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Decision at p.37, 107-108.</li> <li>Joint Minority Parties' Comments on Proposed Decision Approving Settlement Agreement as Amended, filed October 17, 2014, p. 4-5, ("Comments on PD").</li> <li>Reply Comments of the Joint Parties on the Proposed Settlement Agreement, filed May 22, 2014, p. 2-3, ("RC on PD").</li> <li>Opening Comments of the Joint Parties on the Proposed Settlement Agreement, filed May 7, 2014, p. 2, ("OC on PS").</li> </ul>	<p>Verified.</p> <p>Decision 14-11-030 at 37, summarizes JMP's position and does not indicate the position of JMP substantially contributed to the Commission's decision.</p> <p>As stated in the Decision, "it is more efficient to address these issues in the GRC, which will authorize spending for education and outreach, beginning in 2015."</p> <p>D.14-11-040 at 108.</p>

<p>bringing an important minority-specific viewpoint to the proceedings.</p> <p>While the Commission indicated that a better forum for discussing community outreach would be in the 2015 GRC (A.13-11-003), the JMP's discussion in this case helped to create a record of the effect that the changes at SONGS had had on low-income minority communities enabling a beneficial settlement between JMP and SCE in the 2015 GRC case.</p>		<p>JMP may seek compensation for this work by filing a claim in A.14-11-003 (2016 General Rate Case of SDG&amp;E). National Asian American Coalition is a party to A.14-11-003 and appropriately filed notices of intent to claim intervenor compensation.</p>
<p><b>2. Third Party Litigation Recovery.</b></p> <p>The JMP pressed for modifications to the settlement agreement concerning third-party recovery provisions and how they were structured.</p> <p>The JMP completely agreed with and were quite satisfied with the Commission's modification to the settlement as the modifications were very much in line with the spirit of our suggestions, though the Commission used a different formula to determine the appropriate split between ratepayers and the utilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Decision at p.37-38.</li> <li>• OC on PS at p.3.</li> <li>• Assigned Commissioner and ALJs' Ruling Requesting Settling Parties to Adopt Modification to Proposed Settlement Agreement, filed Sept. 5, 2014, p. 6-7.</li> <li>• Late-Filed Comments on Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Requesting Settling Parties Adopt Modifications to Proposed Settlement Agreement, filed on September 16, 2014, p.3-4.</li> </ul>	<p>Verified.</p>

**B. Duplication of Effort (§ 1801.3(f) and § 1802.5):**

	<b>Intervenor’s Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties: Women’s Energy Matters and Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility.</b>		<b>Verified</b>
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b> <p>The work of the JMP did not overlap with other parties, even when addressing the same issue. For example, the JMP supported the settlement and considered it reasonable in light of the whole record, while both A4NR and WEM opposed the settlement. Thus, our contributions came from divergent philosophies, though we advocated for textually similar things.</p> <p>The JMP created a record on how the changes at SONGS affected a variety of low-income minority communities. A4NR and WEM did discuss community outreach, but completely ignored the unique circumstances affecting minority communities and many times argued for lessened outreach. The JMP were the only diverse organizations pushing for stronger acknowledgment of the challenges minority communities faced as a result of the problems that occurred at SONGS.</p>		Duplication occurred with WEM and A4NR.

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

<b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p>The JMP’ request for \$172,170.30 reflects a significant amount of unique work in this proceeding. For the most part, the Joint Parties cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from their work related to D.14-11-040, given the nature of the issues presented, the fact the Commission indicated that A.13-11-003 was a more appropriate forum for the JMP’s concerns, and the fact that the Settlement provisions have yet to</p>	<b>Verified</b>

<sup>2</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>be implemented.</p>	
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p><b>JMP Attorneys and Advocates:</b></p> <p>Attorney Robert Gnaizda was the lead attorney in the case and was supported at various times during the case by staff attorneys Aaron Lewis and Cassandra Yamasaki. Mr. Gnaizda was primarily responsible for coordinating the work between the other attorneys on the case as well as with the other intervenors. Due to his many years of expertise and wealth of contacts, he was an integral part of the case and primarily responsible for reaching out to interested community groups and the utilities involved.</p> <p>Faith Bautista was also an integral part of the case due to her expertise in community outreach and education. Through her network of contacts she was able to create a diverse coalition of parties to address the effects SONGS had on a variety of parties. It was mostly due to her experience that the JMP was able to conduct various community focused surveys and report that information back to the interested parties.</p> <p>Michael Philips is well known for being an expert on the Fukushima nuclear crisis and has experience working with business leaders and community advocates on public outreach issues concerning nuclear energy. His advice was instrumental in developing the community survey in order to catalog public sentiment with regards to SONGS.</p> <p>Staff attorneys Aaron Lewis and Cassandra Yamasaki completed a majority of the drafting for the various briefs and motions filed with the CPUC. Aaron Lewis especially, helped immensely in preparing Faith Bautista for her testimony before the Commission and also worked extensively on researching for cross-examinations at the hearings.</p> <p>There are some hourly entries that reflect meetings attended by two or more of JMP’s attorneys and/or expert witnesses. In past compensation decisions the Commission has sometimes deemed such entries as internal duplication that is not eligible for intervenor compensation. This is not the case here.</p> <p>The meetings between JMP’s attorneys and expert witnesses were essential to the effective development and implementation of JMP’s strategy for this proceeding. Due to the unique nature of community outreach and education issues, it was important to survey and talk to a wide variety of community members, as well as to confer with experts in order to have a greater diversity of opinions. A broad diversity of opinion allowed the JMP to gauge the general public opinion among each of our core constituencies and communities. None of the attendees in the meetings are there in a</p>	<p>Verified, but see CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p> <p>As noted above, the JMP focused on two issues: 1) community outreach and education and 2) third party litigation. The community outreach hours may be claimed in the GRC proceeding, if the JMP believes such hours substantially contribute to that Decision. Additionally, the JMP’s concern with public information zone and emergency materials was previously addressed in the Phase I PD. JMP, along with WEM, advanced these positions. The Commission will compensate JMP for the hours claimed that impacted Phase I. For the duplication, however, the Commission disallows 50% of the hours.</p> <p>As far as the third party litigation claims, the hours</p>

duplicative role, as each representative brings his or her own expertise and knowledge of certain issues to the discussion. As a result of this collaboration, the JMP were able to identify new and unique angles in the case that would not have come to mind without each other's input.

The JMP submits that the recorded hours are reasonable, both for each attorney, the expert witnesses, and in the aggregate. As community outreach issues involves discussions with different constituencies, the JMP's hours are reasonable to the situation at hand.

Therefore, the JMP seek compensation for all of the hours recorded by our attorneys and experts as stated in this request.

**Compensation Request Preparation Time:** The JMP are requesting compensation for approximately 15.25 hours devoted to the preparation of this request. In order to save on costs, Ms. Tam was solely responsible for drafting this request with some oversight from Mr. Gnaizda, who has extensive knowledge of the CPUC Intervenor Compensation program. Additionally, as this was Ms. Tam first time working on a compensation request, she reached out extensively to Mr. Lewis on how to prepare the request and in order to keep the hours reasonable, the time it took to train Ms. Tam on the compensation procedures was not included in this request.

claimed for JMP's advocacy are excessive. The Commission disallows 50% of the hours claimed in this area. Non-Phase I related community outreach hours should be claimed in the GRC proceedings.

For these reasons, the Commission determined that the JMP's claim in this proceeding is excessive and duplicative. *See* Public Utilities Code § 1801.3(f) (requiring the Commission to administer the compensation program in such a way so as to avoid "participation that is not necessary for a fair determination of the proceeding.").

As stated previously, such a reduction should not be interpreted as penalizing the JMP. "When we direct the payment of an award that is less than the amount requested by a customer, the customer should not view the reduction as a penalty. While we wish to foster

	<p>individual and group participation in our proceedings, we must balance that interest with the requirement that compensated intervention must provide value to the ratepayers that ultimately fund it. The Commission must make a judgement as to what amount of compensation is reasonable in light of the substantial contribution made by the customer. The award[] we direct herein reflect[s] that judgment, and we commend [the intervenor] for representing ratepayer interests in this proceeding.” D.00-02-044 at 1; 4 CPUC 3d at 253.</p>				
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>The JMP have allocated its time entries in the attachments by the following codes:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="235 1518 1201 1890"> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 1518 717 1755">GP</td> <td data-bbox="721 1518 1201 1755"><b>General Preparation-</b> Work that generally does not vary with the number of issues that JMP addresses in the case. For example, meetings to discuss strategy and to delegate work, etc.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 1759 717 1890">GH</td> <td data-bbox="721 1759 1201 1890"><b>General Hearing-</b> Hearing related work that was not issue specific. For example, time spent reviewing testimony, discussing witness</td> </tr> </table>	GP	<b>General Preparation-</b> Work that generally does not vary with the number of issues that JMP addresses in the case. For example, meetings to discuss strategy and to delegate work, etc.	GH	<b>General Hearing-</b> Hearing related work that was not issue specific. For example, time spent reviewing testimony, discussing witness	<p>Verified. As discussed above, in both issues to which JMP claims contribution, the Commission disallowed certain hours. According to the timesheets filed, JMP claims 423 hours. 133.35 hours are coded as related to Community Outreach (approx. 32%). Yet, JMP</p>
GP	<b>General Preparation-</b> Work that generally does not vary with the number of issues that JMP addresses in the case. For example, meetings to discuss strategy and to delegate work, etc.				
GH	<b>General Hearing-</b> Hearing related work that was not issue specific. For example, time spent reviewing testimony, discussing witness				

	scheduling, hearing procedure, etc.
PROC	<b>Procedure-</b> Procedural motions such as a Motion to Strike or Motion for Supplemental Testimony
DIS	<b>Discovery-</b> Matters that did not fall into a particular issue area such as work on non-disclosure agreements, discovery disputes, preparation of discovery covering multiple issues, and review of other parties' discovery
#	Where ever possible, the JMP allocated time to a specific issue area. However, use of this symbol indicates entries where the work on the substantive issues was so integrated that the time cannot be broken down into individual issue codes. For example, reviewing and finalizing testimony, certain strategy meetings, early work identifying issues, drafting briefs and responses.
CO	<b>Community Outreach-</b> Time spent researching or working on specifically this issue.
3PR	<b>Third Party Litigation Recovery-</b> Time spent researching or working on specifically this issue.

Roughly, the time was split between the two issues as follows:

CO	85%
3PR	15%
Total	100%

states, at left, 85% of the hours claimed are related to this issue. Similarly, JMP claims 15% of the hours claimed are related to third party litigation recover, when coded timesheets indicate 2.54%. Because the Commission determined reductions are required for these issues, and because JMP's claim, in light of the contributions, is excessive, further reductions to JMP's hours must occur. The Commission reduces JMP's total award by 35%.

As stated, above, the Commission's Decision instructed intervenors that it would be "more efficient to address [community outreach and education] issues in the [General Rate Case], which will authorize spending for education and outreach, beginning in 2015." D.14-11-040 at 108.

As such, the Commission will not compensate JMP for the hours claimed in this proceeding

	<p>related to Community Outreach (CO), unless directly related to Phase I and the Phase I PD. The Commission encourages to JMP to seek compensation for these hours in the GRCs. In order to obtain compensation in the GRCs, it is required that JMP provide the Commission with “sufficient data driven analysis to assist the Commission” and not submit information that is “vague, ambiguous, excessively restrictive, and burdensome for the IOU’s to implement.”</p>
--	---

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours [A]	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Gnaizda	2012	3.25	\$545	D.14-07-023	\$1,771.25	2.75	\$545.00	\$1,498.75
Robert Gnaizda	2013	177	\$555	D.14-07-023	\$98,235	137.25	\$555.00	\$76,451.25
Robert Gnaizda	2014	56	\$570	See Comment #2	\$31,920	50.13	\$570.00	\$28,574.10
Aaron	2012	9	\$90	D.14-08-056	\$720	9.00	90.00	\$720.00

Lewis								
Aaron Lewis	2013	53	\$185	D.14-08-024	\$9,805	52.40	185.00	\$9,694.00
Aaron Lewis	2014	11.10	\$190	See Comment #3	\$2,109	8.70	190.00	\$1,653.00
Cassandra Yamasaki	2014	6.9	\$180	See Comment #4	\$1,242	4.65	180.00	\$837.00
Faith Bautista	2012	1.5	\$155	D.14-07-023	\$232.50	1.50	155.00	\$232.50
Faith Bautista	2013	97.25	\$155	D.14-07-023	\$15,073.75	75.25	155.00	\$11,663.75
Faith Bautista	2014	4.5	\$160	See Comment #6	\$720	4.25	160.00	\$680.00
Michael Phillips	2012	1.5	\$390	D.14-07-023	\$585	1.50	390.00	\$585.00
Michael Phillips	2013	1	\$395	D.14-08-024	\$395	1.00	395.00	\$395.00
Michael Phillips	2014	1	\$400	See Comment #7	\$400	1.00	405.00	\$405.00
<b>Subtotal: \$163,208.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$133,389.35</b>		
						<b>35% Reduction: (\$46,686.27)</b>		
						<b>Revised Subtotal: \$ 86,703.08</b>		
<b>OTHER FEES</b>								
<b>Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Robert Gnaizda	2013	18.75	\$277.50	Travel time for hearings-half hourly rate	\$5,203.13	18.75	\$277.50	\$5,203.13
Robert Gnaizda	2014	1	\$285	Travel time for hearings-half hourly rate	\$285	0 [G]	\$285.00	\$00.00
Faith	2013	21	\$77.50	Travel time	\$1,627.50	20[C]	\$77.50	\$1,550.00

Bautista				for hearings- half hourly rate				
<b>Subtotal: \$7,115.63</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$6,753.13</b>		
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hour s</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Jessica Tam	2014	1	\$90	Half of \$180, See Comment #5	\$90	1	\$90.00	\$90.00
Jessica Tam	2015	14.25	\$90	Half of \$180, See Comment #5	\$1282.50	14.25	\$90.00	\$1,282.50
<b>Subtotal: \$1,372.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$1,372.50</b>		
<b>COSTS</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Detail</b>			<b>Amount</b>	<b>Amount</b>		
1	Travel	Expenses for attendance at hearings			\$419.72	\$375.47[D]		
2	Printing	Printing documents for the proceedings			\$54.00	\$36.00		
<b>Subtotal: \$473.72</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$411.47</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$172,170.35</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$95,240.18</b>		
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>3</sup>	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Robert Gnaizda	Jan. 9, 1962	32148	No
Aaron Lewis	Dec. 5, 2012	285526	No
Cassandra Yamasaki	Dec. 6, 2013	293186	No
Jessica Tam	June 01, 2014	296837	No

### C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III

Comment #	Intervenor's Comments
1	In line with Res. ALJ-303, the JMP request an hourly rate of \$570 for Mr. Gnaizda's work in 2014. This figure represents the hourly rate previously adopted for his work in 2013 escalated by the 2014 COLA of 2.58%.
2	In line with Res. ALJ-303, the JMP request an hourly rate of \$190 for Mr. Lewis's work in 2014. This figure represents the hourly rate previously adopted for his work in 2013 escalated by the 2014 COLA of 2.58%.
3	The JMP request a 2014 hourly rate of \$180 for Ms. Yamasaki. Ms. Yamasaki became a licensed member of the California Bar in December 2013 and had approximately half a year of experience as a licensed attorney when she began work in this proceeding. Though none of this previous experience took place before the CPUC \$180/hr is consistent for attorney intervenors in Ms. Yamasaki's experience range and is in line with the rates set by Resolution ALJ-303.
4	The JMP request a 2014/2015 hourly rate of \$180 for Ms. Tam. Ms. Tam became a licensed member of the California Bar in June 2014 and had approximately half a year of experience as a licensed attorney when she began work in this proceeding. Though none of this previous experience took place before the CPUC \$180/hr is consistent for attorney intervenors in Ms. Tam's experience range and is in line with the rates set by Resolution ALJ-303.
5	In line with Res. ALJ-303, the JMP request an hourly rate of \$160 for Ms. Bautista's work in 2014. This figure represents the hourly rate previously adopted for his work in 2013 escalated by the 2014 COLA of 2.58%.
6	In line with Res. ALJ-303, the JMP request an hourly rate of \$400 for Mr. Phillips's work in 2014. This figure represents the hourly rate previously adopted for his work in 2013 escalated by the 2014 COLA of 2.58%.

<sup>3</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

**D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
[A]	<p>Hours coded CO (community outreach) are disallowed from the award, unless they related to Phase I and the Phase I decision.</p> <p>The Commission disallowed 50% of the claimed hours related to Phase I Community Outreach and Third Party Litigation.</p> <p>Because of the excessive hours claimed by JMP, in light of the contribution, and because of discrepancies in the coding of the timesheet, the Commission reduced JMP’s award by 35% (the 35% reduction was not applied to travel hours, intervenor compensation hour, or fees/costs).</p>
[B]	Travel from Daly City, CA to San Francisco, CA is routine travel and is not compensable by the Commission. ( <i>See</i> D.10-11-032.)
[C]	Travel from Daly City, CA to San Francisco, CA is routine travel and is not compensable by the Commission. ( <i>See</i> D.10-11-032.)
[D]	The Commission does not compensate intervenors for meals and such charges have been removed from the claim.

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No.
<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	No.

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. National Asian American Coalition has made a substantial contribution to D.14-11-040.
2. The requested hourly rates for National Asian American Coalition’s representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$95,240.18.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

**ORDER**

1. National Asian American Coalition shall be awarded \$95,240.18.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric shall pay National Asian American Coalition their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdiction gas and electric revenues for the 2013 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning April 8, 2015, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of National Asian American Coalition's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

## APPENDIX

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1411040		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	I1210013		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Division		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric		

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
NAAC	01/23/2015	\$172,170.35	\$95,240.18	No	Issues more appropriate in another proceeding; excessive hours claimed; duplication with other parties; lack of substantial contribution; travel reductions.

## Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	NAAC	\$545	2012	\$545.00
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	NAAC	\$555	2013	\$555.00
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	NAAC	\$570	2014	\$570.00
Aaron	Lewis	Attorney	NAAC	\$90	2012	\$90.00
Aaron	Lewis	Attorney	NAAC	\$185	2013	\$185.00
Aaron	Lewis	Attorney	NAAC	\$190	2014	\$190.00
Cassandra	Yamasaki	Attorney	NAAC	\$180	2014	\$180.00
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	NAAC	\$155	2012	\$155.00
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	NAAC	\$155	2013	\$155.00
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	NAAC	\$160	2014	\$160.00
Michael	Phillips	Expert	NAAC	\$390	2012	\$390.00
Michael	Phillips	Expert	NAAC	\$395	2013	\$395.00
Michael	Phillips	Expert	NAAC	\$400	2014	\$405.00
Jessica	Tam	Attorney	NAAC	\$180	2014	\$180.00
Jessica	Tam	Attorney	NAAC	\$180	2015	\$180.00

(END OF APPENDIX)