



FORM B: BLANK INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM

Decision _____

FILED
7-13-17
04:59 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2017 (U 39 M).	Application 15-09-001 (Filed September 1, 2015)
--	--

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF THE NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN COALITION AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF THE NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN COALITION

NOTE: After electronically filing a PDF copy of this Intervenor Compensation Claim (Request), please email the document in an MS WORD and supporting EXCEL spreadsheet to the Intervenor Compensation Program Coordinator at Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Intervenor: National Asian American Coalition	For contribution to Decision (D.) D.17-05-013
Claimed: \$ 119,189.50	Awarded: \$
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJ: Stephen Roscow
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).	
Signature:	/s/ Tadashi Gondai
Date: 7/13/2017	Printed Name: Tadashi Gondai

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES (to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.17-05-013 approves a 2017 test year revenue requirement for Pacific Gas & Electric (PGE), and rate adjustments for 2018 and 2019. The decision adopted with modifications a settlement agreement executed by all parties. The National Diversity Coalition (NDC) represented by the National Asian American Coalition (NAAC) negotiated, revised, and signed onto the all-party settlement, and was essential to the development of provisions relating to supplier diversity, employment diversity, outreach to low-income and minority
--	--

	ratepayers, and executive compensation.
--	---

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	October 29, 2015	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	November 25, 2015	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.16-09-001	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	12/22/2016	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b))		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.16-09-001	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	12/22/2016	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.17-05-013	
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	5/18/2017	
15. File date of compensation request:	7/13/2017	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

C. Additional Comments on Part I (use line reference # as appropriate):

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION (to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059). (For each contribution, support with specific reference to the record.)

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. All-Party Settlement NAAC, as the representative of NDC, actively engaged in settlement negotiations with PG&E, reviewed the positions of other parties, revised drafts of the agreement, and ultimately signed onto the all-party settlement. NAAC also supported adoption of the settlement agreement through motions and comments on the ALJ’s proposed decision and the Assigned Commissioner’s alternate proposed decision, in good faith as required by the settlement terms.</p> <p>NAAC substantially contributed to the proceeding by achieving a settlement with PG&E on important public interest issues. Considerable time and effort was necessary to establish the facts related to different issues, develop a complete record, determine the strength of each party’s positions, and negotiate a fair and reasonable compromise that would benefit minority ratepayers and allow the utility to function properly. These commitments will strengthen the utility’s responsiveness to the concerns of minority groups, and allow them to better develop and invest in the communities that make up their customer base.</p>	<p>D.17-05-013, <i>Decision Authorizing Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s General Rate Case Revenue Requirement For 2017-2019</i>, (5/18/2017) (“Decision”).</p> <p><i>Joint Motion Of Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility Employees, Collaborative Approaches To Utility Safety Enforcement, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, And Pacific Gas And Electric Company For Adoption Of Settlement Agreement</i>, (8/3/2016).</p> <p><i>Joint Motion Of Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility Employees, Collaborative Approaches To Utility Safety Enforcement, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, And Pacific Gas And Electric Company For Admission Of Testimony And Supporting Materials Into The Evidentiary Record</i>,</p>	

<p>No parties objected to NAAC's settlement provisions, and the Commission found them to be reasonable and adopted them.</p>	<p>(8/3/2016).</p> <p><i>Joint Motion Of Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility Employees, Collaborative Approaches To Utility Safety Enforcement, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, And Pacific Gas And Electric Company To Shorten Time For Comments And Replies To The Motion For Adoption Of Settlement Agreement, (8/3/2016).</i></p> <p><i>Opening Comments On The Proposed Decision Of Administrative Law Judge Roscow Of Pacific Gas And Electric Company, The Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility Employees, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, And South San Joaquin Irrigation District Concerning The Standard For Evaluating Settlements, (3/20/2017).</i></p> <p><i>Opening Comments On The Alternate Proposed Decision Of Commissioner Picker Of Pacific Gas And Electric Company, The Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility</i></p>	
--	---	--

	<p><i>Employees, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, And South San Joaquin Irrigation District Concerning Rule 20a, RRRMA Costs And Taxes, (4/24/2017).</i></p> <p><i>Notice To Accept Alternative Terms To The August 3, 2016 Settlement Agreement Of Pacific Gas And Electric Company, The Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility Employees, Collaborative Approaches To Utility Safety Enforcement, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, And South San Joaquin Irrigation District, (5/26/2017).</i></p>	
<p>2. ME&O/Community Engagement</p> <p>NAAC recommended increased efforts to reach low-income and minority ratepayer groups through marketing, education, and outreach (ME&O), as well as to engage with leadership and advocates from among these underserved communities to better understand and address the needs of ratepayers.</p> <p>The negotiated provisions in</p>	<p>Decision at 92-94, 165-166, 190.</p> <p><i>Settlement Agreement Among Office Of Ratepayer Advocates, The Utility Reform Network, Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility, Center For Accessible Technology, Coalition Of California Utility Employees, Collaborative Approaches To Utility Safety Enforcement, Consumer Federation Of California, Environmental Defense Fund, Marin Clean Energy, Merced Irrigation District, Modesto Irrigation District, National Diversity Coalition, Small Business Utility Advocates, South San Joaquin Irrigation District, And</i></p>	

<p>the adopted settlement agreement commit greater portions of the ME&O budget of various campaigns toward underserved communities. The settlement also requires PGE to report in the next GRC on the amount of annual funding used to reach these communities.</p> <p>Further, the settlement provides for ongoing dialogue between utility leadership and community representatives on a wide range of issues, including the impact of economic circumstances, effectiveness of outreach, and reasonableness of executive compensation, through the Customer Advisory Panel bi-annual meetings and annual meetings between NDC and PGE executive leadership.</p> <p>These provisions allow NAAC and other members of NDC to provide better guidance to the utility on behalf of underrepresented ratepayers, increasing the participation of minority communities and small businesses in informing the activities of the utility.</p>	<p><i>Pacific Gas And Electric Company, (8/3/2016) (“Settlement Agreement”) at Section 3.1.5.5, 3.2.8.5, 3.2.4.9.1-2, 3.2.4.10</i></p> <p><i>National Diversity Coalition Prepared Testimony of Faith Bautista on Pacific Gas & Electric Company (U 39 M) General Rate Case, (4/29/2016) (“Exhibit NDC”) at 5-6, 10.</i></p>	
<p>3. Supplier Diversity NAAC advocated for progressive supplier diversity targets that reflect the diversity of PGE’s service territory, as well as programs to help develop the capacity of small minority businesses to better work with the utility.</p> <p>The settlement terms establish</p>	<p>Decision at 100, 167-169, 180</p> <p>Exhibit NDC at 15</p> <p>Settlement Agreement Section 3.1.6.2, 3.2.5.1.1-3. 3.2.7.3</p>	

<p>an improved supplier diversity goal of 42%, and provide funding for technical assistance and capacity building programs that focus on small minority owned businesses.</p> <p>Additionally, PGE will meet with diverse business organizations that attend the GO 156 <i>en banc</i> proceedings within 60 days following the proceedings, will seek diverse businesses for auditing, legal, and other professional services, and encourage those organizations to subcontract with smaller diverse businesses. PGE will report on their efforts in the next GRC filing and to NDC.</p> <p>The settlement provisions which NAAC developed are consistent with the intent of General Order 156 and Public Utilities Code §§ 8281-8286 to encourage the participation of underrepresented communities and business enterprises in the procurement of contracts from regulated utilities.</p>		
<p>4. Employment Diversity NAAC sought for meaningful utility goals regarding employment diversity at all levels of the workforce, including management. Employment diversity not only strengthens the utility’s ability to serve a diverse community and enhance their decision making with a variety of perspectives, it also better enables them to meet GO156 supplier diversity goals.</p>	<p>Decision at 169-171</p> <p>Exhibit NDC at 13, 15</p> <p>Settlement Agreement at Section 3.2.6.1.1-3</p>	

<p>The settlement provisions include PGE’s agreement to establish diversity hiring goals at all levels that reflect the diversity of PGE’s service territory. Goals will be established, measured, and reported in alignment with factors used by the US Dept of Labor Office of Federal Contract Compliance Program and demographics from the U.S. Census Bureau. Testimony on employment diversity efforts will be included in the next GRC filing.</p>		
<p>5. Executive Compensation NAAC raised the issue of executive compensation early in the proceeding in our Protest and PHC statements. NAAC questions whether the executive incentive compensation was properly designed to prioritize safety over financial performance, and identified a need for closer Commission evaluation and scrutiny. At the PHC, NAAC responded to questions and urged the ALJ and Assigned Commissioner to include an evaluation of the incentive compensation structure in the scope of the proceeding, particularly as it related to safety.</p> <p>The issue was affirmatively included within the scope of the proceeding, and considerable evidence and testimony was provided by</p>	<p>Decision 171-173</p> <p>Exhibit NDC at 6-9</p> <p>Settlement Agreement at Section 3.2.6.2</p> <p><i>Protest Of The National Diversity Coalition (10/2/2015) at 2-4.</i></p> <p><i>Prehearing Conference Statement Of The National Diversity Coalition, (10/23/2015) at 2.</i></p> <p><i>Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling And Scoping Memo, (12/1/2015) at 7-8</i></p>	

<p>PGE in response to data requests and ALJ requests, to allow the Commission to thoroughly review the current incentive system.</p> <p>The settlement agreement provides that PGE would have shareholders fund the portion of the short-term incentive program for executives, as well as all long-term incentive program costs. Further, NDC would have the opportunity to discuss and recommend revisions to the safety metrics during annual meetings with PGE’s leadership.</p> <p>The decision acknowledges NDC’s efforts to bring this issue to the Commission’s attention, stating that “we commend NDC in particular for raising these issues in testimony and pursuing resolution of their concerns through the settlement process.” (Decision at 172).</p>		

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?¹	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: ORA, TURN		
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: ORA and TURN are well respected and strong advocates for the interests of		

¹ 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>ratepayers generally, and as such, their positions aligned with those of NAAC on certain issues. Throughout the proceeding, NAAC made efforts to communicate and coordinate with other ratepayer advocates to avoid duplication, and jointly filed pleadings when appropriate.</p> <p>However, other ratepayer advocates do not represent the same minority communities as NAAC does. They do not have the same direct grassroots involvement in those communities, and do not give the same focus and priority to the needs of diverse communities. The arguments of other ratepayer advocates, even for the same outcomes, are not based on the same understanding and expertise gained from direct service to and input from ratepayers that NAAC brings. NAAC contributes a distinct perspective on the needs of the minority community, informed through grassroots engagement and experience, which helps inform and lend credibility to Commission decisions.</p> <p>NAAC coordinated with other intervenors who had similar positions and concerns, in order to reduce duplication of effort and argument, allowing other intervenors to speak from their experience and expertise, while presenting our unique perspective as community leaders.</p> <p>Therefore, while other parties may have had positions that were similar to NAAC, our perspectives and goals were necessarily different, and were supplemented, not duplicated, by efforts on common issues.</p>	
---	--

C. Additional Comments on Part II (use line reference # or letter as appropriate):

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

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

a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:	<u>CPUC Discussion</u>
<p>NAAC’s advocacy reflected in D.17-05-013 addressed matters relating to PG&E’s practices with regard to supplier and employment diversity, minority customer engagement/education, and executive incentive compensation. Our contributions on these issues helped to craft a decision that would support greater engagement in minority communities, achieving Commission diversity goals, and furthering economic justice.</p> <p>For the most part, NAAC cannot precisely calculate the exact monetary benefits to ratepayers from their advocacy efforts related to D.17-05-013, given the nature of the issues and the fact that the settlement provisions have yet to be fully implemented.</p>	

<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>This claim for compensation includes 383.45 total hours for NAAC attorneys and experts. NAAC submits that this is a reasonable amount of time, given the volumes of pleadings and testimony involved, the breadth of issues examined, and the encompassing nature of all-party settlement reached. These hours were devoted to thorough research, extensive negotiations, discovery, and substantive pleadings as well as procedural matters.</p> <p>The main bulk of the work was handled by Director of Legal Affairs Tadashi Gondai and General Counsel Robert Gnaizda. To reduce overall costs and duplication of efforts, Mr. Gondai took primary responsibility for the case.</p> <p>NAAC President and CEO Faith Bautista played an integral part of the case, due to her expertise in community marketing, education and outreach, and with her grassroots connections to leaders within the minority community. Through her network of contacts and involvement in direct services, she was able to draw together a diverse coalition of parties to identify and advocate for the needs and concerns of the communities that will be affected by this decision. Her expertise and input allowed the parties to develop provisions that better address the educational, financial, and social needs of low-income minority communities.</p> <p>NAAC submits that the recorded hours are reasonable, both for each attorney and expert, and in the aggregate. Appropriate reductions have been made for time spent on issues outside the scope, above average efforts spent on individual tasks, or arguments that did not contribute to the final decision. Therefore, NAAC seeks compensation for all hours recorded by our attorneys and experts as stated in this claim.</p> <p><u>Compensation Request Preparation Time:</u></p> <p>NAAC is requesting compensation for 17.25 hours devoted to the preparation of the compensation request. This number of hours is reasonable in light of the fact that this was an active and large proceeding, with a voluminous amount of materials to review, and achieving the all-party settlement required extensive logs of coordination, communication, and discussion which were reviewed.</p> <p>In order to save on costs, Mr. Gondai was solely responsible for drafting this claim. Mr. Gondai reviewed timesheets, emails, briefs, motions, filings, testimony, settlement proposals, and decisions in order to properly allocate time by issue. He also reviewed I-Comp claim procedures and decisions to determine what work could be appropriately claimed, and omit</p>	

<p>hours spent on work that was beyond the scope, did not contribute to the final decision, or exceeded normal time allotments for similar activities.</p> <p>The Commission should find that the hours claimed are reasonable.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>The attached timesheets (Attachment 2) indicate hours spent addressing separate issues identified according to the following codes:</p> <p>Preparation (PREP) – 12.22%: time and effort that was not tied to specific issues, but was nonetheless essential to effective participation, such as reviewing other party filings and discussing case strategy.</p> <p>Procedural (PROC) – 11.14%: time and effort spent addressing procedural matters, researching and advocating for proper legal standards, and preparing required filings.</p> <p>Coordination (COOR) – 0.37%: time and effort to work with other parties, reduce duplication, and coordinate the organizations involved in the proceeding as part of NDC, not including settlement discussions.</p> <p>Settlement (SETL) – 40.45%: time and effort spent negotiating, analyzing, and revising the all-party settlement, as well as supporting adoption of the settlement.</p> <p>ME&O/Community Engagement (ME&O) – 6.13%: advocacy and research on outreach to and engagement with the minority community.</p> <p>Supplier Diversity (SDIV) – 6.57%: advocacy and research on supplier diversity performance, programs, costs, and needed improvements.</p> <p>Employment Diversity (EDIV) – 4.81%: advocacy and research on appropriate goals, programs, performance, and evaluation.</p> <p>Executive Incentive Compensation (EIC) – 8.23%: advocacy and research on the metrics, costs, performance, evaluation, and needed improvements to the EIC program.</p> <p>Discovery (DISC) – 10.09%: time and effort spent on research, drafting, and review of data requests and responses.</p> <p>PREP – 12.22% PROC – 11.14% COOR – 0.37% SETL – 40.45% ME&O – 6.13% SDIV – 6.57% EDIV – 4.81% EIC – 8.23% <u>DISC – 10.09%</u> Total: 100%</p>	

--	--

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Tadashi Gondai	2015	84.40	\$225	D.16-09-031	\$18,990.00			
Tadashi Gondai	2016	138.20	\$230	D.16-09-031	\$31,786.00			
Tadashi Gondai	2017	14.65	\$230	D.16-09-031	\$3,369.50			
Robert Gnaizda	2015	50.65	\$570	D.16-09-031	\$28,870.50			
Robert Gnaizda	2016	38.60	\$575	D.16-09-031	\$22,195.00			
Robert Gnaizda	2017	6.30	\$575	D.16-09-031	\$3,622.50			
Faith Bautista	2015	25.2	\$165	D.16-09-031	\$4,158.00			
Faith Bautista	2016	24.45	\$165	D.16-09-031	\$4,034.25			
Faith Bautista	2017	1.00	\$165	D.16-09-031	\$165.00			
Subtotal: \$ 117,190.75						Subtotal: \$		
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Tadashi Gondai	2015	2.00	\$112.50	\$225/2	\$225.00			
Tadashi Gondai	2017	15.25	\$115	\$230/2	\$1,753.75			
Subtotal: \$1,978.75						Subtotal: \$		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	Printing	Printing costs for filings, as well as to review filings from other parties and the Commission			\$20.00			

TOTAL REQUEST: \$119,189.50		TOTAL AWARD: \$	
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' 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. **Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>			
ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ²	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Tadashi Gondai	Dec 3, 2010	273186	No
Robert Gnaizda	Jan. 9, 1962	32148	No

**C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III
(Intervenor completes; attachments not attached to final Decision):**

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Timesheets of NAAC Attorneys and Experts

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments (CPUC completes):

Item	Reason

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

**Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (see § 1804(c))
(CPUC completes the remainder of this form)**

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?		
If so:		
Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch> .

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	
---	--

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Intervenor [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to D. _____.
2. The requested hourly rates for Intervenor’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 \$ _____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, [satisfies/fails to satisfy] all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Intervenor is awarded \$ _____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay Intervenor the total award. [for multiple utilities: “Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay Intervenor their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional [industry type, for example, electric] revenues for the ^ 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 [date], the 75th day after the filing of Intervenor’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today’s decision [is/is not] waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.