



**FILED**  
 FEB 17 2017  
 01:50 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
 COMPANY (U902E) for Approval of SB 350  
 Transportation Electrification Proposals.

Application 17-01-020

And Related Matters.

Application 17-01-021

Application 17-01-022

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES' RULING ON COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL  
 COUNCIL'S SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP**

<b>Customer (party intending to claim intervenor compensation):</b> Community Environmental Council	
<b>Assigned Commissioner:</b> Carla Peterman	<b>Administrative Law Judges:</b> Michelle Cooke, Sasha Goldberg

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**  
**(Completed by the party intending to claim intervenor compensation)**

<b>A. Status as "customer" (see Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b))<sup>1</sup></b> The party claims "customer" status because the party is (check one):	<b>Applies (check)</b>
<b>1.</b> A <b>Category 1</b> 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 the same time, the customer must represent the broader interests of at least some other customers. See, for example, D.08-07-019 at 5-10).	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>2.</b> A <b>Category 2</b> 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>3.</b> A <b>Category 3</b> 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 (§1802(b)(1)(C)). Certain environmental groups that represent residential customers with concerns for the environment may also qualify as	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

<p>Category 3 customers, even if the above requirement is not specifically met in the articles or bylaws. <i>See</i> D.98-04-059, footnote at 30.</p>	
<p><b>4. The party’s detailed explanation of the selected customer category.</b></p> <p><u>The party’s explanation of its status as a Category 3 customer.</u> If the party represents residential and small commercial customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation, it must include in the Notice of Intent either the percentage of group members that are residential ratepayers or the percentage of the members who are receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation. Supporting documentation for this customer category must include current copies of the articles of incorporation or bylaws. If current copies of the articles and bylaws have already been filed with the Commission, only a specific reference (the proceeding’s docket number and the date of filing) to such filings needs to be made.</p> <p>On May 15, 2017, Administrative Law Judge Michelle Cooke ruled that the Council had not adequately shown that it is an environmental organization eligible as a Category 3 customer. The Council’s NOI was rejected on the grounds that the Council’s Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws are not on file at the PUC, as required by the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure. Additionally, that the Council’s Bylaws were not fully conforming with §1802(b)(1)(C), and D.98-04-059. The Council was instructed to demonstrate in our bylaws that we “represent residential or small commercial utility customers or to represent the environment” as well as to clarify the issue of our membership and our funding sources.</p> <p>While the Council believes its prior bylaws allowed such conduct, and the Council has received reimbursement in numerous proceedings over the last decade (such as R.03-10-003 (community choice aggregation), R.04-04-026, R.06-02-010, R.08-08-009 (Renewable Portfolios Standard), I.05-09-005 (renewables transmission), R.06-04-010 (energy efficiency), R.08-12-009 (smart grid), R.12-03-014 (GHG compliance) and others) in an abundance of caution, the Council amended its bylaws. With this amended NOI, we file as attachments the Community Environmental Council’s newly amended Bylaws (Attachment 1). The Bylaws contain provisions authorizing the Council to represent the environmental interests of residential customers, as described in the bylaws, section 1.3.</p> <p><b>1.3 Purpose.</b> This Corporation is organized and shall be operated for charitable, scientific, and educational purposes within the meaning of Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended. The Corporation focuses primarily on environmental research, development of public policy, project implementation, and public education. The corporation also participates in regulatory and public proceedings by providing information about scientific, technical, and economic implications of public-policy options on behalf of the environmental interests of citizens, including but not limited to community-based organizations, individual utility customers, and</p>	

individual end-use consumers.

The Council has been developing creative solutions to environmental problems since 1970. It has served the people of Santa Barbara and the Central Coast for over 47 years, and is the leading non-profit environmental organization in the region. In 2004, the Council shifted its focus to energy and climate change issues. The Council is participating in this proceeding because it qualifies as a Category 3 customer, representing residential customers receiving service from investor-owned utilities AND representing residential customers with concerns for the environment. See D.98-04-059, footnote at 30. The Council is the only intervenor in this proceeding representing environmental customers from California's Central Coast region, particularly Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo counties.

The Council is participating in this proceeding because of its extensive on-the-ground and planning work with EV Readiness efforts, with unique experience among intervenors. The Council's transportation program works to reduce vehicle miles traveled and encourage a switch to zero emission vehicles. The Council is on the steering committee for Plug-in Central Coast, the official EV Readiness group for the region. This group has developed a regional EV Readiness Plan, and works with local businesses and governments to develop EV friendly policies. The Council has worked with dozens of charging station companies, businesses, governments, and other site hosts to install hundreds of charging stations throughout Ventura, Santa Barbara, and San Luis Obispo Counties. The Council also hosts multiple consumer facing EV education events annually such as Drive Electric Week and the Santa Barbara Green Car Show, which attracts 35,000 people as part of Earth Day and features dozens of EVs and a Ride and Drive. Through on-the-ground interactions with different actors of the EV ecosystem, the Council seeks to transform these lessons learned into effective policy. More information on the Council and its energy program may be found at [www.CECSB.org](http://www.CECSB.org)

Section 2 of the Council's bylaws describe members:

**2. MEMBERS.** This Corporation shall have no members within the meaning of Corporations Code Section 5056. Any action that otherwise would require a vote of members shall require only a vote of Directors, and no meeting or vote of members shall be required for any purpose. This Corporation may refer to classes or other persons or entities associated with it as "members" even though those persons or entities are not voting members, but no such reference shall constitute anyone as a member within the meaning of Corporations Code Section 5056.

While the Council has no members within the meaning of Corporations Code Section 5056, the Council has approximately 6,400 supporters, which is the number of individuals subscribing to the Council's email listserve. The Council also has 350 contributing supporters, who make donations to the annual fund. The Council's Directors and supporters are generally Southern California Edison or PG&E

customers who, by virtue of their electricity bills, have a direct interest in any energy related policy matter, such as this proceeding, that may affect the quality and type of their electric service, as well as utility EV Readiness activities planned for their service territory. The Council’s members have an interest in achieving energy independence and mitigating climate change locally, regionally and globally by switching to electric vehicles while maximizing energy efficiency and utilizing local renewable energy resources.

Pursuant to D.98-04-059, Finding of Fact 13, an intervenor must show that it will represent customer interests that would otherwise be under-represented. The Council represents environmentalists and grassroots EV owners and is the only intervenor representing the interests of residential electricity and natural gas customers in the Central Coast region of California.

The Council received no direct funding for PUC advocacy work. As requested by ALJ Cooke, below is a list of grants received over \$5,000 during the last 5 years:

Government grants:

2012, California Energy Commission - \$50,000 as a subcontractor to \$200,000 Ventura Air Pollution Control District for Central Coast Electric Vehicle Readiness Grant

2015, California Energy Commission - \$73,000 as a subcontractor to \$300,000 County of Santa Barbara for Central Coast Alternative Fuels Planning Grant

2015, California Energy Commission - \$42,000 as a subcontractor to a \$200,000 Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District Hydrogen Readiness Grant

2016, California Energy Commission - \$99,000 as a subcontractor to a \$5,000,000 Los Angeles Regional Energy Innovation Cluster Grant

<b>Foundations</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Designation</b>	<b>Close Date</b>
James S. Bower Foundation	\$50,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	1/19/2012
Johnson Ohana Charitable Foundation	\$5,000.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	4/9/2012
The Gildea Foundation	\$5,000.00	1415---SVP	4/24/2012
The Roddick Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	5/31/2012
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$40,000.00	1415---SVP	7/5/2012
Kind World Foundation	\$10,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	7/25/2012
The Gildea Foundation	\$20,000.00	1415---SVP	8/16/2012

Green Park Foundation	\$10,000.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	10/4/2012
Orfalea Foundation	\$34,000.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	10/15/2012
Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians	\$5,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	11/5/2012
Tomchin Family Charitable Fnd	\$20,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	11/13/2012
James S. Bower Foundation	\$20,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/10/2012
Outhwaite Charitable Trust	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/12/2012
The Yardi Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/13/2012
The Zannon Family Foundation	\$5,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/20/2012
WWW Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	3/5/2013
Johnson Ohana Charitable Foundation	\$5,000.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	4/8/2013
William E. Weiss Foundation, Inc.	\$9,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	5/7/2013
Dipaola Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	7/1/2013
The Roddick Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	7/18/2013
Kind World Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	8/27/2013
WWW Foundation	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	9/13/2013
Dipaola Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	10/16/2013
Tomchin Family Charitable Fnd	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	10/25/2013
Schlinger Family Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	10/25/2013
Outhwaite Charitable Trust	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/9/2013
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$5,000.00	Food Action Plan	12/10/2013
The Yardi Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/16/2013
Orfalea Foundation		Orfalea Plastics	12/31/2013

	\$11,775.00	Project	
Foodbank of Santa Barbara County	\$5,000.00	Food Action Plan	2/10/2014
The Rubin 1984 Trust	\$49,401.91	Endowment	5/28/2014
The Rubin 1984 Trust	\$9,075.31	Endowment	6/2/2014
WWW Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	6/10/2014
WWW Foundation	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	6/17/2014
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$49,280.00	Food Action Plan	9/22/2014
Lyons Family Foundation, Inc.	\$5,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	10/6/2014
Dipaola Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	10/8/2014
Dipaola Foundation	\$12,500.00	Green Gala sponsorship	10/8/2014
Outhwaite Charitable Trust	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/11/2014
The Yardi Foundation	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/12/2014
Orfalea Foundation	\$25,000.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	12/31/2014
Clifford Wright, Jr. Fund	\$5,000.00	Restricted/sponsorship	12/31/2014
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$6,000.00	Food Waste Recovery Pilot	2/2/2015
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$41,330.00	Food Action Plan	4/30/2015
WWW Foundation	\$15,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	5/28/2015
The Yardi Foundation	\$25,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	6/1/2015
James M. Cox Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	6/22/2015
WWW Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	6/23/2015
The Dehlsen Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	7/1/2015
Orfalea Foundation	\$15,000.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	9/16/2015
James S. Bower Foundation	\$12,500.00	Community Choice Energy	10/12/2015

Dipaola Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	10/15/2015		
Orfalea Foundation	\$50,000.00	Food Action Plan	10/22/2015		
Hutton Parker Foundation	\$35,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/7/2015		
The Yardi Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/21/2015		
Outhwaite Charitable Trust	\$12,500.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/31/2015		
Armand Hammer Foundation	\$5,000.00	Restricted/sponsorship	3/3/2016		
Dipaola Foundation	\$5,000.00	Restricted/sponsorship	5/23/2016		
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$20,800.00	Food Action Plan	5/23/2016		
The Roddick Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	6/13/2016		
Audacious Foundation	\$50,890.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	6/20/2016		
Dipaola Foundation	\$10,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	8/29/2016		
Kind World Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	9/27/2016		
Union Bank Foundation	\$5,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	10/24/2016		
Union Bank Foundation	\$5,000.00	Food Action Plan	10/24/2016		
Schlinger Family Foundation	\$9,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	10/27/2016		
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$19,500.00	Food Action Plan	11/21/2016		
Schlinger Family Foundation	\$10,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	11/22/2016		
Dipaola Foundation	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	12/5/2016		
Edison International	\$7,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/19/2016		
Audacious Foundation	\$19,918.00	Orfalea Plastics Project	12/19/2016		
The Yardi Foundation	\$20,000.00	Annual Fund Unrestricted	12/19/2016		
Santa Barbara Foundation	\$7,000.00	Food Action Plan	12/19/2016		
Santa Barbara		Food Action Plan	3/9/2017		

Foundation	\$54,410.00			
William E. Weiss Foundation, Inc.	\$5,000.00	Green Gala sponsorship	5/19/2017	
<b>Do you have any direct economic interest in outcomes of the proceeding?</b> <sup>2</sup>				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
If “Yes”, explain:				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>B. Conflict of Interest (§ 1802.3)</b>				<b>Check</b>
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?				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> No
<b>C. Status as an Eligible Local Government Entity (§§1802(d), 1802.4, 1803.1)</b>				
The party claims “eligible local government entity” status because the party is a city, county, or city and county that is not a publicly owned public utility that intervenes or participates in a Commission proceeding for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the residents within the entity’s jurisdiction following a catastrophic material loss suffered by its residents either in significant damage to infrastructure or loss of life and property, or both, as a direct result of public utility infrastructure.				<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
The party’s explanation of its status as an eligible local government entity must include a description of				
(1) The relevant triggering catastrophic event;				
(2) The impacts of the triggering catastrophic event on the residents within the entity’s jurisdiction as a result of public utility infrastructure; and				
(3) The entity’s reason(s) to participate in this proceeding.				
<b>D. Timely Filing of Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)(1)):</b>				
1. Is the party’s NOI filed within 30 days after a Prehearing Conference? Date of Prehearing Conference: 3/16/2017				<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2a. The party’s description of the reasons for filing its NOI at this other time: The original NOI was filed within 30 days of the Prehearing Conference. ALJ Cooke ruled on May 15, 2007 that additional information was needed, and gave the Council 21 days to file additional information. Upon the Council’s request, ALJ Wong extended the time for filing to 60 days.				

<sup>2</sup> See Rule 17.1(e).



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: Per email on May 23, 2017, from Icompcordinator Maria Vengerova “With the permission of the assigned Administrative Law Judge John Wong, an amended NOI may be filed by July 21, 2017.”

**PART II: SCOPE OF ANTICIPATED PARTICIPATION  
(To be completed by the party intending to claim intervenor compensation)**

<b>A. Planned Participation (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)):</b>				
The party’s statement of the issues on which it plans to participate:				
The Council has been an active participant in proceedings regarding Community Choice, Renewables, Energy Efficiency, Smart Grid, GHG Compliance, and others. We expect to actively participate in the SB 350 transportation electrification applications by using our on-the-ground EV readiness experience, particularly in program design for deployment of EVSE, integration of renewable energy into transportation electrification, rate design and impacts to consumers, analysis of greenhouse-gas impacts, and consumer and fleet facing education and outreach programs.				
The party’s explanation of how it plans to avoid duplication of effort with other parties:				
As an environmental non-profit that leads EV Readiness efforts, the Council represents grassroots electric vehicle drivers, and has a unique consumer advocacy perspective from our work with governments and businesses. The Council has been working with the Green Power Institute to coordinate activities and comments in this proceeding (as we have in R.13-11-007 for a number of years), and will work with other parties who represent similar interests. The Council will also utilize the same attorney as Green Power Institute (Tam Hunt), which will reduce total hours needed.				
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).				
The Council expects to file briefs, prepare comments and testimony, will participate in hearings, workshops, and meetings as necessary.				
<b>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)):</b>				
Item	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	#
<b>ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES</b>				
Tam Hunt	150	375	\$56,250	
Michael Chiacos	150	230	\$34,500	
<i>Subtotal: \$ 90,750</i>				
<b>OTHER FEES</b>				
<i>Subtotal: \$</i>				

<b>COSTS</b>			
Office and Misc Expenses			\$150
Travel			\$1,200
			<i>Subtotal: \$1,350</i>
			<b><i>TOTAL ESTIMATE: \$92,100</i></b>
<p><b>Estimated Budget by Issues:</b>                      The Council will focus on program design for deployment of EVSE, integration of renewable energy into transportation electrification, policy issues, rate design and impacts to consumers, and consumer and fleet facing education and outreach programs.</p> <p><b>Estimated Budget:</b>                      EVSE Infrastructure Program Design: 30%                      Policy and Rate Issues: 30%                      EV adoption/Marketing and Outreach Issues: 30%                      General Preparation: 10%</p>			

**PART III: SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP**  
**(To be completed by party intending to claim intervenor compensation;**  
**see Instructions for options for providing this information)**

<b>A. The party claims that participation or intervention in this proceeding without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship, on the following basis:</b>	<b>Applies (check)</b>
1. The 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(h))	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. In 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(h))	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. The eligible local government entities’ participation or intervention without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship. (§ 1803.1(b).)	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. A § 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b) 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)).	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Commission has not made such a finding in the last year.	
<p><b>B. The party’s explanation of the factual basis for its claim of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)) (necessary documentation, if warranted, is attached to the NOI:</b></p> <p>Section 1802’s rebuttable presumption does not apply to the Council’s showing of significant financial hardship because it has been more than a year since such a finding was made (it has been made previously many times). The Council is a 501(c)(3) non-profit with no specific funding for policy advocacy, as shown in the list of grants above. As such, the Council’s continued participation in Commission proceedings requires intervenor compensation.</p>	

Council supporters do not have a significant economic interest in this proceeding; they are concerned environmentalists who want the utilities to pursue investments that lead to greater adoption of electric vehicles, informed by the Council’s on the ground experience with EV Readiness activities. Council supporter’s economic interest in this proceeding is limited to a small economic interest as ratepayers. The average utility bill paid by a Council supporter is miniscule compared to the cost of effectively representing the supporter’s environmental interests in this proceeding.

The Council’s participation over the last decade has been steady and prudent and we have repeatedly demonstrated that our contributions have been substantial and warrant the compensation we have received.

The Council believes that the attached documents and additional information submitted in this amended NOI correct the deficiencies noted in the May 15, 2017 rejection of our NOI. We request a swift response from the Commission so that we know where we may stand in this proceeding.

### ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING

<p><b>1. The Amended Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (Amended NOI) filed by Community Environmental Council (CEC) has demonstrated the party’s status as a “customer” for the following reason(s):</b></p> <p>CEC filed its original NOI on April 14, 2017, claiming eligibility for intervenor compensation as a “Category 3” customer, pursuant to Sec. 1802(b)(1)(C). A ruling of May 15, 2017 rejected the NOI and requested information in support of CEC’s customer status and significant financial hardship. On June 29, 2017, CEC filed the Amended NOI, responding to the ruling. The amended NOI provides a copy of CEC’s bylaws, amended and restated as of June 19, 2017. The bylaws authorize CEC to participate “in regulatory and public proceedings by providing information about scientific, technical, and economic implications of public-policy options on behalf of the environmental interests of citizens, including but not limited to community-based organizations, individual utility customers, and individual end-use consumers.”<sup>3</sup> Based on the bylaws and information supplied by the Amended NOI, this ruling finds that the amended NOI has demonstrated CEC’s status pursuant to Sec. 1802(b)(1)(C) as an organization authorized by its bylaws to represent environmental concerns of residential customers.<sup>4</sup></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2. The NOI has demonstrated significant financial hardship for the reasons set forth in Part III of the NOI (above).</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>3. The Administrative Law Judge provides the following additional guidance</b></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

<sup>3</sup> Section 1.3 of CEC’s bylaws attached to the Amended NOI at 1.

<sup>4</sup> D.98-04-059 at 30 explains that certain environmental groups are eligible pursuant to Sec. 1802(b)(1)(C).

<p><b>(see § 1804(b)(2)):</b></p> <p>CEC’s original NOI of April 14, 2017 estimates the budget at \$45,525, with 150 hours of work allocated among two CEC’s representatives. The Amended NOI filed only two and a half months later doubles the hours for two representatives and more than doubles the projected budget, with no explanation. While the future claim’s amount in the NOI is an estimate, the ruling warns CEC that the Commission scrutinizes intervenor’s compensation claims and disallows fees and costs determined by the Commission to be unnecessary and unreasonable.</p>	
--	--

**IT IS RULED that:**

<p>1. Community Environmental Council has satisfied the eligibility requirements of Public Utilities Code § 1804(a).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>2. Community Environmental Council has shown significant financial hardship.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. Community Environmental Council is preliminarily determined to be eligible for intervenor compensation in this proceeding. However, a finding of significant financial hardship in no way ensures compensation.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4. Additional guidance is provided to Community Environmental Council as set forth above.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Dated December 6, 2017, at San Francisco, California.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 /s/ MICHELLE COOKE  
 Michelle Cooke  
 Administrative Law Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
 /s/ SASHA GOLDBERG  
 Sasha Goldberg  
 Administrative Law Judge