

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**05/09/18
03:36 PM

May 9, 2018

Agenda ID #16498

**TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 14-08-013 ET AL. AND
APPLICATION 15-07-005 ET AL.:**

This is the proposed decision of ALJs Peter V. Allen and Robert M. Mason III. 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 June 21, 2018 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 this proposed decision as provided in Article 14 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), accessible on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov. Pursuant to Rule 14.3, opening comments shall not exceed 15 pages.

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 ALJs Peter Allen and Robert Mason at pva@cpuc.ca.gov and rim@cpuc.ca.gov to the Intervenor Compensation Program at **Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov** The current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE for
Anne E. Simon
Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:lil

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJS ALLEN AND MASON** (Mailed 5/9/2018)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Policies, Procedures and Rules for Development of Distribution Resources Plans Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 769.	Rulemaking 14-08-013
And Related Matters.	Application 15-07-002 Application 15-07-003 Application 15-07-006
(NOT CONSOLIDATED)	
In the Matter of the Application of PacifiCorp (U901E) Setting Forth its Distribution Resource Plan Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 769.	Application 15-07-005
And Related Matters.	Application 15-07-007 Application 15-07-008

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO
COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL FOR CONTRIBUTION
TO DECISIONS 17-09-026 AND 17-06-012**

Intervenor: Community Environmental Council	For contribution to Decision (D.) 17-09-026 and D.17-06-012
Claimed: \$89,235	Awarded: \$11,988
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJs: Peter Allen and Robert Mason III

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Rulings approving Final Distribution Resources Plan (DRP) Guidance, Decision approving Track 1 demonstration projects, and Decision approving revised Track 2 demonstration projects
--	--

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:¹

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	9/30/2015	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	None	
3. Date NOI filed:	1/13/2015, filed intentionally before PHC ² b/c no PHC date was set for some time after the proceeding opened, as discussed in 4/1/15 ALJ Ruling approving our NOI.	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
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:	R.14-08-013	A.17-01-020, et al. (consolidated docket)
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	4/1/15 ruling on NOI	The ruling of December 6, 2017 in A.17-01-020, et al. found that Community Environmental Council (Council) was eligible for intervenor compensation. It is appropriate to apply this finding to Council's participation in this proceeding. ³
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b))		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in	R.14-08-013	A.17-01-020, et al.

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

² Prehearing Conference.

³ The ruling of April 1, 2015 referred to by Council found that Council's NOI was deficient. The Ruling of December 6, 2017 was based on additional information provided by Council in support of its customer status and significant financial hardship.

proceeding number:		(consolidated docket)
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	4/1/15 ruling on NOI	The ruling of December 6, 2017 in A.17-01-020, et al. found that Council was eligible for intervenor compensation. It is appropriate to apply this finding to Council's participation in this proceeding. ⁴
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.17-09-026, D.17-06-012	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	October 6, 2017	October 6, 2017 and June 19, 2017, respectively
15. File date of compensation request:	Dec., 5, 2017	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion

⁴ The ruling of April 1, 2015 referred to by Council found that Council's NOI was deficient. The ruling of December 6, 2017 was based on additional information provided by Council in support of its customer status and significant financial hardship.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>This compensation claim includes advocacy since the start of this proceeding since there was no decision that approved the Final DRP Guidance and the Council's work was focused on Track 1 issues that weren't resolved until the most recent decision (D.17-09-026, "Track 1 Decision")</p> <p>Accordingly, this claim includes hours for the Final DRP Guidance and both Track 1 and Track 2 decisions.</p>		See discussion at Part III(C).
<p><i>Final DRP Guidance and Track 1 decision D.17-09-026</i></p>		
<p>The Council was an active participant since the start of this proceeding and the Council's attorney Hunt was involved in legislation that became the basis for the DRP proceeding even before the DRP proceeding opened. The Council advocated in this proceeding primarily for inclusion of both interconnection and procurement issues in the DRP, suggesting that both were crucial "legs of the stool" for development of DERs, along with permitting issues that are not the Commission's purview, and also for creating a dramatically streamlined interconnection process that is a key motivation for the Integration Capacity Analysis (ICA) (Dec. 12, 2014 Council Opening comments on draft DRP Guidance, pp. 3-4).</p>	<p>The Commission agreed with the Council's concerns with the initial DRP guidance and the final DRP guidance was modified to include procurement issues within scope (Final DRP Guidance, Attachment, p. 12, states that Phase 2b "will entail stakeholder-driven development of DER procurement policy and mechanisms for the IOUs.")</p> <p>The Commission also convened two large working groups addressing the two legs of the stool that the Council identified: the ICA Working Group (looking primarily at interconnection issues) and the Locational Net Benefits Analysis Working Group (looking at the value of DER for procurement and planning purposes).</p> <p>The Final DRP Guidance states (p. 3): "One integral step in this process is the need to dramatically streamline and simplify processes for interconnecting to</p>	See discussion at Part III(C).

<p>The Council’s “Click n Claim” process (Council comments on Demo A and B report, July 22 2016, p. 8 et seq.; workshop presentation on same May 23, 2016) and focus more generally on <u>automation</u> of the interconnection process has become a key part of this proceeding as it continues to implement the Final DRP Guidance.</p>	<p>the distribution grid to create a system where high penetrations of DER can be integrated seamlessly.” This mirrors the Council’s calls for a strong focus on interconnection improvements along with a focus on procurement improvements.</p> <p>The Commission did not name parties or contributions by parties in the Final DRP Guidance so we cannot cite to mentions of the Council and our advocacy in the Guidance.</p>	
<p>The Council advocated for changing the default ICA map display information back to the RAM information, because the initial ICA results were so inaccurate, as the Council learned through various data collection methods including Preapplication Reports and through discussions with the IOUs and Energy Division (Council comments on workshop report, March 3, 2016, pp. 5-7)</p>	<p>After our written comments and significant discussion between the Council and Energy Division staff, the Commission required via ruling (Assigned Commissioner Ruling, May 2, 2016, p. 14) that the IOUs make the RAM data the default data in the ICA maps because of concerns about the lack of reliability of the ICA data. The ICA maps still display the RAM data as the default because of the same concerns, which will be addressed in the final version of the ICA results to be completed in 2018.</p>	<p>See discussion at Part III(C).</p>
<p>The Council argued consistently for automation of the Fast Track interconnection process as the “end game” for the “dramatic streamlining” of interconnection procedures expressly called for in the Final DRP Guidance.</p> <p>We presented, at Energy Division’s invitation, at a Commission workshop on May 23, 2016, on our proposed “Click n Claim” automated interconnection process. This is one example of how an automated process could work. We described our proposal in detail in Council comments on Demos A and B, July 22, 2016, p. 8 et seq.</p>	<p>The Track 1 Decision adopted the ICA Working Group’s Final Report as is (App. D to the Decision) and the report included substantial recommendations advocated by the Council and accepted by consensus for the Working Group, including specifically a focus on automation of interconnection. The Final Report describes the two primary use cases of the ICA in part as follows (p. 8, emphasis added):</p> <p>“These two use cases of ICA are described in further detail below:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Informing interconnection siting decisions and facilitating an eventual <u>automated</u> and transparent interconnection process...”</p>	<p>See discussion at Part III(C).</p>

<p>The proposed Click n Claim process would allow developers who pre-registered to use the online interface to click on the appropriate circuit and line section and claim the available interconnection capacity they needed for their planned project. This new automation system is still being developing during this proceeding, but its start occurred during Phase 1 of this proceeding with the Council’s advocacy for automation.</p>	<p>The same document adds at p. 9: The ICA shall be updated frequently enough to allow for an eventual <u>automated</u> and transparent interconnection process for projects that are a proposed size below the ICA value at their point of interconnection, taking into account changes in the project queue.</p> <p>These discussions and the language of automation were added specifically due to the Council’s requested DRP changes.</p> <p>The Track 1 Decision adopts the described use cases, stating (p. 2): “The ICA use cases for online maps and interconnection streamlining, as well as for distribution planning, are adopted.”</p> <p>The Decision then sets forth a number of criteria that the utility demos must include, based on the recommendations from the ICA WG (Decision, pp. 3-4). Requirements that the Council, in comments an workshops, either advocated or supported include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IOUs must use the iterative methodology for the online maps and interconnection streamlining use cases (Council argued for this alternative rather than only the streamlined approach because the streamlined approach wouldn’t be actionable for interconnection purposes); • IOUs must update ICA maps on a monthly basis (Council advocated at least monthly updates but preferably in real time) 	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IOUs shall employ 576 hourly profiles (Council supported this alternative) • IOUs shall continue to standardize a common mapping structure and mapping functionality (Council advocated for harmonizing maps) • IOUs shall implement the ICA to achieve the online maps plus interconnection use case within nine months of the Decision (Council advocated for less than the one year proposed by IOUs) 	
<p>The Council advocated, during our participation in the ICA Working Group meetings over a number of months, for stronger language re automation in the final Working Group report, which was adopted in the Track 1 Decision.</p>	<p>The Track 1 Decision adopted the Council’s recommendations by going further than the WG’s final report in terms of achieving automation as the end goal of the “dramatic streamlining” of interconnection called for in the DRP Final Guidance. The Track 1 Decision states (pp. 28-29) that the “goal of the interconnection use case” is “to move towards an automated process that requires less manual review by engineers and would enable the ICA information displayed on the map to be the same as what is applied in the interconnection process.”</p>	<p>See discussion at Part III(C).</p>
<p><i>Track 2 Decision</i></p>		
<p>The Council was active in Track 2 in terms of promoting automation and our Click n Claim process as a potential demo project. We proposed the Click n Claim as a utility demo project in our July 22, 2016, comments on proposed demos, and in our opening comments on the Track 2 PD (Jan. 13, 2017).</p>	<p>The Commission did not adopt our recommendation to include Click n Claim as a demo project b/c it determined that the Council’s proposal was not timely. The Council nevertheless was successful in raising these issues in this forum as a prelude to the ICA Working Group and the Track 1 PD, which did adopt our recommendations with respect to including automation as a strong focus of the DRP.</p>	<p>See discussion at Part III(C).</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?⁵	Yes	Correct
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Correct
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Clean Coalition, GPI, Sierra Club, SEIA and ORA.		Correct
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: The Council was the only party advocating strongly for a dual focus on interconnection and procurement, with respect to the DRP Guidance document, and for automation of interconnection procedures with respect to Track 1 and Track 2 demos. We worked with the Clean Coalition on some policy advocacy where we had similar positions, as well as GPI, in order to ensure against duplication of efforts. In general, however, because our positions were relatively unique there was little risk of duplication of effort with other parties.		Correct

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

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness: Council consulting attorney Tam Hunt was the lead for this work, with energy expert, and Council Energy Program Director, Michael Chiacos providing support. Hunt has been lead for the Council in the DRP proceeding over the last three years, as well as many other past proceedings relating to renewable energy, electric vehicles, climate change and energy efficiency, so he has considerable experience with these issues and CPUC advocacy more generally. He billed judiciously and effectively, consulting with other parties where required or beneficial. Chiacos reviewed documents filed on the Council's behalf and otherwise added his	CPUC Discussion Claimant's statements are not relevant to the overall reasonableness analysis. They do not assist the Commission in determining how the costs of Hunt's participation bear a reasonable
--	---

⁵ 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>views and advice to filed positions.</p> <p>Mr. Hunt is a renewable energy law and policy expert with substantial experience in California, in local-energy planning and in state energy-policy development. He has worked with local governments throughout Southern California, in his current role with Community Renewable Solutions LLC, and in his previous role as Energy Program Director for the Community Environmental Council, a well-known non-profit organization based in Santa Barbara. Mr. Hunt was the lead author of the Community Environmental Council's A New Energy Direction, a blueprint for Santa Barbara County to wean itself from fossil fuels by 2030. Mr. Hunt also contributes substantially to state policy, in Sacramento at the Legislature and in San Francisco at the California Public Utilities Commission, in various proceedings related to renewable energy, energy efficiency, community-scale energy projects, and climate change policy. Mr. Hunt is also a Lecturer in Climate Change Law and Policy at UC Santa Barbara's Bren School of Environmental Science & Management (a graduate-level program). He received his law degree from the UCLA School of Law in 2001, where he was chief managing director of the Journal for International Law and Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hunt is a regular columnist at Renewable Energy World</p>	<p>relationship to the benefits realized through participation.</p> <p>Based on our own analysis, we conclude that with significant adjustments and reductions that we make in this decision, the cost of Council's participation that we authorize bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through its participation. See further discussion at Part III(C).</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>The Council made Significant Contributions to the final DRP Guidance and to both Track 1 and 2 decisions by providing Commission filings on the various topics that were under consideration in the Proceeding, and are covered by this Claim. Attachment 1 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant the Council's claim in its entirety.</p>	<p>See discussion at Part III(C).</p>
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>Most Council hours were devoted to two key issues: 1) development of the final DRP Guidance document (about 20%); 2) determining how ICA and Locational Net Benefit Analysis (LNBA) were to be used, including extensive discussions of automation of the ICA and interconnection process (about 80%).</p>	<p>See discussion at Part III(C).</p>

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Hunt	2014	13	\$370	D.15-10-014 ⁶	\$4,810	7.0	\$370	\$2,590
Hunt	2015	98.75	370	D.16-06-049	\$36,538	10.0	\$370	\$3,700
Hunt	2016	81.5	375	D.16-06-049	\$30,563	8.0	\$375	\$3,000
Hunt	2017	39	385	Res. ALJ-345	\$15,015	4.0	\$385	\$1,540
Subtotal: \$ 86,925						Subtotal: \$ 10,830		
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 \$
[Person 1]								
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Hunt	2017	12	193	Res. ALJ-345	\$2,310	6	\$193	\$1,158
Subtotal: \$2,310						Subtotal: \$1,158		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$89,235						TOTAL AWARD: \$11,988		
<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</p>								

⁶ D-15-10-014 does not adopt hourly rates for Hunt. The correct reference would be to D.16-06-049.

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

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁷	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Tam Hunt	2002	218673	No

C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
Analysis of Council’s work and claims of substantial contribution	<p>Analyzing Council’s claim, we have identified several areas of concern, which warrant reductions of the requested amount. Because of a multitude of issues with the requested amount, instead of applying a multi-tiered and piecemeal reduction for specific activities, we apply percentile reductions to the requested hours.</p> <p>Council’s request identifies the following areas to which Council asserts it made substantial contributions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development of the final DRP guidance document, and 2. Determining how ICA and LNBA were to be used, including extensive discussions of automation of the ICA and interconnection process. <p>We have analyzed Council’s statements of “substantial contribution” in Part II based on the references Council provides in support of these statements. We have determined that the large majority of Council’s participation did not result in a substantial contribution to either the Track 1 or Track 2 decisions. At the outset, the proceeding scope was clear that actual interconnection streamlining procedures (changing Rule 21 tariffs and interconnection procedures) would occur in the Rule 21 Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR), not in the DRP proceeding. Council continuously advocated its position despite awareness that it was the improper proceeding for such advocacy.</p> <p>Likewise, it was made clear through the proceeding that Council’s “Click n Claim” interconnection demonstration project was best addressed in the Rule 21 OIR and was outside of the scope of the DRP proceeding. Council nevertheless continued to advocate for this project. Further, Council’s participation in the ICA Working Group meetings primarily involved advocacy of the aforementioned topics. Any mention of an <i>eventual</i> automated ICA process in the Track 1 decision reflects the ICA working group consensus.</p> <p>Following a thorough review of Council’s comments and responses, we conclude that the vast majority of Council’s advocacy related to the aforementioned out-of-scope issues. We therefore conclude that Council’s participation on these issues did not result in a substantial</p>

⁷ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

contribution to either the Track 1 or Track 2 decision.

The timesheets for Hunt did not itemize his time to clearly show hours related specifically to the aforementioned issues in this proceeding. After further review of Council’s comments and responses filed in this proceeding, we have concluded that Council failed to provide substantial contribution to the final decisions. As such, the Commission finds 203 hours of Council’s claimed hours for Hunt as unreasonable. We have, however, credited Hunt for time spent participating in working groups and workshops, assuming that during these events, Council provided some relevant contributions to the proceeding.

We also find that spending 12 hours preparing the subject compensation claim was unreasonable. The claim has many defects (the issues in Part II do not correspond to the issues in Part III (A)(c), the reasonableness analysis in Part III(A)(a) is not adequate, and the time records include issues indicated neither in the Substantial Contribution (Part II) nor in the Allocation of Hours by Issue in Part III(A)(c)). For an experienced intervenor like Council, this is inexcusable. Similarly, for an experienced representative like Tam Hunt, spending 12 hours on the preparation of the claim reflecting the work of this representative appears excessive. More importantly, a ratio of the time spent on non-substantive matters, such as the intervenor compensation claim preparation, and the time spent on the substantive issues of the proceeding must be reasonable. We find that reducing the claimed hours spent on the intervenor compensation claim preparation by 6 hours would, at least, to some extent, address our concerns.

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))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
---	----

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No
---	----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Intervenor Community Environmental Council has made a substantial contribution to D.17-09-026 and D.17-06-012.
2. The requested hourly rates for Community Environmental Council's representative 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 \$11,988.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim for Intervenor Compensation filed by Community Environmental Council, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Community Environmental Council is awarded \$11,988.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, PacifiCorp, Liberty Utilities, and Golden State Water Company shall pay Community Environmental Council their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2016 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 9, 2018, 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 not waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1709026 and D1706012		
Proceeding(s):	R.14-08-013, A.15-07-002, A.15-07-003, A.15-07-006, and (not consolidated) A.15-07-005, A.15-07-007, A.15-07-008		
Author:	ALJs Peter Allen and Robert Mason III		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, PacifiCorp, Liberty Utilities, and Golden State Water Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Community Environmental Council	01/24/2018	\$89,235	\$11,988	No	Working on issues outside the proceeding's scope; excessive hours for the claim preparation

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Community Environmental Council	\$370	2014	\$370
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Community Environmental Council	\$370	2015	\$370
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Community Environmental Council	\$375	2016	\$375
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	Community Environmental Council	\$385	2017	\$385

(End of Appendix)