

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-329**FILED**09/09/19
03:05 PM

September 9, 2019

Agenda ID #17730
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 07-01-031 et al.:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Hallie Yacknin. 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 October 10, 2019 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 ALJ Yacknin at HSY@cpuc.ca.gov and 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/ ANNE E. SIMON_____

Anne E. Simon
Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:avs

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ YACKNIN (Mailed 9/9/2019)****BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (U338E) for a Permit to Construct Electrical Facilities with Voltages between 50kV and 200 kV: Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission Line Project.	Application 07-01-031
And Related Matters.	Application 07-04-028 Application 09-09-022

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
FOR CONTRIBUTION TO D.18-08-026**

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 18-08-026
Claimed: \$366,280.57	Awarded: \$351,955.30
Assigned Commissioner: Martha Guzman Aceves	Assigned ALJ: Hallie Yacknin

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	In D.18-08-026, the Commission addressed two projects proposed by Southern California Edison Company (SCE), the Valley-Ivyglen 115 kV Subtransmission Line Project (Valley-Ivyglen Project) and the Alberhill System Project (Alberhill Project). The Commission granted SCE's petition to modify the permit to construct the Valley-Ivyglen Project and declined to take action on SCE's request for a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the Alberhill Project. The Commission kept open A.09-09-022 to provide a forum for considering additional evidence related to whether a CPCN should issue for the Alberhill Project. To that end, the Commission directed SCE to supplement the record in this proceeding with additional analyses (1) to allow the Commission to better determine whether it is likely that local peak demand in the Valley South system will exceed its capacity as soon as SCE predicts, and (2) to evaluate the costs and benefits of alternatives for enhancing reliability and providing additional capacity.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	June 5, 2017	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	June 26, 2017	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:	See Comment Below for Rows 5-6	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	See Comment Below for Rows 5-6	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	

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

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 proceeding number:	See Comment Below for Rows 9-10	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	See Comment Below for Rows 9-10	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.18-08-026	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	Aug. 31, 2018	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	Oct. 30, 2018	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
Rows 5-6	The Commission issued a finding of significant financial hardship within one year prior to the commencement of this proceeding in September 2009; within one year of the more recent “re-commencement” of this proceeding with the issuance of the April 28, 2016 <i>Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Giving Notice of Anticipated Issues and Schedule for Prehearing Conference</i> ; and within one year of the issuance of the April 26, 2017 <i>Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Setting Joint Prehearing Conference</i> . Given the unusual procedural posture of this proceeding, TURN provided information about all three findings of significant hardship in our NOI filed in this proceeding to ensure that the Commission has ample information to find that the	Verified

<p>rebuttable presumption applies here. TURN repeats this information here.</p> <p>Finding of Significant Financial Hardship tied to the Commencement of A.09-09-022:</p> <p>Commission’s finding of significant financial hardship made in proceeding number: <u>A.08-05-023</u></p> <p>Date of Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling (or CPUC Decision) in which the finding of significant financial hardship was made: <u>April 22, 2009</u></p> <p>Finding of Significant Financial Hardship tied to the April 28, 2016 ALJ Ruling:</p> <p>Commission’s finding of significant financial hardship made in proceeding number: <u>A.15-03-005</u></p> <p>Date of Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling (or CPUC Decision) in which the finding of significant financial hardship was made: <u>August 6, 2015</u></p> <p>Finding of Significant Financial Hardship tied to the April 26, 2017 ALJ Ruling:</p> <p>Commission’s finding of significant financial hardship made in proceeding number: <u>A.16-08-006</u></p> <p>Date of Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling (or CPUC Decision) in which the finding of significant financial hardship was made: <u>Nov. 28, 2016</u></p>	
--	--

<p>finding of fact on this point. The Commission also considered “SCE’s track record in forecasting local peak demand” in determining that it should take no action on Alberhill at this time.</p>		
<p>2. SCE’s Successive Forecasts of Load Growth Rates</p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission’s finding that “SCE’s successive forecasts have predicted decreasing rates of load growth, with its most recent forecast predicting load growth of 0.89 percent per year from 2017 to 2026, and have pushed out the projected need for the Alberhill project from 2011 to 2021.”</p> <p>TURN compared SCE’s forecast for 2011, provided in 2009, with five vintages of SCE’s multiyear 1-in-5 forecasts for Valley South, prepared from 2011-2017, to show the steady decline in projected load growth rates. TURN also evaluated SCE’s claims regarding historic load growth rates from 2004-2017. TURN showed that the rate of growth has declined significantly over time to SCE’s current growth rate projection of 0.89% per year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Finding of Fact 21 • Ex. TURN-1, p. 20, Figure 6 (as updated by Ex. TURN-9) • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 9, 22-25 • D.18-08-026, p. 31 (citing Ex. TURN-1) 	<p>Verified</p>

<p>3. CAISO’s Declining Demand Forecast</p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission’s finding that the “CAISO predicts declining electric demand for its transmission planning area which includes the Valley South system” and the Commission’s consideration of this factor in determining what to do about Alberhill.</p> <p>TURN explained the differences between SCE’s “bottom-up” forecasting method and CAISO’s “top down” forecasting method. TURN demonstrated that, had SCE used a load forecast consistent with the CEC IEPR top-down forecast and consistent with the load forecasting practices utilized on the CAISO controlled grid, there would be no forecasted capacity deficiency on the Valley South 500/115 kV transformers through 2026 because the CAISO’s forecast shows declining electric demand.</p> <p>TURN recommended that the Commission consider the CAISO’s much lower forecast for Valley South in its assessment of the need for Alberhill. TURN pointed out that, while CAISO’s forecast has tended to be high (like SCE’s), it has been more closely aligned with SCE’s recorded load. TURN showed that the shifting of the peak load to later in the day did not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Finding of Fact 22 • Ex. TURN-1, pp. 6-7, 9-17 and Appendix A • Ex. TURN-6 • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 13-22, 25-28 • TURN Reply Brief, pp. 6-8 • D.18-08-026, p. 31 (“Considering SCE’s point that the CAISO’s and SCE’s forecasts are not directly comparable without adjustment, we note that the CAISO predicts declining electric demand at the Valley South system.”) (citing Ex. TURN-6) • D.18-08-026, p. 32 (“... Taken together with SCE’s track record in forecasting local peak demand, these factors lead us to request SCE to supplement the record with additional analyses to better determine whether it is likely that local peak demand in the Valley South system will exceed its capacity as soon as SCE predicts.”) 	<p>Noted. Decision rejects use of CAISO forecast as demonstrating whether VS electrical demand will exceed transformer operating limits. See D.18-08-026 at 29. We reduce by 10% TURN’s hours related to activities it categorized as “Need.”</p>
--	--	---

<p>4. Impact of Distributed Energy Resources on Need for Alberhill</p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission’s finding that “energy storage is expected to have a downward impact on peak demand that increases as the technology continues to develop,” and its requirement that SCE submit a load forecast including industry accepted methods for estimating load growth and incorporating load reduction programs due to energy efficiency, demand response, and behind-the-meter generation.</p> <p>TURN demonstrated that state policies and initiatives currently being executed can be expected to exert more downward pressure on demand in the Valley South area than recognized by SCE’s load forecast. TURN pointed to new mandates regarding Energy Efficiency and increasing EE goals over the next 5 years; future, reliable gains expected from Demand Response; and the Commission’s commitment to increasing future distributed energy resource (DER) penetration (including distributed renewable generation resources, energy storage, EE, and demand response), and optimization of DER to capture T&D avoided costs. As TURN also explained, the Commission’s IRP process signifies that future transmission planning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Finding of Fact 23 • D.18-08-026, pp. 33-34 and Ordering Paragraph 4 • Ex. TURN-1, pp. 7-9 • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 35-41 • TURN Comments on the PD, pp. 5-6 	<p>Verified</p>
--	--	-----------------

<p>will reflect tighter integration of traditional generating resources, preferred resources (such as Demand Response, Energy Efficiency, Energy Storage, etc.) and transmission planning.</p> <p>In comments on the Proposed Decision, TURN argued that the PD – which only acknowledged the reasonably anticipated downward impact of energy storage on electricity peak demand – should be modified to also recognize the impacts of other DER on reduced load in the Valley South area. The Commission’s final decision does so by requiring a new load forecast that incorporates load reduction programs due to energy efficiency, demand response, and behind-the-meter generation.</p>		
<p>5. Potential Reliability and Operational Flexibility Benefits</p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission’s finding that the “Alberhill project’s reliability and operational flexibility benefits are not overriding considerations meriting project approval at this time. “</p> <p>TURN established that SCE had not performed incremental reliability benefit analysis associated with Alberhill. TURN also demonstrated that the only “subpar system performance issue” SCE could identify that Alberhill would</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Finding of Fact 26 • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 33-34 • TURN Reply Brief, pp. 14-16 • D.18-08-026, p. 32 (citing TURN’s cross-examination of SCE’s witness McCabe at RT 159-160) • D.18-08-026, pp. 33-34 and Ordering Paragraph 4. 	<p>Verified</p>

<p>address was the lack of cross ties between 115kV lines in the Valley South system. Yet, as TURN showed, SCE could build cross ties to address operational flexibility and reliability without Alberhill. TURN also demonstrated that the Valley South electric demand is lightly loaded (below 50% of its peak value) approximately 90% of the year, which calls into question why it cannot continue to manage its system to support construction and maintenance activities.</p> <p>The Commission relied on TURN’s showing in concluding that, while the Alberhill project could provide reliability and operational benefits, those benefits “might be achievable through a project of a different scope.”</p> <p>Because of this, the Commission directed SCE to supplement the record with additional evidence related to the reliability benefits associated with Alberhill, including existing customer service level, causes of outages in the Valley South systems compared to other subtransmission radial systems, the forecasted impact of Alberhill on reliability performance, and a cost/benefit analysis of “several alternatives” for enhancing reliability.</p>		<p>Noted</p>
---	--	--------------

<p>6. Potential Benefits Associated with the Lake Elsinore Advanced Pumped Storage (LEAPS) Project</p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission’s finding that the “Alberhill project’s ability to enable the possible LEAPS project to interconnect to SCE’s system is not an overriding consideration meriting approval of the Alberhill project.”</p> <p>TURN demonstrated that there is no reason to believe, at this time, that LEAPS will be permitted and constructed. TURN explained that CAISO found the Talega-Escondido/Valley–Serrano (TE/VS) Transmission Project, which would interconnect LEAPS to SCE’s system, to be unnecessary for reliability in its 2014-2015 Transmission Plan. TURN showed that the Commission has twice denied Nevada Hydro’s applications for a CPCN for TE/VS, and has no open docket to reconsider TE/VS at this time. Further, TURN showed that FERC denied Nevada Hydro’s application for LEAPS in 2011. While Nevada Hydro refiled its NOI in June 2017, it has no financing plan for the \$2 billion project.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with TURN’s assessment of the likelihood of interconnecting the LEAPs project to SCE’s system, finding no basis in the record to find that ability to</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Finding of Fact 27 • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 45-46 • D.18-08-026, pp. 32-33 	<p>Verified</p>
---	--	-----------------

<p>Commission took “note of the Alberhill cost of \$464 million <i>or more</i>” in considering the “uncertain and relatively modest need for the Alberhill project” as weighed “against its certain significant and unavoidable impacts on aesthetics.” This is consistent with TURN’s urging that the Commission consider cost in determining what action to take on Alberhill.</p>		
<p>8. No Action Should Be Taken on Alberhill CPCN At This Time</p> <p>TURN contributed to the Commission’s conclusion that a CPCN should not be granted for Alberhill at this time.</p> <p>Regarding the capacity need asserted by SCE, the Commission explained the factors that led to this conclusion, as follows:</p> <p>“Indeed, while SCE predicted in its application that Valley South peak demand would exceed its capacity by 2011, its successive forecasts have predicted decreasing rates of load growth, with its most recent forecast now predicting load growth of 0.89 percent per year from 2017 to 2026, and pushing out the now relatively modest projected need for the Alberhill project to 2021. Considering SCE’s point that the CAISO’s and SCE’s forecasts are not directly comparable without</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Conclusion of Law 4 (“No action should be taken, at this time, regarding the application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity to construct the Alberhill project.”) • D.18-08-026, pp. 31-32 (citing to Ex. TURN-1 and Ex. TURN-6) • D.18-08-026, Findings of Fact 24 and 25 • See TURN contributions to issues #1 - #4 above (TURN does not repeat all of those citations here) 	<p>Verified</p>

<p>adjustment, we note that the CAISO predicts declining electric demand at the Valley South system. Also considering SCE’s point that there are few examples of energy storage to demonstrate what its impact will be, there is no reason to expect it to have other than a downward impact on peak demand that increases as the technology continues to develop. Taken together with SCE’s track record in forecasting local peak demand, these factors lead us to request SCE to supplement the record with additional analyses to better determine whether it is likely that local peak demand in the Valley South system will exceed its capacity as soon as SCE predicts.”</p> <p>TURN provided evidence related to each of these factors, as demonstrated above in the discussion of TURN’s substantial contributions #1-4. TURN’s showing contributed to the Commission’s findings that “[i]t is uncertain whether the Alberhill project will be needed in the near or foreseeable future,” and that “the uncertain and relatively modest projected need for the Alberhill project is not an overriding consideration meriting project approval at this time.”</p>		
<p>9. Alternatives to Alberhill TURN contributed to the Commission’s determination</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-08-026, Ordering Paragraph 4 (ordering SCE to supplement the record with an alternatives analysis for Valley 	<p>Verified</p>

<p>that it should order SCE to supplement the record “with additional analyses of alternatives which may satisfy the needs of the Valley South system,” including reliability and capacity needs that might be justified by SCE’s supplemental showing on both types of need. The Commission ordered, “The new information should comprehensively present the business case justifying the project, cost/benefit analysis of the scope of alternatives considered, and forecasted improvements in service reliability performance that the proposed project would impact.”</p> <p>TURN argued that SCE failed to perform a cost-effectiveness analysis of Alberhill and demonstrate the financial impact of the project on ratepayers, as required by Pub. Util. Code Section 1003(d). TURN urged that this analysis must include cost-effective alternatives to Alberhill that could serve capacity needs in the Valley South area, consistent with Section 1002.3, which requires the Commission to “consider cost-effective alternatives to transmission facilities that meet the need for an efficient, reliable and affordable supply of electricity.”</p> <p>TURN explained that the alternatives analysis in the EIR was distinguishable from this requirement because of its</p>	<p>South system capacity and reliability need)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TURN Opening Brief, pp. 11-13, 31, 34 • TURN Motion for Reconsideration of the Ruling Striking Testimony • TURN Reply Brief, pp. 10, 14-16, 26-27 	<p>Noted</p>
--	--	--------------

<p>distinct purpose. As TURN pointed out, CEQA does not require an EIR to consider a project’s relative economic costs or benefits in its environmental impact analysis, and the responses to comments contained in the FEIR confirm that the Commission shares this view. For this reason, TURN argued that the Commission should admit TURN’s testimony on alternatives to Alberhill that would more cost-effectively meet the project objective of relieving growth in Valley South system electrical demand. This testimony had been stricken by ALJ Ruling.</p> <p>While the Commission upheld the ALJ’s ruling striking the testimony of TURN and other intervenors on alternatives (D.18-08-026 at pp. 36-37), the Commission also ordered SCE to make a supplemental showing so that alternatives for meeting any demonstrated capacity and reliability needs in the Valley South system can be considered by the Commission. The Commission ordered SCE to provide the following analysis (among many other specific analyses):</p> <p>“Cost/benefit analysis of several alternatives for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancing reliability • providing additional capacity including evaluation of energy storage, distributed energy resources, 		<p>Verified</p>
--	--	-----------------

<p>demand response or smart-grid solutions”</p> <p>TURN, as well as other intervenors to varying extents, had urged consideration of nonwires alternatives (including energy storage, EE, demand response, other DERs), as well as alternative infrastructure options, such as building cross-ties between Valley South and other electrical systems for reliability, or adding another transformer to the Valley South substation for capacity.</p> <p>TURN understands that the range of the “several alternatives” that will be considered for meeting the capacity and reliability need in Valley South (if established by the other analyses SCE is now required to provide) is yet to be determined. Even so, because of TURN’s efforts, at least in part, the Commission will eventually have this expanded record upon which to consider the appropriateness of granting a CPCN for the Alberhill project, as urged by TURN and others.</p>		
---	--	--

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?²	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Forest Residents Opposing New Transmission Lines (FRONTLINES)		Verified
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Given our overlapping interests, TURN began coordinating with the Public Advocates Office (then called the Office of Ratepayer Advocates or ORA) as soon as TURN decided to intervene in this proceeding. This early coordination informed the issues TURN emphasized in our testimony and subsequent pleadings. TURN also began coordinating with FRONTLINES to minimize potential overlap in issue coverage and to ensure that where such overlap occurred, each party is presenting a unique analysis. The Public Advocates Office provided very brief testimony in this proceeding on the unreliability of SCE’s load forecast (2.5 pages), pointing to recorded load levels, forecasted development of Distributed Energy Resources (DER), and the CAISO’s forecast. The Public Advocates Office devoted the majority of pages in its testimony (8 pages) to recommending cost-effective alternatives to the Alberhill project and smaller projects that would avoid construction of unnecessary elements. TURN, in contrast, provided much more extensive testimony regarding the unreliability of SCE’s load forecast, given past performance and its forecast methodology. First of all, TURN provided evidence that SCE has updated its own load forecast and no longer predicts a need for the Alberhill project in 2019, as assumed in Appendix K of the Final EIR; rather, it anticipates that need in 2021. TURN further described and compared SCE’s “bottom-up” forecast methodology to CAISO’s “top-down” forecast methodology, used for transmission planning to serve the Valley South system (and beyond), and also used to plan most of the subtransmission facilities of PG&E and SDG&E. TURN provided evidence of negative projected load growth in the LA Basin	Noted. We note both TURN and FRONTLINES provided extensive testimonies regarding Alberhill’s scoping Issues. In an attempt to avoid duplication, some arguments inadvertently overlapped, however, parties performed conceptually different analysis to support their position thus parties’ participation materially, supplemented and complemented each other’s testimonies. <i>See</i> Pub. Util. Code § 1802(5).	

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

(of which Valley South is a part) when viewed from a top-down perspective. TURN provided evidence that the peak demand forecasts for Valley South at the 1-in-10 level of “heat storm” severity, as utilized for the CAISO’s TPP, have been significantly lower than SCE’s 1-in-5 forecasts and have tended to be closer to peak demands that actually materialize. TURN demonstrated that shifting of the peak load to later in the day did not significantly support SCE’s argument that the noncoincident peak for Valley South was significantly different than the coincident system peak. TURN also presented evidence that SCE’s Valley system is currently below 50% of its peak value approximately 90% of the year, rebutting SCE’s assertion that the system is very heavily loaded. All of this evidence helped to demonstrate that it is reasonable for the Commission to consider CAISO’s forecast in assessing need for Alberhill, despite SCE’s objections. TURN also provided more extensive evidence of SCE’s failure to reasonably account for future load reduction measures in its load forecast, including state laws impacting DER and integrated resource planning, and Commission programs and initiatives affecting energy efficiency, demand response, energy storage, among other DER, which support CAISO’s prediction of load reduction in the Valley South electrical needs area.

Like TURN, FRONTLINES also offered more extensive testimony than the Public Advocates Office. But TURN’s showing and that of FRONTLINES focused on different aspects of the need – or lack thereof – for the Alberhill project. For example, both parties pointed to SCE’s over-predictive forecast methodology, which gives inadequate weight to demand-reducing efforts, as compared to the CAISO’s method. But TURN uniquely focused on the differences in CAISO’s and SCE’s methodologies (as explained above). TURN also provided different evidence of load reduction measures than offered by FRONTLINES, such as state laws and Commission policies and programs, that support the CAISO’s prediction of load reduction in the Valley South electric needs area.

TURN notes that FRONTLINES has provided an extensive demonstration of the complementary nature of its showing and TURN’s, as well as our efforts to coordinate and minimize duplication throughout this proceeding, in its request for compensation filed yesterday (at pp. 19-20 and in the comment box commencing at the bottom of page 21 and continuing to page 22). TURN refers to FRONTLINES’ characterization of both intervenors’ success at avoiding undue duplication, should the Commission need additional demonstration of the complementary nature of our respective work in this proceeding.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>TURN’s request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$366,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in this proceeding. The requested compensation is a very small fraction of the savings to ratepayers directly attributed to TURN’s work, at least for the time being. Had the Commission granted SCE’s request for a CPCN for the Alberhill project, ratepayers would face costs of <i>at least</i> \$464 million (SCE’s very preliminary estimate of project costs). Including the contingency added by SCE, corporate overhead, and cost of financing brings SCE’s estimated to \$575 million. SCE also indicated its expectation that the actual cost of the project would be much higher.</p> <p>TURN recognizes that the Commission may at some point in the future determine that there is a capacity and/or reliability need in the Valley South system that should be relieved by some investment – whether the Alberhill project or a more cost-effective alternative. The supplemental record required by D.18-08-026 will inform this analysis. However, at this time, TURN submits that the only known outcome is that the Commission has not approved the Alberhill CPCN. Thus, at this time, ratepayers have been protected from paying for a major infrastructure project that SCE has yet to demonstrate would serve a present or future public convenience and necessity.</p> <p>Given the scope and quality of TURN’s work, and the benefits achieved through TURN’s participation in the proceeding, TURN submits that the amount requested is reasonable.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>TURN seeks compensation for approximately 1,150 hours of time devoted to this proceeding by our staff attorneys and outside consultants who provided legal and technical services. In the sections that follow, TURN describes the contributions of all members of our team and why the Commission should find that the hours incurred were reasonable in light of our substantial contribution described in Section II above.</p> <p>1. TURN Attorneys</p> <p>TURN Legal Director Thomas Long initially took responsibility for this proceeding, including retaining outside counsel Joseph Como and expert consultants at Flynn Resource Consultants Inc. (Flynn RCI). TURN’s request for compensation includes approximately 10 hours of Mr. Long’s time.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

In mid-April 2017, Mr. Long handed this proceeding over to TURN Staff Attorney Hayley Goodson. Ms. Goodson served as TURN's in-house attorney for the remainder of the proceeding. Ms. Goodson played a much smaller role than is typical for TURN's attorneys, thanks to outside counsel Joseph Como, who served as TURN's lead attorney in this proceeding. TURN's timesheets include fewer than 90 hours of Ms. Goodson's time, excluding time devoted to intervenor compensation matters. Ms. Goodson's activities generally included communications with Mr. Como about strategic and substantive issues, close review of pleadings prepared by Mr. Como and testimony prepared by TURN's outside consultants, and limited drafting of pleadings or sections thereof (among other activities like reviewing and executing nondisclosure agreements on behalf of TURN).

2. Outside Counsel

Law Office of Joseph P. Como

TURN retained Joseph Como in April 2017 to serve as TURN's lead attorney in this proceeding. Mr. Como was an obvious choice, given his extensive experience with energy utility regulatory and technical engineering issues, including experience with transmission planning (which has not been an area of focus for TURN). Mr. Como handled nearly 100% of the communications with TURN's expert consultants, Flynn RCI, with the applicant SCE, and with other intervenors. He oversaw the preparation of TURN's testimony by Flynn RCI, took the lead on drafting all pleadings for TURN (with one limited exception), participated in evidentiary hearings and conducted all cross-examination for TURN, represented TURN in ex parte meetings with Commissioner advisors, and represented TURN during the oral argument held by the Commission in this proceeding. His timesheets reflect his leadership role and include approximately 265 hours of work in 2017 and 2018.

Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger

TURN retained the law firm of Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger (SMW) in November 2017 to provide legal services related to the role of alternatives analysis in the EIR process and the CPCN process. SMW is a law firm specializing in government, land use, renewable energy, and environmental law that has presented other clients in CPCN proceedings before the Commission. SMW attorneys Ellison Folk, Edward Schexnayder, and Aaron Stanton provided counsel to TURN and assistance with drafting portions of TURN's opening brief related to CEQA and alternatives analysis. This compensation request includes approximately 34 hours of time spent by SMW's attorneys on this effort.

3. Expert Consultants

Flynn Resource Consultants Inc.

TURN retained the expert consulting services of Flynn Resource Consultants Inc. (Flynn RCI) in this proceeding. After an initial case planning meeting between Principals Barry Flynn and Doug Boccignone, Flynn RCI assembled a team of 5

consultants to work on the Alberhill CPCN project for TURN, each of whom brought unique training and experience to the project and played a unique role. The Flynn RCI team included the following members, whose roles are indicated below:

1. **Barry Flynn** – MSEE/BSEE- Principal- former Utility Director of Municipal Utility: Manage project by making sure the appropriate resources are applied to the effort, taking into account FlynnRCI employee capabilities.
2. **Robert Jenkins** - ME/BSEE- Managing Consultant- former Manager of Transmission Planning for a California investor-owned utility: Provide expert witness services by assimilating results of the research and findings of other team members. Primary FlynnRCI contact for co-operation with assigned Counsel. Provide expertise on transmission planning practices and standards.
3. **Pushkar Wagle** - PHD/MA Economics BS Mathematics- Senior Consultant: Primary expert with respect to the impact of preferred resources and storage on the need for the project. Utilize the RESOLVE model to help provide those insights.
4. **Keith White** - PHD Ecology, MA Engineering & Applied Physics-Senior Consultant: Research and document factors affecting the demand forecast for the area served by Alberhill. Compare and contrast alternative forecasts of CAISO load. Contact CEC Staff about the CEC forecast assumptions for the SCE system load and the Alberhill portion of the load.
5. **Alexey Orkin** - BSEE-Consultant- Transmission Planning and Operations for East Coast investor-owned utility: Research assumptions in CAISO base cases and evaluate CAISO findings for the reliability needs for the Alberhill area. Compare and contrast findings with other areas of the SCE system.

As is their usual practice, the Flynn RCI team worked closely with one another to ensure a comprehensive and accurate analysis of the need for the Alberhill project. Their timesheets reflect this close coordination.

The Flynn RCI team assisted TURN with discovery; prepared expert testimony; provided expert support during evidentiary hearings and briefing; and assisted TURN in analyzing and preparing comments and reply comments on the Proposed Decision and Alternate Proposed Decision.

4. Intervenor Compensation-Related Time

TURN is requesting compensation for 21.25 hours of intervenor compensation-related efforts, primarily consisting of 20 hours associated with preparation of this request for compensation by TURN attorney Hayley Goodson. TURN recognizes that this number of hours is larger than we usually claim for preparing a request for compensation. However, this request was unique in that it required preparation of showings supporting new hourly rates for 10 outside attorneys and experts retained by TURN in this proceeding, and for multiple time periods for

many of them. See Section III.C, Comments 1, 2, and 3. The time claimed by TURN reflects a fraction of the time TURN actually devoted to preparation of this request for compensation because of this time-consuming task.			
c. Allocation of hours by issue:			
TURN has allocated all of our attorney and consultant time by issue area or activity, as is evident on our attached timesheets (Attachments 2 and 3) and in Attachment 5, which shows the allocation of TURN's time included in this request by attorney or expert and issue / activity area. The following codes relate to specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN.			
Code	Description	Allocation of Time	Hours
#	The work in in this category pertained to substantive issues but was not specific to any one issue area addressed by TURN.	19.30%	221.50
Alt	Work related to nonwires (DER/demand reduction) and infrastructure alternatives to meet capacity and reliability needs	10.23%	117.35
Coord	Work related to coordinating with other intervenors	1.44%	16.50
Cost	Work related to the cost of the Alberhill project	0.15%	1.75
EH	Work related to evidentiary hearings, including preparation and participation	6.43%	73.75
GP	The work in this category includes activities associated with general participation in this proceeding, such as the initial review of the application and testimony, preparing a protest, attending the PHC, reading ALJ procedural rulings, and reading parties' pleadings as necessary to determine whether TURN should address the issues raised, and addressing proposed nondisclosure agreements.	2.53%	29.00
Need	Work related to the need for the Alberhill project	50.02%	574.00
OA	Work related to preparing for and participating in oral argument	1.11%	12.75
PD	Work related to the Proposed Decision and Alternate Proposed Decision which preceded D.18-08-026	6.95%	79.75
Comp	Work related to preparing TURN's NOI and Request for Compensation	1.85%	21.25
TOTAL		100.00%	1,147.60

If the Commission believes that a different approach to issue-specific allocation is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.	
---	--

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Hayley Goodson, TURN Staff Attorney	2017	57.25	\$405	D.18-01-020	\$23,186.25	57.25	\$405	\$23,186.25
Hayley Goodson, TURN Staff Attorney	2018	30.25	\$435	D.18-04-020	\$13,158.75	30.20[4]	\$435	\$13,137.00
Thomas J. Long, TURN Legal Director	2017	10.25	\$585	D.17-11-029	\$5,996.25	10.25	\$585	\$5,996.25
Joseph P. Como, Law Office of Joseph P. Como	2017	206.00	\$425	See Comment #1	\$87,550.00	204.75[1][4]	\$425	\$87,018.75
Joseph P. Como, Law Office of Joseph P. Como	2018	59.50	\$425	See Comment #1	\$25,287.50	59.35[4]	\$425	\$25,223.75
Doug Boccignone, Flynn RCI	2016-2017	0.50	\$300	See Comment #2	\$150.00	0.45[4]	\$300	\$135.00.00
Barry Flynn, Flynn RCI	2016-2017	49.25	\$300	See Comment #2	\$14,775.00	44.85[4]	\$300	\$13,455
Barry Flynn, Flynn RCI	2017-2018	31.50	\$310	See Comment #2	\$9,765.00	31.35[2][4]	\$310	\$9,718.50
Barry Flynn, Flynn RCI	2018-2019	3.25	\$320	See Comment #2	\$1,040.00	1.75[2]	\$320	\$560.00
Robert Jenkins, Flynn RCI	2016-2017	89.75	\$280	See Comment #2	\$25,130.00	81.27[4]	\$280	\$23,568.30

Robert Jenkins, Flynn RCI	2017-2018	252.50	\$290	See Comment #2	\$73,225.00	238.40[4]	\$290	\$69,136.00
Robert Jenkins, Flynn RCI	2018-2019	2.25	\$300	See Comment #2	\$675.00	2.25	\$300	\$675.00
Alexey Orkin, Flynn RCI	2016-2017	51.00	\$210	See Comment #2	\$10,710.00	47.00[4]	\$210	\$9,870.00
Alexey Orkin, Flynn RCI	2017-2018	35.00	\$215	See Comment #2	\$7,525.00	31.50[4]	\$215	\$6,772.50
Pushkar Wagle, Flynn RCI	2016-2017	15.00	\$245	See Comment #2	\$3,675.00	15.00	\$245	\$3,675.00
Pushkar Wagle, Flynn RCI	2017-2018	2.50	\$250	See Comment #2	\$625.00	2.50	\$250	\$625.00
Keith White, Flynn RCI	2016-2017	63.00	\$245	See Comment #2	\$15,435.00	57.60[4]	\$245	\$14,112.00
Keith White, Flynn RCI	2017-2018	134.00	\$250	See Comment #2	\$33,500.00	121.10[4]	\$250	\$30,275.00
Ellison Folk, Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	2017	1.80	\$585	See Comment #3	\$1,053.00	1.80	\$585	\$1,053.00
Edward Schexnayder, Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	2017	22.50	\$310	See Comment #3	\$6,975.00	22.50	\$310	\$6,975.00
Edward Schexnayder, Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	2018	0.80	\$315	See Comment #3	\$252.00	0.80	\$315	\$252.00
Aaron M. Stanton, Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	2017	8.50	\$210	See Comment #3	\$1,785.00	8.50	\$210	\$1,785.00
Subtotal: \$361,473.75						Subtotal: \$347,204.30		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Hayley Goodson	2017	0.50	\$202.50	1/2 of 2017 hourly rate; D.18-01-020	\$101.25	0.50	\$202.50	\$101.25
Joseph P. Como	2017	0.75	\$212.50	1/2 of requested 2017 hourly rate	\$159.38	0.75	\$212.50	\$159.38

Hayley Goodson	2018	20.00	\$217.50	1/2 of 2018 hourly rate; D.18-04-020	\$4,350.00	20.00	\$217.50	\$4,350.00
Subtotal: \$4,610.63						Subtotal: \$4,610.63		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.	Copies	Copies of filings related to D.18-08-026			\$140.37	\$140.37		
2.	Lexis Research	Lexis research related to D.18-08-026			\$34.09	\$0.00[3]		
3.	Postage	Mailing costs for filings/testimony related to D.18-08-026			\$21.73	\$21.73		
Subtotal: \$196.19						Subtotal: \$140.37		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$366,280.57						TOTAL AWARD: \$351,955.30		

*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 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Hayley Goodson	December 2003	228535	No
Thomas Long	December 1986	124776	No
Joseph Como	June 2000	206648	No
Ellison Folk	December 1990	149232	No
Edward Schexnayder	November 2012	284494	No
Aaron Stanton	December 2016	312530	No

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

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Timesheets for TURN's Staff Attorneys and Outside Counsel
Attachment 3	Timesheets for TURN's Expert Consultants
Attachment 4	TURN's Direct Expenses Associated with D.18-08-026
Attachment 5	Claimed Hours Allocated by Issue
Attachment 6	Resumes for Flynn RCI Experts
Comment 1	<p>Hourly Rates for Outside Counsel Joseph P. Como</p> <p>This is TURN's first request for compensation that includes work performed by outside counsel Joseph P. Como. The Commission has not previously adopted an authorized rate for Mr. Como.</p> <p><u>2017</u></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$425 for Mr. Como's work in 2017. This is the hourly rate charged by Mr. Como for legal services provided to TURN in this proceeding.</p> <p>Mr. Como received his JD with honors from Golden Gate University School of Law in 1999 and has been a member of the California Bar since June 2000. Mr. Como previously obtained an MS in Environmental Engineering from Stanford University and an BS in Environmental Engineering and Natural Resources Management from Cornell University, with a minor in Chemistry.</p> <p>Mr. Como has combined his legal and engineering experience in providing legal services to energy sector clients for the past 18 years. Before establishing the Law Office of Joseph P. Como in 2016, Mr. Como served as the Acting Director and Chief Counsel for the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (now called the Public Advocates Office) from mid-2010 through 2015. He served as Chief Counsel for the Office of Ratepayer Advocates from 2008 through mid-2010. Following employment as a Public Utilities Counsel at the Commission in 2006, Mr. Como served as the Legal, Energy and Water Advisor to Commissioner Rachelle Chong in 2007. Prior to joining the Commission, Mr. Como served as a Deputy City Attorney in the San Francisco City Attorney's Office from 2000-2005. Mr. Como worked for many years as an engineer prior to obtaining his law degree and is a Registered Civil Engineer in California and Nevada.</p> <p>The requested hourly rate of \$425 is in the bottom half of the range adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for attorneys with 13+ years of experience, which is \$325-\$585 for 2017. TURN submits that this rate is extremely reasonable for an attorney with Mr. Como's legal experience and specific subject matter expertise.</p>

	<p><u>2018</u></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$425 for Mr. Como’s work in 2018, the same rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Como in 2017. This is the actual rate charged by Mr. Como to TURN in 2018. It is well within the 2018 hourly rate range authorized by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-352 for attorneys with 13+ years of experience, \$340-\$600.</p>
Comment 2	<p>Hourly Rates for Expert Consultants at Flynn Resource Consultants Inc. (Flynn RCI)</p> <p>This is TURN’s first request for compensation that includes work performed by outside expert consultants employed by Flynn RCI, including Barry Flynn, Doug Boccignone, Robert Jenkins, Alexey Orkin, Pushkar Wagle, and Keith White. The Commission has not previously adopted an authorized rate for these experts.</p> <p>The hourly rates requested below are the actual rates charged by Flynn RCI to TURN for services rendered in this proceeding during 2017 and 2018.</p> <p>Flynn RCI has a business practice of increasing its rates charged to clients on July 1 of each year, rather than on January 1. As a result, the rates charged to TURN during the first half of 2017 were the rates set by the firm for July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017. On July 1, 2017, Flynn RCI increased its rates and billed TURN at those new rates from July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018. Flynn RCI increased its rates again July 1, 2018. Work done for TURN after July 1, 2018 was billed to TURN at this new rate. As a result of this schedule, TURN is requesting that the Commission adopt rates for the Flynn RCI experts that are out of sync with the Commission’s normal calendar year approach to hourly rates. Instead, TURN proposes rates for “July 2016 – June 2017,” “July 2017- June 2018,” and “July 2018 – June 2019” for the Flynn RCI experts (as applicable depending on the time period(s) in which they each worked on this proceeding.</p> <p>The Commission has previously adopted rates that aligned with mid-year changes in the rates charged by TURN’s other consultants. For instance, the JBS Energy firm, long relied on by TURN for expert consulting, would periodically increase its rates mid-year. The Commission adopted hourly rates for the JBS Energy experts in recognition of these mid-year rate changes in a number of decisions. For instance, in D.07-12-026, issued in the PG&E TY 2007 GRC, the Commission adopted two 2006 rates for several JBS Energy experts because of a mid-year rate increase charged by the firm to TURN, with one set of rates covering work through April 30, 2006, and the second covering work starting on May 1, 2006. D.07-12-026, pp. 25, 29. In D.12-03-024, issued in the PG&E TY 2011 GRC, the Commission applied two different rates to the work conducted by Garrick Jones of JBS Energy in 2010, one before and one after the firm increased Mr. Jones’ rate on July 1, 2010. D.12-03-024, pp. 14-15 and A2. Similarly, in D.14-05-015, issued in the Sempra TY 2012 GRC, the Commission adopted different rates for the work of JBS Energy experts before and after the firm’s March 1, 2013 rate increase. D.14-05-015, p. 34 (discussing John Sugar’s rates, e.g.). Finally, in D.15-11-019, issued in the Triennial Nuclear Decommissioning Cost proceeding, the Commission adopted two 2014 rates for Garrick Jones of JBS Energy, one before and one after the firm’s rate increase on October 1, 2014. D.15-11-019, pp. 19, 23.</p> <p>The Commission has also recognized mid-year rate changes charged by TURN’s expert consultant Barbara Alexander in adopting hourly rates. In D.15-03-039, issued in A.12-08-007 et al., the Commission adopted a 2012 rate for Ms. Alexander starting in September 2012, while the Commission adopted a lower 2012 rate for her work before September 1, 2012 in D.14-12-019.</p>

TURN requested these two different rates for 2012 because Ms. Alexander increased the rate she charged to TURN on September 1, 2012. *See* D.15-03-039, p. 12 (explaining the Commission's adoption of these two different rates across the two proceedings).

In the sections that follow, TURN discusses the requested rates for each time period for the Flynn RCI experts and demonstrates the reasonableness of each rate.

Barry Flynn, P.E.

Barry Flynn is a Principal of Flynn RCI, where he has worked for almost 30 years (1987 – Present). While at Flynn RCI, Mr. Flynn has provided testimony before the California Energy Commission and CPUC on transmission related issues; advocated for clients in various ISO stakeholder groups; participated in some of the ISO definition teams, including those concerning the Transmission Access Fee, Congestion Management and Pricing, Transmission and Ancillary Services Rules and Protocols, Transmission Congestion Contracts; and helped to negotiate the first network transmission agreement in the PG&E service territory, among other things. Mr. Flynn's earlier professional experiences include 10 years as the Director of Electric Utility for the City of Santa Clara (1974-1984); 8 years as a Senior Transmission Planning Engineer at PG&E (1966-1974); and 3 years as the President of an alternative energy company (1984-1987).

Mr. Flynn is a Registered Professional Electrical Engineer in California. He received an MS in Electrical Engineering from the University of Santa Clara and a BS in Electrical Engineering from the University of California at Berkeley. His resume is included in Attachment 6.

2016-2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$300 for Mr. Flynn's work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Flynn's expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

The requested hourly rate of \$300 is approximately the mid-point of the range for 2016 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 329 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$170-\$425. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2016 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention. Given Mr. Flynn's more than 50 years of experience working on electric utility planning and operational issues, including nearly 40 working directly on transmission planning, TURN submits that this is a very reasonable rate for Mr. Flynn.

2017-2018

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$310 for Mr. Flynn's work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Flynn's expert services during this time period

The requested hourly rate of \$310 is approximately the mid-point of the range for 2017 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$175-\$435. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2017 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention.

If one were to apply the 2.14% 2017 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 to the \$300 hourly rate requested by TURN for Mr. Flynn in 2016-2017, the result would be an hourly rate of \$306. TURN acknowledges that this product is lower than the rate of \$310 actually charged by Flynn RCI and requested by TURN. However, the requested rate is lower than the rate that would result from applying both the 2017 COLA and a 5% step increase, as authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 (permitted per individual twice within each experience level, up to the maximum rate for that level), which would be just over \$320. Because Flynn RCI charged TURN \$310 per hour during this time period, not \$320 per hour, TURN does not propose that the Commission adopt a rate of \$320 for Mr. Flynn for 2017-2018.

Instead, TURN asks the Commission to find the requested rate of \$310 reasonable because it is lower than the rate of \$320 that would result from applying the 5% step increase, plus the 2.14% COLA authorized for 2017, to the \$300 rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Flynn in 2016-2017.

2018-2019

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$320 for Mr. Flynn's work from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Flynn's expert services during this time period

The requested hourly rate of \$320 is approximately the mid-point of the range for 2018 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$185-\$445. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2018 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention.

A rate of \$320 is reasonable, not only because of Mr. Flynn's tremendous experience, but because it is consistent with the Commission's framework for authorizing rate increases. As explained above, if the Commission were to apply the 5% step increase, plus the 2.14% COLA authorized for 2017, to the \$300 rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Flynn in 2016-2017, the result for 2017-2018 would be a rate of \$320. This is the same rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Flynn in 2018-2019. Additionally, applying the 2018 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-352 of 2.30% to a 2017-2018 rate of \$320 would support an even higher rate of \$325 for 2018-2019.

In seeking to justify these rates for Mr. Flynn, TURN proposes to "exhaust" the first 5% step increase for him in the 13+ year experience tier, even though TURN does not seek adoption of the precise rates that result from applying this 5% step increase.

Douglass Boccignone, P.E.

Douglass Boccignone is a Principal of Flynn RCI, where he has worked for 17 years (2001 – Present). While at Flynn RCI, Mr. Flynn has sponsored testimony before the CPUC and FERC on transmission related issues; provided strategic advice, expert testimony and litigation support services for complex energy-related business issues to municipal utilities, independent power producers, and large energy consuming companies; advised and represented clients on CAISO market issues; and advised clients on locational marginal price impacts and congestion revenue rights strategies. Mr. Boccignone's earlier professional experiences include approximately 4 years at Dynegy Inc., Europe and USA, starting as a Senior Director, Energy Marketing & Origination, and ending as VP, European Origination; 4 years as Manager, Supply Resources and Resource

Planner for the City of Palo Alto; and 8 years as a consultant and analyst working on electric power industry issues.

Mr. Boccignone is a Registered Professional Electrical Engineer in California. He received a BS in Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management from Stanford University and a BA in Management-Engineering from Claremont McKenna College. His resume is included in Attachment 6.

2016-2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$300 for Mr. Boccignone's work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Boccignone's expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

The requested hourly rate of \$300 is approximately the mid-point of the range for 2016 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 329 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$170-\$425. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2016 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention. Given Mr. Boccignone's more than 30 years of experience working on electric utility planning and operational issues, including nearly 20 working directly on transmission issues, TURN submits that this is a very reasonable rate for Mr. Boccignone.

Robert Jenkins, P.E.

Robert Jenkins is a Managing Consultant at Flynn RCI, where for 6 years he has provided expert support on transmission planning and generation interconnection matters. Prior to joining Flynn RCI, Mr. Jenkins served for 20 years in various engineering and management positions in Pacific Gas and Electric Company's transmission planning department, where he was responsible for preparing and overseeing analysis and recommendations for improvement of PG&E's electric transmission system, including providing testimony at state and federal proceedings. Before that, for 12 years, Mr. Jenkins specialized in generation interconnection issues through management of generation interconnection activities at Mirant, PG&E and First Solar. He also managed the transmission evaluation for PG&E's long-term energy procurement activities.

Mr. Jenkins is a Registered Professional Engineer in California. He received a MEng in Electric Power from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and a BS in Electrical Engineering from North Carolina State University. His Qualifications are attached to his testimony in this proceeding (Ex. TURN-1, Attachment D).

2016-2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$280 for Mr. Jenkins's work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Jenkins's expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

The requested hourly rate of \$280 is in the bottom half of the range for 2016 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 329 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$170-\$425. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2016 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention. Given Mr. Jenkins's nearly 40 years of experience

working in the electric utility industry on transmission planning and generation interconnection issues, TURN submits that this is a very reasonable rate for Mr. Jenkins.

2017-2018

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$290 for Mr. Jenkins's work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Jenkin's expert services during this time period

The requested hourly rate of \$290 is in the bottom half of the range for 2017 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$175-\$435. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2017 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention.

If one were to apply the 2.14% 2017 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 to the \$280 hourly rate requested by TURN for Mr. Jenkins in 2016-2017, the result would be an hourly rate of \$286. TURN acknowledges that this product is lower than the rate of \$290 actually charged by Flynn RCI and requested by TURN. However, the requested rate is lower than the rate that would result from applying both the 2017 COLA and a 5% step increase, as authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 (permitted per individual twice within each experience level, up to the maximum rate for that level), which would be \$300. Because Flynn RCI charged TURN \$290 per hour during this time period, not \$300 per hour, TURN does not propose that the Commission adopt a rate of \$300 for Mr. Jenkins for 2017-2018.

Instead, TURN asks the Commission to find the requested rate of \$290 reasonable because it is lower than the rate of \$300 that would result from applying the 5% step increase, plus the 2.14% COLA authorized for 2017, to the \$280 rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Jenkins in 2016-2017.

2018-2019

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$300 for Mr. Jenkins's work from July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Jenkins's expert services during this time period

The requested hourly rate of \$300 is in the bottom half of the range for 2018 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$185-\$445. TURN ties this rate to the Commission's schedule for 2018 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI's mid-year rate increase convention.

A rate of \$300 is reasonable, not only because of Mr. Jenkins's tremendous experience, but because it is consistent with the Commission's framework for authorizing rate increases. As explained above, if the Commission were to apply the 5% step increase, plus the 2.14% COLA authorized for 2017, to the \$280 rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Jenkins in 2016-2017, the result for 2017-2018 would be a rate of \$300. This is the same rate TURN is requesting for Mr. Jenkins in 2018-2019. Additionally, applying the 2018 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-352 of 2.30% to a 2017-2018 rate of \$300 would support an even higher rate of \$305 (rounded down from \$307) for 2018-2019.

In seeking to justify these rates for Mr. Jenkins, TURN proposes to “exhaust” the first 5% step increase for him in the 13+ year experience tier, even though TURN does not seek adoption of the precise rates that result from applying this 5% step increase.

Pushkar Wagle, Ph.D.

Pushkar Wagle is a Senior Consultant at Flynn RCI, where he has worked for 14 years (2004 – Present). While at Flynn RCI, Dr. Wagle has advised and represented clients on CPUC, CAISO, and FERC issues, including Resource Adequacy, Integrated Resource Planning, Transmission Planning, and Congestion Revenue Rights; valued the economics of new transmission projects from Canada to Northern California as well as local projects to improve capacity into the San Francisco Greater Bay Area; and coordinated numerous power flow studies and evaluated the impact of transmission alternatives; among other things. Prior to joining Flynn RCI, Dr. Wagle worked as a Senior Economist for nearly 5 years at a consulting firm, where he managed over twenty studies/projects in the areas of market design, market power issues, litigation and testimonial support, electricity market price forecasting, electricity generating asset valuations, optimization of energy resource portfolio and risk management. Before that he taught Economics at State University of New York, Stony Brook, where his research focused on restructuring of the electric power industry.

Dr. Wagle has a PhD in Economics from State University of New York, Stony Brook, a MA in Economics from University of Bombay, and a BS in Mathematics from St. Xavier’s College, Mumbai, India. His resume is included in Attachment 6.

2016-2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$245 for Dr. Wagle’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Dr. Wagle’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

The requested hourly rate of \$245 is in the bottom third of the range for 2016 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 329 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$170-\$425. TURN ties this rate to the Commission’s schedule for 2016 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI’s mid-year rate increase convention. Given Dr. Wagle’s 20 years of experience in the electric utility industry, with more than half of that working directly on transmission projects and planning, TURN submits that this is a very reasonable rate for Dr. Wagle.

2017-2018

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$250 for Dr. Wagle’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Dr. Wagle’s expert services during this time period. It is also equal to the rate that results from applying the 2.14% 2017 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 to the \$245 hourly rate requested by TURN for Dr. Wagle in 2016-2017.

TURN also notes that the requested hourly rate of \$250 is in the bottom third of the range for 2017 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$175-\$435. TURN ties this rate to the Commission’s schedule for 2017 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI’s mid-year rate increase convention.

Keith White, Ph.D.

Keith White was a Senior Consultant at Flynn RCI, where he worked during 2017. While at Flynn RCI, Dr. White evaluated the need for transmission projects subject to the CPUC CPCN process. Prior to joining Flynn RCI, Dr. White was a Senior Analyst at the CPUC for more than 10 years, serving as the Staff lead for transmission planning/access matters at CAISO, FERC and DOE; the lead CPUC technical representative for “economic” (market- and policy-driven) transmission planning at WECC (database, modeling, studies); and played substantial CPUC staff role at CAISO and FERC for market design activities involving renewables integration. Before that, Dr. White worked as a Consultant on energy issues for nearly 17 years and as an Energy Analyst and Project Manager for 8 years at a firm, where he focused on utility resource planning.

Dr. White has a PhD in Ecology from University of California at Davis and an A.B. in Engineering and Applied Physics from Harvard College. He has also taken extension courses at UC Davis in health and environmental risk assessment. His resume is included in Attachment 6.

2016-2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$245 for Dr. White’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Dr. White’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.

The requested hourly rate of \$245 is in the bottom third of the range for 2016 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 329 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$170-\$425. TURN ties this rate to the Commission’s schedule for 2016 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI’s mid-year rate increase convention. Given Dr. White’s nearly 40 years of experience in the electric utility industry, with much of that working directly on transmission planning, TURN submits that this is a very reasonable rate for Dr. White.

2017-2018

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$250 for Dr. White’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Dr. White’s expert services during this time period. It is also equal to the rate that results from applying the 2.14% 2017 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 to the \$245 hourly rate requested by TURN for Dr. White in 2016-2017.

TURN also notes that the requested hourly rate of \$250 is in the bottom third of the range for 2017 rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 13+ years of experience, which is \$175-\$435. TURN ties this rate to the Commission’s schedule for 2017 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI’s mid-year rate increase convention.

Alexey Orkin

Alexey Orkin is a Consultant at Flynn RCI, where he has worked for 5 years (2013 – Present). While at Flynn RCI, Mr. Orkin has provided advice to clients on electric transmission planning and operations issues, and generation interconnection issues; and performed power flow studies for current and proposed transmission projects. Mr. Orkin’s earlier professional experiences include

	<p>approximately 1.5 years at PG&E as an Engineer in the Regional Planning Unit and 6 years at Baltimore Gas and Electric as an Engineer in the Transmission Planning Unit, Transmission Operations Unit, and Substation Engineering Unit.</p> <p>Mr. Orkin received a BS in Electrical Engineering from the Georgia Institute of Technology. His resume is included in Attachment 6.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>2016-2017</u></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$210 for Mr. Orkin’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Orkin’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017.</p> <p>The requested hourly rate of \$210 is in the bottom half of the range for <u>2016</u> rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 329 for experts with 7-12 years of experience, which is \$170-\$290. TURN ties this rate to the Commission’s schedule for 2016 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI’s mid-year rate increase convention. At the time Mr. Orkin performed work for TURN in this proceeding (the first half of 2017), he had nearly 12 years of experience working on utility transmission planning issues, putting him at the top of the 7-12 year experience tier. Given Mr. Orkin’s experience, TURN submits that a rate of \$210 is very reasonable for his work in 2016-2017.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>2017-2018</u></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$215 for Mr. Orkin’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Orkin’s expert services during this time period. It is also equal to the rate that results from applying the 2.14% 2017 COLA authorized by the Commission in Res. ALJ-345 to the \$210 hourly rate requested by TURN for Mr. Orkin in 2016-2017.</p> <p>TURN also notes that the requested hourly rate of \$215 is in the bottom third of the range for <u>2017</u> rates adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ 345 for experts with 7-12 years of experience, which is \$177-\$295. TURN ties this rate to the Commission’s schedule for 2017 rates in an effort to translate Flynn RCI’s mid-year rate increase convention.</p>
<p>Comment 3</p>	<p>Hourly Rates for Outside Counsel at Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger</p> <p>This is TURN’s first request for compensation that includes work performed by outside counsel Ellison Folk, Edward Schexnayder, and Aaron Stanton, members of the law firm Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP (SMW). SMW is a law firm specializing in government, land use, renewable energy, and environmental law. The Commission has not previously adopted hourly rates for Ms. Folk, Mr. Schexnayder, or Mr. Stanton.</p> <p><u>Ellison Folk</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>2017</u></p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$585 for Ellison Folk’s work in 2017. This is the rate charged by SMW for the legal services provided by Ms. Folk to TURN in this proceeding.</p>

Ms. Folk joined SMW in 1990 and is a partner with the firm. She represents community groups, public agencies, and environmental organizations on a wide range of environmental and land use issues, including CEQA, the California Coastal Act, Proposition 65, the Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and general plan and zoning law. Ms. Folk also advises and defends public agencies in litigation raising takings and related constitutional challenges to land use and environmental regulations. Ms. Folk has been named as a Northern California Super Lawyer every year since 2012 and is the lead author for several publications regarding takings law, including Chapter 65: Takings and Other Constitutional Controls in California Environmental Law and Land Use Practice (Matthew Bender), and articles for the California Environmental Law Reporter. She regularly speaks at conferences regarding land use and environmental issues.

Ms. Folk received her law degree from Boalt Hall School of Law and has been a member of California Bar since 1990. She also holds a Masters in City and Regional Planning from the University of California at Berkeley. Ms. Folk graduated *magna cum laude* from Princeton University in 1984.

The requested hourly rate of \$585 is at the top of the range adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-345 for attorneys with 13+ years of experience in 2017, which is \$325-\$585. The Commission has previously authorized a rate of \$585 for work in 2017 conducted by attorneys who, like Ms. Folk, have decades of experience and who are widely regarded as experts in their fields. For instance, in D.18-08-025, the Commission authorized a 2017 rate of \$585 for Robert Gnaizda of the National Asian American Coalition. In D.17-11-029, the Commission authorized a 2017 rate of \$585 for Thomas Long of TURN. In D.17-11-027, the Commission authorized a rate slightly above the range, \$590, for John Geesman (representing the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility). The Commission has likewise authorized hourly rates at the top of the adopted range for attorneys with 13+ years of experience in years prior to 2017. For instance, in D.13-08-021, the Commission authorized a 2011 hourly rate of \$535 for then-TURN attorney Michel Florio, which was at the top of the \$300-\$535 range adopted for that year in Resolution ALJ-267.

Given Ms. Folk's 28 years of experience and widely-regarded expertise on CEQA issues, TURN submits that a rate of \$585 is reasonable for her work in 2017.

Edward Schexnayder

2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$310 for Edward Schexnayder's work in 2017. This is the rate charged by SMW for the legal services provided by Mr. Schexnayder to TURN in this proceeding.

Mr. Schexnayder joined SMW in 2012 and is an associate at the firm. Mr. Schexnayder's practice includes representing public agencies, non-profit organizations, and community groups in government, environmental, and land use matters. His practice areas include litigation under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), local ordinance compliance, and inverse condemnation and takings, as well as representing clients in administrative proceedings before the California Public Utilities Commission and California Energy Commission.

Before joining the firm, Mr. Schexnayder received his J.D. with honors from the University of Michigan Law School and has been a member of the California Bar since 2012. Mr. Schexnayder

also holds a Master of Public Policy from the University of Michigan. While in law school, he was a law clerk for the U.S. Department of Justice, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the California Department of Justice. Mr. Schexnayder also served as a Managing Articles Editor and founder of the Michigan Journal of Environmental & Administrative Law. He received his undergraduate degree from Macalester College.

The requested hourly rate of \$310 is at the bottom of the range adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-345 for attorneys with 5-7 years of experience in 2017, which is \$310-\$330. In late 2017, when TURN retained SMW for assistance in this proceeding, Mr. Schexnayder was beginning his 6th year of practice at the firm. TURN submits that a rate of \$310 is reasonable for his work in 2017.

2018

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$315 for Mr. Schexnayder's work in 2018. This rate reflects the 2.30% COLA authorized in Resolution ALJ-352 for 2018, as applied to the 2017 rate of \$310 requested by TURN. A rate of \$315 is also the bottom of the range for attorneys within the 5-7 year experience tier for 2018.

Aaron Stanton

2017

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$210 for Aaron Stanton's work in 2017. This is the hourly rate charged by SMW for the legal services provided by Mr. Stanton to TURN in this proceeding.

In 2016, Mr. Stanton graduated from Stanford Law School and was admitted to the California Bar. He joined SMW in 2017 as an environmental law fellow. Prior to joining the firm, he served as a law clerk for the Honorable Howard R. Lloyd of the Northern District of California.

During law school, Mr. Stanton interned for the Environmental Defense Fund, externed for the land law and environment sections of the California Attorney General's Office, and clerked for SMW.

Prior to attending law school, Mr. Stanton worked for five years at the New York City Office of Emergency Management as a Senior Plan Manager. In that capacity, he worked with local, state, and federal agency representatives to draft and edit New York City emergency response plans, including the plans for coastal storms, cyber incidents, and commodity distribution. While at NYC OEM, Mr. Stanton served as a Planning Section Chief in the City's Emergency Operations Center during the initial response to Hurricane Sandy. In Sandy's aftermath, he coordinated the damage assessment and generator task forces.

Mr. Stanton graduated magna cum laude from Brown University in 2008 with a bachelor's degree in history.

The requested hourly rate of \$210 is in the middle of the range adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-345 for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience in 2017, which is \$170-\$230. In late 2017, when TURN retained SMW for assistance in this proceeding, Mr. Stanton had slightly more than 1 year of legal experience, putting him in the middle of the 0-2 year experience tier. TURN submits that a rate of \$210 is reasonable for his work in 2017.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1.] Adjustment for Mr. Como	Due to arithmetic errors, adjustments for hours in 2017 were made from 206.00 to 204.75.
[2.] Adjustment for Mr. Flynn	Due to arithmetic errors, adjustments for hours in 2017-18 were made from 31.50 to 31.35, and from 3.25 to 1.75 in 2018-2019.
[3.] Adjustment for services	We disallowed \$34.09 on Lexis research. Basic operational services are not compensable. See D.14-02-039.
[4.] CAISO forecast reduction	While TURN substantially contributed to D.18-08-026, the Decision rejects use of CAISO forecast as demonstrating whether VS electrical demand will exceed transformer operating limits. See D.18-08-026 at 29. Due to failure of allocation of issue by year 10% deduction was made on the total hours allocation on “Need”, based on attachment 5-Time Allocation by Issue.
[5.] Adoption of Como Hourly Rate	<p>Joseph P. Como TURN requests an hourly rate of \$425 for Mr. Como’s work in 2017, and requests an hourly rate of \$425 for Mr. Como’s work in 2018. It is well within the 2018 hourly rate range authorized by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-352 for attorneys with 13+ years of experience, \$340-\$600. This is the hourly rate charged by Mr. Como for legal services provided to TURN in this proceeding. This is TURN’s first request for compensation that includes work performed by outside counsel Joseph P. Como. Based on the rate justification and resume attached to the claim, the Commission finds the cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) hourly rate of \$425 reasonable and adopts the rate.</p>
[6.] Adoption of Hourly Rate for Expert Consultants at Flynn Resource Consultants Inc. (Flynn RCI)	<p>This is TURN’s first request for compensation that includes work performed by outside expert consultants employed by Flynn RCI, including Barry Flynn, Doug Boccignone, Robert Jenkins, Alexey Orkin, Pushkar Wagle, and Keith White. The Commission has not previously adopted an authorized rate for these experts.</p> <p>Flynn RCI has a business practice of increasing its rates charged to clients on July 1 of each year, rather than on January 1. As a result, the rates charged to TURN during the first half of 2017 were the rates set by the firm for July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017. On July 1, 2017, Flynn RCI increased its rates and billed TURN at those new rates from July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2018. Flynn RCI increased its rates again July 1, 2018. Work done for TURN after July 1, 2018 was billed to TURN at this new rate. As a result of this schedule, TURN is requesting that the Commission adopt rates for the Flynn RCI experts that are out of sync with the Commission’s normal calendar year approach to hourly rates. Instead, TURN proposes rates for “July 2016 – June 2017,” “July 2017- June 2018,” and “July 2018 – June 2019” for the Flynn RCI experts (as applicable depending on the time period(s) in which they each worked on this proceeding.</p> <p>The Commission has previously adopted rates that aligned with mid-year changes in the rates charged by TURN’s other consultants. See D.07-12-026; D.07-12-026, pp. 25, 29; D.07-12-026, pp. 25, 29.</p>

[7.] Adoption of Hourly Rate	<p>Barry Flynn</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$300 for Mr. Flynn’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Flynn’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017, and requests an hourly rate of \$310 for work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018;</p> <p>Given Mr. Flynn’s more than 50 years of experience working on electric utility planning and operational issues, including nearly 40 working directly on transmission planning. Given Mr. Flynn’s years of experience, the Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable for Mr. Flynn and adopts the rates.</p>
[8.] Adoption of Hourly Rate	<p>Douglass Boccignone</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$300 for Mr. Boccignone’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Boccignone’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017. The Commission finds the rates reasonable.</p>
[9.] Adoption of Hourly Rate	<p>Robert Jenkins</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$280 for Mr. Jenkins’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Mr. Jenkins’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 and requests an hourly rate of \$290 for Mr. Jenkins’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. The Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable.</p>
[10.] Adoption of Hourly Rate	<p>Pushkar Wagle</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$245 for Dr. Wagle’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). Wagle’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 and requests an hourly rate of \$250 for Dr. Wagle’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. Given D. Wagle’s years of experience, the Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable.</p>
[11.] Adoption of Hourly Rate	<p>Keith White</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$245 for Dr. White’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). This is the hourly rate charged by Flynn RCI for Dr. White’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 and requests an hourly rate of \$250 for Dr. White’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. Given Dr. White’s years of expertise, the Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable.</p>
[12.] Adoption of Hourly Rate	<p>Alexey Orkin</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$210 for Mr. Orkin’s work in the first half of 2017 (through June 30, 2017). Orkin’s expert services from July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2017 and requests an hourly rate of \$215 for Mr. Orkin’s work from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. The Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable and adopts the rates.</p>
[13.] Adoption of Hourly Rate for Outside Counsel at Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	<p>Ellison Folk</p> <p>This is TURN’s first request for compensation that includes work performed by outside counsel Ellison Folk, Edward Schexnayder, and Aaron Stanton, members of the law firm Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP (SMW).</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$585 for Ellison Folk’s work in 2017. This is the rate charged by SMW for the legal services provided by Ms. Folk to TURN in this proceeding.</p>

	Given Ms. Folk's 28 years of experience and widely-regarded expertise on CEQA issues, the Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable and adopts the rates of \$585 for her work in 2017.
[14.] Adoption of Hourly Rate for Outside Counsel at Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	Edward Schexnayder TURN requests an hourly rate of \$310 for Edward Schexnayder's work in 2017 and requests an hourly rate of \$315 for Mr. Schexnayder's work in 2018. This is the rate charged by SMW for the legal services provided by Mr. Schexnayder to TURN in this proceeding. A rate of \$315 is also the bottom of the range for attorneys within the 5-7-year experience tier for 2018. The Commission finds the COLA rates reasonable.
[15.] Adoption of Hourly Rate for Outside Counsel at Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger	Aaron Stanton TURN requests an hourly rate of \$210 for Aaron Stanton's work in 2017. In 2016, Mr. Stanton graduated from Stanford Law School and was admitted to the California Bar. The requested hourly rate of \$210 is in the middle of the range adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-345 for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience in 2017, which is \$170-\$230. The Commission finds the COLA rate reasonable and hereby adopts the rate.

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?		Yes
Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion
SCE	On November 28, 2018, SCE filed a response to the Intervenor Compensation Claim for TURN and FRONTLINES. SCE contends the Intervenor Compensation claim with respect to the Alberhill System project proceeding should be denied as premature as no final action has been taken with respect to ASP's CPCN. Moreover, SCE insists "No substantial contribution made in the ASP proceeding because no decision has been made on the ASP." (<i>See</i> SCE response to comments at 1, 4).	The Commission notes that this proceeding remains open. <i>See</i> D.18-08-026 OP 4, 7 at 41. We disagree that TURN did not make substantial contribution. TURN's participation substantially assisted the Commission in reaching its findings that it is uncertain whether ASP is needed and its OP requiring SCE to present additional analyses to ascertain whether an alternative project is needed. TURN's active participation in this proceeding has substantially contributed to Decision 18-08-026.

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.18-08-026.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network'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 \$351,955.30.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network shall be awarded \$351,955.30.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network the total award. 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 January 12, 2019 the 75th day after the filing of The Utility Reform Network'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 _____, 2019, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision:	D1808026		
Proceeding(s):	A0701031, A0704028, A0909022		
Author:	ALJ Yacknin		
Payer:	Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	10/30/18	\$366,280.57	\$351,955.30	N/A	Rate adoptions, math errors, non-substantive work.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$405	2017	\$405
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$435	2018	\$435
Thomas	Long	Attorney	\$585	2017	\$585
Joseph	Como	Attorney	\$425	2017	\$425
Joseph	Como	Attorney	\$425	2018	\$425
Doug	Boccignone	Expert	\$300	2016-2017	\$300
Barry	Flynn	Expert	\$300	2016-2017	\$300
Barry	Flynn	Expert	\$310	2017-2018	\$310
Barry	Flynn	Expert	\$320	2018-2019	\$320
Robert	Jenkins	Expert	\$280	2016-2017	\$280
Robert	Jenkins	Expert	\$290	2017-2018	\$290
Robert	Jenkins	Expert	\$300	2018-2019	\$300
Alexey	Orkin	Expert	\$210	2016-2017	\$210
Alexey	Orkin	Expert	\$215	2017-2018	\$215
Pushkar	Wagle	Expert	\$245	2016-2017	\$245
Pushkar	Wagle	Expert	\$250	2017-2018	\$250
Keith	White	Expert	\$245	2016-2017	\$245
Keith	White	Expert	\$250	2017-2018	\$250
Ellison	Folk	Attorney	\$585	2017	\$585
Edward	Schexnayder	Attorney	\$310	2017	\$310
Edward	Schexnayder	Attorney	\$315	2018	\$315
Aaron	Stanton	Attorney	\$210	2017	\$210

(END OF APPENDIX)