

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ YIP-KIKUGAWA (Mailed 6/24/2013)****BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Modifications to its SmartMeter™ Program and Increased Revenue Requirements to Recover the Costs of the Modifications (U39M).

Application 11-03-014  
(Filed March 24, 2011)

And Related Matters.

Application 11-03-015  
Application 11-07-020

**DECISION GRANTING REQUEST OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIANS FOR WIRED SOLUTIONS TO SMART METERS FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 12-04-019**

<b>Claimant: Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters (SCWSSM)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision 12-04-019</b>
<b>Claimed (\$): \$21,018.50</b>	<b>Awarded (\$): \$4,959.00</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES****A. Brief Description of Decision:**

This decision grants in part the intervenor compensation request of Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters (SCWSSM) for substantial contributions to Decision 12-04-019, which granted an option for residential customers of SDG&E to opt-out of having a wireless smart meter installed at their location. The opt-out option shall be an analog electric and/or gas meter.

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

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	May 6, 2011	Yes
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI Filed:	June 2, 2011	Yes
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 11-03-015	Yes
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 24, 2011	Yes
7. Based on another CPUC determination:		
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
<b>Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.11-03-015	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 24, 2011	
11. Based on another CPUC determination:		
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.12-04-019	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	April 24, 2012	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	June 19, 2012	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**C. Additional Comments on Part I:**

<b>#</b>	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1	XX		Martin Homec represented SCWSSM and CARE/CEP. The filings and participation by Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE) were through the Center for Electrosmog Prevention (CEP). CEP was not organized as a separate entity at the beginning of this proceeding and so made the filings for CARE. A separate compensation claim is being submitted for CARE, but could be consolidated?
2		XX	The claims submitted by CARE and SCWSSM will be reviewed and awarded separately.

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION****A. Claimant's description of its contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059):**

<b>Contribution</b>	<b>Specific References to Claimant's Presentations and to Decision (Provided by Claimant)</b>	<b>Showing Accepted by CPUC</b>
1. SCWSSM explained the need for analog meters instead of the smart meter or radio off options for smart meters. The result was that although SDG&E recommended the radio-off option in its compliance filing with D.11-11-007, the final decision followed SCWSSM's recommendation and ordered an analog meter as the only option.	D.12-04-019 p. 10, OP 1	Claimant's participation and contribution is duplicative of the original Utility Consumers' Action Network's (UCAN) Application to modify D.07-04-043. In that original application, UCAN already requested an analog option and claimant is only one of many intervenors which supported UCAN's application. There is also substantial overlap in claimant's work with another intervenor- Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE) .
2. SCWSSM opposes charging ratepayers for meter removal and meter reading. SCWSSM's opposition has been recognized in the final decision by establishment of a Phase 2 to the proceeding discussing the charges.	D.12-04-019 p. 11, OP 2	Duplicative with CARE, and also duplicative with DRA and UCAN assertions on need for further hearings on cost.
3. SCWSSM filed a motion on January 9, 2012, to include the California Department of Public Health participate as an expert in health concerns.	Denied by D.12-04-019, OP 5	Claimant's work on this issue made no contribution to the final decision, and will therefore be disallowed.
4. SCWSSM filed an Ex Parte notice on January 19, 2012, explaining that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) prevents the CPUC from forcing smart meters on disabled persons who suffer adverse health impacts from operating smart meters.	June 8, 2012, scoping memorandum asks that the issue of ADA applicability to this proceeding be the subject of briefs. SCWSSM first raised this issue in the proceedings.	The scoping memorandum was issued for Phase II of the proceeding and not part of D.12-04-019. Any work claimant has done on this particular issue is outside the scope and did not contribute to the decision in question. All hours claimed for work under this issue will be disallowed as outside the scope.
5. SCWSSM filed comments to the proposed decision explaining that the ADA	June 8, 2012, scoping memorandum asks that the	The scoping memorandum was issued for Phase II of the

<p>and state statutes are being violated by the CPUC ordering opt-out fees and payments for ratepayers with medical problems.</p>	<p>issue of ADA applicability to this proceeding be the subject of briefs. SCWSSM first raised this issue in the proceedings.</p>	<p>proceeding and not part of D.12-04-019. Any work claimant has done on this particular issue is outside the scope and made no contribution to the decision in question. All hours claimed for work under this issue will be disallowed as outside the scope.</p>
---	---	--

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

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p><b>a. Was the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to the Claimant's?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>
<p><b>c. Names of other parties (if applicable):</b>                      - Center for Electromog Prevention                      - DRA</p>		<p>Yes, but UCAN should also be included as a party with similar positions on the proceeding.</p>
<p><b>d. Claimant's description of how Claimant coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or of how Claimant's participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b></p> <p>Barbara Schnier formed the group SCWSSM to represent the interests of disabled persons who wanted the protections of the federal ADA because SCWSSM members were disabled people who felt nauseous and ill when living in residences with many appliances. They wanted electricity for their homes but felt ill when they spent too much time in the presence to wireless devices. Martin Homec filed the NOI to claim compensation for SCWSSM.</p> <p>SCWSSM also joined the coalition of groups asking that Southern California Edison Company (SCE) adopt an opt-out program in the proceeding with docket number A.11-07-020. Later Martin Homec began representing SCWSSM in A.11-07-020 but did not submit an NOI to claim compensation in that proceeding and so cannot claim compensation for the work done in the A.11-07-020 proceeding.</p> <p>During July 2011, another group of interested residents started a group of persons living in Topanga Canyon asking for the SCE opt-out. That group calls itself the Peoples Initiative Foundation (PIF) and is led by Elizabeth Barris. Martin Homec also advised that group and helped by drafting documents and filing and serving the documents, but did not file a NOI to claim compensation for that group either.</p> <p>During April 2012, another opt-out group started in Ojai, California</p>		<p>Claimant fails to show how there is no duplication of effort with the other parties. Claimant and CARE had duplicative advocates as well as duplicative arguments in the proceeding. Both advanced arguments based on health concerns which have been ruled to be outside the scope of the current proceeding. Claimant was one of multiple intervenors agreeing with the original applicant, and fails to show how its participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to the position of another party.</p> <p>Furthermore, the positions put forth by Claimant, CARE, DRA and UCAN are similar and duplicative in that they all believed that an analog opt-out option is feasible at this time despite having different reasoning.</p> <p>UCAN and DRA believe that the cost of the opt-out option cannot be determined based only on information provided by SDG&amp;E, and requested that further hearings be conducted.</p>

<p>and Martin Homec helped that group too. The Ojai group contacted Martin Homec through Sasha Leiterman and helped convince the City of Ojai to adopt an ordinance for smart meter opt-outs. This group also filed some documents in the A.11-07-020 proceeding. Martin Homec helped write, format, file, and serve the documents but did not represent the Ojai group in the CPUC proceedings.</p> <p>Martin Homec represented or helped, CARE, CEP, SCWSSM, PIF, and the citizens of Ojai, California to participate in the A.11-03-015 and A.11-07-020 proceedings. The NOIs to claim compensation and the compensation claims were written, filed and served by Martin Homec for CARE and SCWSSM not for CEP, PIF, or the citizens of Ojai because these latter groups did not exist at the time the applications were filed.</p>	<p>Their position was adopted by the Commission in its decision to hold a second phase to determine the cost of opt-out option for SDG&amp;E ratepayers.</p> <p>Claimant’s coordination with CARE, CEP, PIF and the Residents of Ojai in A.11-07-020 has no bearing on this claim.</p> <p>As such, we have made applicable reductions to the hours claimed by the Claimant for duplicative work as well as work that is outside the scope of the proceeding.</p>
--	--

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p><b>a. Claimant’s explanation of how its participation bore a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through its participation (include references to record, where appropriate)</b></p> <p>SCWSSM opposed requiring wireless smart meters in residences and businesses desiring to opt-out. Many ratepayers in SDG&amp;E service territory filed complaints with the CPUC about the smart meters already installed and those proposed to be installed. SCWSSM’s participation in the proceeding resulted in an analog meter opt-out option as well as a second phase to the proceeding to determine the costs to ratepayers who choose to opt-out.</p> <p>SCWSSM asked the CPUC to include the California Department of Public Health in the proceeding to provide expertise in health impacts. Their California Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) Program is a research, education, and technical assistance program concerned with the possible health effects of electric and magnetic fields from power lines, appliances, and other uses of electricity.</p> <p>SCWSSM provided an Ex Parte communication on January 18, 2012, stating that the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 USCA 12101, applies to the smart meter installations in homes and businesses in California. It provided an analysis of the requirements for this opt out proceeding. SCWSSM submitted comments on the proposed decision that was adopted as D.12-04-019</p>	<p>D.98-04-059 directs customers to demonstrate the productivity of their participation by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers.<sup>1</sup> The costs of a customer’s participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through its participation.</p> <p>Even without claimant’s participation, UCAN and DRA advocated for analog meters in their briefs and arguments before the Commission.</p> <p>The scoping memorandum dated June 8, 2012, was issued for Phase II of the proceeding and not part of D.12-04-019. Any work Claimant has done on this particular issue is outside the scope and made no contribution to the decision in question. All hours claimed for work under this issue will be disallowed for being outside the scope.</p> <p>Claimant has failed to show how the costs it claims bear a reasonable relationship with the benefits realized through its participation. We have therefore made certain adjustments, disallowances, and reductions in areas described in detail in Part III, Section C-D of this claim. After these reductions,</p>

<sup>1</sup> See D.98-04-059 at 34-35.

<p>making the same statements about the ADA and related State statutes. This was recognized by the June 8, 2012, scoping ruling requiring briefs on the issues.</p>	<p>disallowances and adjustments, the remaining hours and costs are reasonable and should be compensated.</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b></p> <p>Barbara Schnier organized the group of people known as Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters and did the information gathering required for presenting it to the CPUC. Ms. Schnier found experts who diagnosed the health issues caused by smart meters.</p> <p>Martin Homec is an attorney who has worked at the California Public Utilities Commission for over 25 years and at the California Energy Commission for 6 years. He is responsible for the contributions of representation in San Francisco for ratepayers residing in southern California who would have no representation in this proceeding. He also contacted experts at the National Regulatory Research Institute, University of Southern California, Electric Power Research Institute, and the University of California to request medical studies on the issues.</p>	<p>Claimant was one of many parties in the proceeding that supported an analog option for the Smart Meter Opt-out program. We have disallowed certain hours spent by Mr. Homec as being un-related to the proceeding or excessive in light of the work performed. We have detailed these adjustments, disallowances, and reductions in areas described in detail in Part III, Section C-D of this claim. In addition, Mr. Homec recorded duplicative hours for his representation of another Intervenor in this proceeding. Consequently, we have also made reductions, disallowances and adjustments where appropriate. After these reductions, disallowances and adjustments, the remaining hours and costs are reasonable and should be compensated.</p>
<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b></p> <p>The initial hours considered all issues as SCWSSM learned the CPUC procedures and interests. SCWSSM’s Barbara Schnier knows the impacts claimed by many who want to opt out of smart meters. She spent her efforts talking to individual SCE and SDG&amp;E ratepayers to determine how to represent their interests to the CPUC decision makers. This resulted in several Ex Parte e-mails to the administrative law judge assigned to the proceeding as well as review of the pleadings filed in the case.</p> <p>Martin Homec drafted data requests and researched the costs of the smart meter opt out and meter reading expenses. Mr. Homec spent many hours reviewing the issues in the SDG&amp;E and SCE service territories. He also allocated many hours for attending the workshop and drafting and filing documents.</p> <p>Many issues involve discussing why individual ratepayers want to opt out of smart meters. Individuals explained their reasoning to Mr. Homec and Mr. Homec had to research the legal and technical bases for the claims. Some individuals wanted to explain their reasoning to the CPUC decision makers and Mr. Homec had to format these communications</p>	<p>Claimant has allocated its claimed hours into issues A, B, C and D. We are reducing the hours claimed under Issue A - need for analog meters as being duplicative with other parties. We are disallowing claims under issue B and C on health issues related to smart meters and ADA claims for being outside the scope of the proceeding, and reducing certain hours claimed under Issue D for being excessive. Claimant states many hours were spent discussing why ratepayers wanted to opt out. We are reducing or disallowing these proportionally - the reasons for which ratepayers want to opt out of the smart meters are irrelevant, as ratepayers may opt out for any reason, or no reason at all.</p>

for filing as Ex Parte contacts with the CPUC.	
<p><b><i>Our reasonableness assessment of the Claimant’s work focuses on these aspects: First, are the hourly rates for the Joint Parties’ advocates reasonable comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services. Secondly, did the Joint Parties advocate for any issues which were outside the scope of the proceeding, or which failed to make a substantial contribution to the final decision as required by statute.<sup>2</sup> Lastly, given the scope of the work and the documents that the Claimant filed, should the hours be compensated as requested.</i></b></p>	

**B. Specific Claim\*:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY, EXPERT AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total
Martin Homec	2011	37.2	\$ 235	D.12-02-034 plus 5% and ALJ-267 p. 5	\$8,742	2011	15.7	\$185	\$2904.50
Martin Homec	2012	41.1	\$ 280	D.12-02-034 plus increase of 5% and ALJ-267 p.5	\$11,508	2012	7.9	\$190	\$1,501.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>					<b>\$20,250.00</b>	<b>Subtotal:</b>			<b>\$4,405.50</b>
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total
Martin Homec	2011	1.4	\$117.5	D.12-02-034 plus increase of 5% and D.10-04-010 p.5	164.50	2011	1.4	\$92.50	\$129.50
Martin Homec	2012	4	\$140	D.12-02-034 plus increase of 5% and D.10-04-010 p.5	560	2012	4	\$95	\$380.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>					<b>\$724.50</b>	<b>Subtotal:</b>			<b>\$509.50</b>
COSTS									
#	Item	Detail		Amount	Amount				

<sup>2</sup> §1802(1) defines substantial contribution as the customer’s presentation that substantially assisted the Commission in making its decision because it has adopted factual and legal contentions, or policy recommendations presented by the intervenor. §1802.5 allows compensation for an intervenor’s participation which materially supplements, complements, or contributes to the presentation of another party, provided that the intervenor’s own participation makes a substantial contribution to a Commission order or decision. Merely assisting another party to participate effectively does not constitute a substantial contribution by the intervenor, nor does such help seem reasonably necessary to the intervenor’s own substantial contribution.

	Photocopying, postage, stationary	\$44.00	\$	44
<b>Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$44.00</b>	<b>Subtotal:</b>	<b>\$44</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUEST :</b>		<b>\$21,018.50</b>	<b>TOTAL AWARD :</b>	<b>\$4,959.00</b>

\* We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant’s records should identify specific issues for which it requested 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.  
 \*\* Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate (the same applies to the travel time).

**C. Additional Comments on Part III:**

CPUC	Comment
Miscalculation of total hours in 2011	The total number of hours claimed by Claimant is off by 1.5 hours, based on the spreadsheet submitted, Claimant should have claimed for 38.7 hours in 2011.
2011-2012 hourly rates for Martin Homec	The Claimant requests an hourly rate of \$235 an hour for Mr. Homec’s work during 2011 and an hourly rate of \$285 an hour for his work during 2012. Claimant bases these hourly rates on a 5% step increase as well as moving Mr. Homec from his current experience range to the next one. Mr. Homec was granted an hourly rate of \$185 an hour in D.12-02-034 for work done in 2011 and we adopt that same rate of \$185 an hour for Mr. Homec’s work done in 2011 in this case. We have seen no demonstrable change in the quality of Mr. Homec’s work before the Commission that would warrant the change in range. For Mr. Homec’s work done in 2012, we adopt it here with a Cost-of-Living Adjustment (COLA) increase of 2.2% (rounded to the nearest \$5 increment), as allowed in Resolution ALJ-281 to \$190 an hour. <sup>3</sup>

**D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
Hours spent by Mr. Homec on Prehearing conference on May 6, 2011.	Mr. Homec is claiming 4 hours of work on behalf of CARE for attending the prehearing conference on May 6, 2011, and claiming another 2 hours worked for representing SCWSSM, the Claimant, for attending the same. This is duplicative. We disallow 4 of those 6 hours and will grant a total claim of two hours for Mr. Homec’s participation at the prehearing conference, one hour for the CARE, and another hour for SCWSSM.
Hours spent on Ms. Schnier’s personal complaint with SDG&E.	We disallow all hours claimed by Mr. Homec for his assistance to Ms. Schnier in opting out of the smart meter program with SDG&E. This is a personal complaint and not related substantively to the proceeding at hand, nor did it contribute in any way to the final decision. Mr. Homec’s hours in 2011 is reduced by 4.5 hours for being outside the scope of the proceeding.

<sup>3</sup> See Note 2.

Hours spent on Issue A by Mr. Homec.	We disallow all 3.4 hours claimed by Mr. Homec for his work on SCWSSM comments and responses to the SDG&E compliance filing for not making any substantive contribution to the final decision. SDG&E provided analog options as requested by the commission and the SCWSSM comments were outside the scope of the proceeding and not part of the final decision. We disallow the 0.8 hours claimed for Response to ALJ on party status as being administrative and for verification purpose only, thereby making no substantial contribution to the proceeding. We reduce the 0.8 hours claimed on November 7, 2011 for a telephone conference to 0.4 hours for being duplicative of the same claim submitted by CARE. For Issue A (excluding the 4.5 hours already disallowed by previous comment), Mr. Homec's hours in 2011 are reduced by 1.4 hours and his hours in 2012 are reduced by 3.2 hours.
Hours spent on Issue B by Mr. Homec.	We disallow all of the hours spent under this issue for being outside the scope of the proceeding. As we have stated in the decision, the Commission recognizes ratepayers' right to opt out of the Smart Meter program for any reason or no reason at all. Mr. Homec's hours for Issue B in 2011 are reduced by 8.6 hours and his hours in 2012 are reduced by 11 hours.
Hours spent on Issue C by Mr. Homec.	We are disallowing all hours claimed by Mr. Homec in 2012 in relation to Issue C, ADA and Public Utilities Code § 453 issues, as being outside the scope of the proceeding. Claimant bases its claim for compensation on this issue on a scoping memorandum dated June 8, 2012, which was issued for Phase II of the proceeding and not part of D.12-04-019. Any work claimant has done on this particular issue is outside the scope and made no contribution to the decision in question. All hours claimed for work under this issue will be disallowed as outside the scope.  For Issue C, Mr. Homec's hours spent in 2012 are reduced by 19 hours.
Hours spent on Issue D by Mr. Homec.	We reduce the 6.6 hours claimed in 2011 for reading the applications and discussion with Ms. Schnier to 3.3 hours for being duplicative of the same claimed activity submitted by CARE. We reduce the 1.2 hours claimed for correcting the service list on May 9, 2011 to 0.6 hours for the same reason. We disallow the 0.6 hours claimed on June 5, 2011 to discuss CPUC procedures as making no contribution to the final decision. It is not the intent of the Intervenor compensation program to pay intervenors for time spent on learning Commission procedures.  For Issue D, Mr. Homec's hours spent in 2011 are reduced by 7.5 hours.
	<b>After these reductions, disallowances and adjustments, the remaining hours and costs demonstrate that the claimant's participation was reasonable, and should be compensated.</b>

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim?</b>	No
---	----

If so:

<b>Party</b>	<b>Reason for Opposition</b>	<b>CPUC Disposition</b>

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

If not: This is an intervenor compensation matter. As provided in Rule 14.6(c)(6) of our Rules of Practice and Procedure, we normally waive the otherwise applicable 30-day comment period for this proposed decision. Because the Commission is sizably reducing the amount requested in this award we allowed comments on this proposed decision.

<b>Party</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CPUC Disposition</b>
	No comments received.	

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters has made a substantial contribution to Decision 12-04-019.
2. The claimed fees and costs, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The total of reasonable compensation is \$4,959.00.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters is awarded \$4,959.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters the total award. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning

September 2, 2012, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This order is effective today.

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

**APPENDIX****Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b> No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1204019	
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A1103014, et al.	
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Amy C. Yip-Kikugawa	
<b>Payer(s):</b>	San Diego Gas & Electric Company	

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
<b>Southern Californians for Wired Solutions to Smart Meters (SCWSSM)</b>	June 19, 2012	\$21,018.50	\$4,959.00		Excessive hours claimed, duplication of efforts, work done outside scope of proceeding and requested rate not justified by advocate experience.

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Martin	Homec	Attorney	SCWSSM	\$235	2011	\$185
Martin	Homec	Attorney	SCWSSM	\$280	2012	\$190

**(END OF APPENDIX)**