

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Address
Utility Cost and Revenue Issues Associated
with Greenhouse Gas Emissions.

Rulemaking 11-03-012
(Filed March 24, 2011)

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL
CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 12-12-033**

Claimant: The Utility Reform Network	For contributions to Decision 12-12-033
Claimed (\$): \$54,398	Awarded (\$): 53,565 (1.54 % reduction)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ): ALJ Melissa K. Semcer

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

This decision adopts a methodology for allocating greenhouse gas allowance revenues received by California's investor-owned utilities, including small and multi-jurisdictional utilities, in accordance with Public Utilities Code §748.5, as part of California's Cap-and-Trade program.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	June 2, 2011	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for Notice of Intent (NOI):	N/A	Verified
3. Date NOI Filed:	June 30, 2011	Verified
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.11-03-012	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 1, 2011	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Petition 10-08-016	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 22, 2010	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	Decision (D.) 12-12-033	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	December 28, 2012	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 26, 2013	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059)

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>1. REVENUE ALLOCATION / REJECTION OF PROPOSALS TO ALLOCATE REVENUES TO CLEAN ENERGY OR EFFICIENCY MEASURES</p> <p>The Utility Reform Network (TURN) argued that the Commission should reject revenue allocation proposals that carve out funds for the creation of new clean energy, energy efficiency or research and development programs. Specifically, TURN argued that new GHG auction revenues do not justify new spending programs, especially since ratepayers will also be charged for the costs of purchasing GHG allowances. TURN noted that none of the proposals offered by various parties were sufficiently detailed to be adopted or implemented. TURN further expressed concern about the potential overlap between new program proposals submitted in this proceeding and those being considered in Rulemaking (R.) 11-10-003 and other ongoing proceedings devoted to overseeing clean energy investment strategies.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with TURN and declined to allocate any portion of GHG allowance revenues towards clean energy or energy efficiency measures. The Decision explicitly agrees with TURN in the following sections:</p> <p>(1) “As noted by the Joint Utilities and TURN, we have many ongoing</p>	<p><u>Opening comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, January 31, 2012, at 2-4.</u></p> <p><u>Reply comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, February 14, 2012, at 2-3.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 5, 51.</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>2. RATE DESIGN / TWO PART RETURN OF ALLOWANCE REVENUES TO RESIDENTIAL CUSTOMERS</p> <p>TURN argued for the return of all allowance revenues to residential customers via a two-part process that included reductions to volumetric rates and also through a “separate bill credit” mechanism. TURN argued that this two-part process would preserve a marginal carbon price signal, provide educational value and benefit low usage customers. TURN further opposed proposals to provide all credits in the form of fixed rebates.</p> <p>Specifically, TURN urged the Commission to provide bill credits for upper-tier rates “equal to the incremental cost of electricity procurement caused by Assembly Bill (AB) 32.” TURN further urged the Commission to reject the joint IOU proposal to return the entire residential class share of allowance revenues through credits to upper-tier usage, pointing out that this proposal would ultimately reduce upper tier rates below the levels that would have been in place even without any GHG regulation.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with TURN and concluded that residential customers should receive upper-tier rate credits to “neutralize the rate impacts of the Cap-and-Trade program” and that all remaining revenues should be distributed to all residential customers. Specifically, the Decision clarifies that the upper-tier rate credits shall not exceed GHG costs embedded in those rates. The Commission rejected efforts to return</p>	<p><u>Response of TURN to the IOUs Joint Motion for an Interim Decision to authorize use of GHG allowance revenues for 2012 electricity rates, May 26, 2011.</u></p> <p><u>Reply comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, February 14, 2012, at 5, 7.</u></p> <p><u>Opening comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, January 31, 2012, at 5.</u></p> <p><u>Reply comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, February 14, 2012, at 6.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 49-50, 108-109.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 62-63.</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	--	------------

<p>all residential class credits to the upper tier rates, finding that this approach “would disproportionately reward high consumption energy users.”</p>		
<p>3. LOW-INCOME / PROVIDING BENEFITS TO LOW-INCOME CUSTOMERS</p> <p>TURN expressed concern that lower-income customer households will face larger economic burdens due to the impact of Greenhouse Gas regulation in California. TURN noted that a larger fraction of the budgets of lower income households is spent on relatively carbon intensive goods. As a result, lower-income customers are more vulnerable to the broad economic impacts of GHG regulation.</p> <p>To address this concern, TURN proposed that a separate bill credit be provided to CARE customers and non-CARE customers using less than 130% of the baseline quantity. These credits are intended to offset some of the impacts that disproportionately affect lower-income and disadvantaged groups.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with TURN’s concern about the likelihood that the cap-and-trade program will increase the cost of basic goods and services for low-income households and have disproportionate economic impacts. The Decision addresses this concern by returning the remaining residential class revenues (after mitigating GHG costs in upper-tier rates) to all residential accounts on an equal amount per customer basis. The Decision references TURN’s position and explains “by returning remaining GHG allowance revenue to all residential customers (and not only</p>	<p><u>Proposal of TURN for Allocation of Greenhouse Gas Revenues, October, 2011, at 2-5.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 66-67.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 108-109.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 109-110.</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>those that bear direct GHG costs,) we achieve our policy objective of reducing adverse impacts to low-income households.” The Commission ordered these credits to be provided through a “climate dividend” in a form similar to the methodology proposed by TURN.</p>	<p><u>D.12-12-033, at 117, footnote 80.</u></p>	
<p>4. RATE DESIGN / CLIMATE DIVIDEND PROVIDED VIA ON-BILL REBATE</p> <p>TURN supported using allowance revenues to provide the “climate dividend” via a quarterly credit as a separate line item on the residential customer bill. TURN argued that the use of periodic bill credits would allow timely pass-through of revenues, highlight the fact that AB 32 is designed to be financially neutral for consumers, be administratively simple, and maintain the carbon price and conservation signals by not explicitly lowering marginal usage rates.</p> <p>TURN expressed concern over DRA’s proposal for an off-bill credit distributed via separate checks to customers. TURN argued that the mechanics and costs of an off-bill credit would be problematic and that an on-bill credit offers superior administrative efficiencies without diluting the carbon price signal and the educational benefits.</p> <p>The Commission agreed to provide a semi-annual climate dividend as a periodic on-bill credit and rejected the off-bill credit approach. The Decision explains “as noted by TURN, on-bill rebates do not necessarily dampen price signals in rates, including conservation price signals separate from the carbon price signal, which will be neutralized in residential rates.”</p>	<p><u>Opening comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, January 31, 2012, at 5-7.</u></p> <p><u>Reply comments of TURN on Cap-and-Trade Revenue Allocation Proposals, February 14, 2012, at 8.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, Finding of Fact 24.</u></p> <p><u>D.12-12-033, at 122.</u></p>	<p>Yes</p>

(at 122)		
----------	--	--

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was ORA¹ a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Yes	Verified
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</p> <p>California Cogeneration Council, California Farm Bureau Federation, Agricultural Council of California, California League of Food Processors, Agricultural Energy Consumers Association (collectively, the Agricultural Parties), the Direct Access Customer Coalition (DACC), the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), the Green Power Institute, (GPI), jointly the California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA), the California Manufacturers and Technology Association, and the Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC) (collectively, the Large Users), Marin Energy Authority (MEA), jointly the Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club California, the Greenlining Institute, Union of Concerned Scientists, Local Government Sustainable Energy Coalition, National Consumer Law Center, Climate Protection Campaign, California Housing Partnership Corporation, and the Community Environmental Council (collectively, the Joint Parties), Noble Americas Energy Solutions, LLC (Noble Americas), the Joint Utilities, PacifiCorp, the Solar Energy Industries Association (SEIA)(formerly the Solar Alliance).</p>		Verified
<p>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</p> <p>TURN coordinated with DRA and other parties to the extent practicable. Specifically, TURN held direct meetings with DRA, the National Consumer Law Center, PG&E, SCE, Greenlining, Sempra, and the Joint Environmental Parties. TURN engaged these parties in an effort to determine whether shared positions could be reached. A substantial number of hours were spent meeting with various parties for the express purpose of coordination. These hours are given the “Coordination” code in the hourly timesheets.</p> <p>Since TURN held a set of unique positions, it was not possible to find uniform agreement with any other party. TURN vigorously opposed efforts by environmental organizations, clean energy advocates and DRA to allocate any GHG allowance revenues to purposes other than bill credits. Moreover, TURN opposed DRA’s proposal for providing any refunds through an off-bill credit mechanism. TURN also opposed the efforts of PG&E, SCE and SDG&E</p>		Verified

¹ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources) which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>to prevent any GHG revenues from being credited to CARE customers or non-CARE residential customers who do not have consumption in the upper rate tiers.</p> <p>TURN focused exclusively on proposals to return all funds to customers and a mechanism for returning revenues to residential customers including those without usage above 130% of baseline. TURN did not address a variety of other issues in this proceeding and thereby deferred to the efforts of DRA and other customer representatives on those subjects. As a result, TURN was able to make a substantial contribution with a modest involvement in the proceeding. Had TURN attempted to engage in a broader set of issues, and undertook greater efforts to actively coordinate with other parties, the amount of total hours would have been significantly larger. TURN therefore asserts that its participation in this proceeding prevented duplication and limited the number of hours sought for compensation.</p>	
---	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

<p>Concise explanation as to how the cost of claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)</p>	<p>CPUC Verified</p>
<p>As demonstrated in the substantial contribution section, TURN’s participation ensured that all GHG allowance revenues are being credited back to customers rather than being diverted to other public goods program efforts. This result means that 100% of allowance revenues (estimated to range between \$5.7 and \$22.6 billion between 2013 and 2020) will be used as an offset to rates otherwise charged to customers. TURN’s successful opposition to any alternative use of these funds results in maximum financial returns for all customers and particularly for residential customers.</p> <p>In addition, TURN successfully recommended that bill credits be provided to lower usage non-CARE residential customers and to CARE customers. These credits, offered in the form of a “climate dividend”, will provide substantial financial benefits to lower-income families struggling with increased economic burdens due to climate change regulations.</p> <p>Taken together, the demonstrable financial benefits obtained by TURN for residential customers, and particularly low-income customers, far exceed (by orders of magnitude) the cost of TURN’s participation in the proceeding. TURN’s claim should be found to be reasonable.</p>	<p>We agree with the benefits to ratepayers that TURN lists here.</p> <p>After some minor disallowances to this claim, the remainder of TURN’s hours and costs are reasonable and warrant compensation.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>TURN assigned a number of attorneys to work on various pieces of this proceeding. Staff Attorney Marybelle Ang was the original lead attorney</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>on the case with Staff Attorney Marcel Hawiger serving as the backup attorney working jointly with Ms. Ang to develop TURN’s positions. When Ms. Ang left TURN for maternity leave at the end of 2011, Matt Freedman became the lead attorney with Mr. Hawiger continuing to work jointly on the development of positions and reviewing TURN’s pleadings. At the end of 2012, Staff Attorney Nina Suetake took over as the lead in tandem with assuming other responsibilities for TURN related to Greenhouse Gas Emissions policy. TURN consultants Bill Marcus and Jeff Nahigian provided advice on allocation and rate design elements of TURN’s proposal.</p> <p>TURN attorneys worked on distinct issues, to the extent practicable, but also worked together to develop the overall positions incorporated into pleadings. It was, however, necessary to involve numerous TURN attorneys because this proceeding involved cross-cutting issues that relate to rate design, cost allocation, concerns about low-income customer impacts, research and development programs, energy efficiency and renewable energy. No single attorney at TURN has sufficient expertise to address this entire suite of issues. Moreover, it is critical that the positions taken in this proceeding are consistent with those articulated in other ongoing cases.</p> <p>The number of hours devoted to this proceeding reflects the need to review voluminous pleadings submitted by an extremely large number of active parties. Some of the filings included extremely substantive proposals and detailed attachments. As a result, TURN attorneys were required to spend a substantial number of hours reviewing these proposals – more than would occur in a typical proceeding. These hours have been recorded as “GP” (General Preparation) because they were necessary to participate effectively in the case and did not vary based on positions advocated by TURN.</p> <p>Finally, some of the issues presented in this case were new and involved review of basic information about the cap-and-trade program administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). In order to effectively participate in this proceeding, TURN attorneys needed to become more familiar with the CARB program. These hours are recorded with the activity code “GHG” and reflect a unique need, in this case, to research the underlying programs that result in the allowance revenues at stake in this proceeding.</p> <p>Given the level of success achieved by TURN in this proceeding and the complexity (and variety) of issues at stake, the amount of time devoted by staff and consultants is fully reasonable.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>TURN has allocated all of our attorney and consultant time by issue area</p>	<p>Confirmed</p>

or activity, as evident on our attached timesheets. The following codes relate to specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN. TURN also provides an approximate breakdown of the number of hours spent on each task and the percentage of total hours devoted to each category (note that the numbers do not equal 100% due to rounding).

General Participation (GP) – 52 hours – 30% of total

General Participation work essential to participation that typically spans multiple issues and/or would not vary with the number of issues that TURN addresses. This includes reading the initial application, drafting of a protest, reviewing Commission rulings, case management tasks, participating in prehearing conferences, attending workshops, and reviewing pleadings submitted by other parties. The relatively large number of GP hours in this case reflects the need to review a large volume of pleadings submitted by an extraordinary number of active parties.

Greenhouse Gas Policy (GHG) – 18 hours – 11% of total

Includes time spent on reviewing state policy on Greenhouse Gas emissions, the cap-and-trade program administered by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), CPUC policies relating to the regulation of GHGs, and legal challenges to the CARB cap-and-trade program.

Rate credits (Rate) – 30 hours – 17% of total

Includes work on mechanisms for returning GHG revenues to residential customers through specific rate credits. This area includes TURN's proposal for returning some revenues to upper tier residential rates while preserving the carbon price signal.

Revenue Allocation (Alloc) – 44 hours – 26% of total

Includes work on the various proposals for allocating GHG allowance revenues amongst customer classes and proposals to divert some funds for research and development, energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

Coordination (Coord)– 13 hours – 8% of total

Time devoted to coordinating with other intervenors and utilities for the purpose of reducing duplication of effort and finding common support for specific proposals.

Low-income customer impacts (Lowinc) – 14 hours – 8% of total

Includes work to establish the need for additional financial support to low-income customers given the economic impacts of GHG regulation in support of TURN's proposal for rate credits to CARE customers and non-CARE customers without usage in the upper rate tiers.

Compensation – 12 hours

Time spent on the notice of intent to claim compensation and the preparation of this compensation request.

----- TURN attorneys used “#” to describe time devoted to a mix of issues with 40% of the hours allocated to Rate Credits, 40% allocated to Revenue Allocation, and 20% allocated to Low Income Customer Impacts. These hours have been incorporated to the totals listed above.	
---	--

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Marybelle Ang	2011	103.20	\$280	D.11-06-012	\$28,896	2011	103.2	\$280	\$28,896
Marcel Hawiger	2011	20	\$350	D.11-09-037	\$7,000	2011	20	\$350	\$7,000
Marcel Hawiger	2012	6.24	\$375	D.13-08-022	\$2,344	2012	6.25 ²	\$375	\$2,343.75
Matthew Freedman	2011	1.25	\$350	D.12-07-019	\$438	2011	1.25	\$350	\$437.50
Matthew Freedman	2012	21	\$360	D.13-10-037	\$7,560	2012	21	\$370	\$7,770
Nina Suetake	2012	16.5	\$315	D.13-08-028	\$5,198	2012	16.5	\$315	\$5,197.50
Tom Long	2011	1.0	\$520	D.13-05-007	\$520	2011	1.0	\$520	\$520
<i>Subtotal:</i>					\$51,955	<i>Subtotal:</i>			\$52,164.75
EXPERT FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Jeff Nahigian	2011	0.75	\$190	D.12-06-036	\$143	2011	0.75	\$190	\$142.50
William Marcus	2011	0.75	\$250	D.10-11-032	\$188	2011	0.75	\$250	\$187.50
<i>Subtotal:</i>					\$330	<i>Subtotal:</i>			\$330
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Marybelle Ang	2011	2	\$140	D.11-06-012 (@50%)	\$280	2011	2	\$140	\$280

² Actual hours worked total 6.25. The math in the original claim matches this amount; it is assumed that 6.24 is a typographical error.

Matthew Freedman	2013	10	\$180	See comment #1 (@ 50% of 2012 rate)	\$1,800	2013	10	\$185	\$1850
<i>Subtotal:</i>					\$2,080	<i>Subtotal:</i>			\$2,130
COSTS									
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount			
	Photocopies	Pleadings			\$19.80				\$19.80
	Postage	For pleadings filed with CPUC			\$13.14				\$13.14
<i>Subtotal:</i>					\$32.94	<i>Subtotal:</i>			\$32.94
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$54,398	TOTAL AWARD \$:			\$53,565³ ₄
<p>*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 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.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>									

³ Although TURN provides explanation as to the hours spent on general preparation, and the scope and breadth of this proceeding is cross-cutting and complex, some hours spent on preparation are excessive. Therefore, the total amount claimed for attorney/expert fees is reduced by 2%. Please see the Comments section below for a more detailed explanation. The total before the 2% reduction is \$54,657.69. The 2% reduction results in the total of \$53,564.54. The actual deduction from TURN's original request is 1.54% as a result of Matthew Freidman's updated 2012 hourly rate of \$370, approved in D.13-10-037.

⁴ Rounded to the nearest whole number.

C. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:

#	Reason
Disallowance for Excessive Hours	Although TURN provides explanation as to the hours spent on general preparation, and the scope and breadth of this proceeding is cross-cutting and complex, some hours spent on preparation are excessive, especially given the depth and scope of TURN's participation in the proceeding as compared to other parties. Therefore, total hours are reduced by 2%. At the same time, the Commission appreciates the efficient organization of the claim (e.g., allocation of hours by issue) and coding to facilitate easier interpretation and evaluation of time spent on specific activities.
Adopted Hourly Rates	TURN requests adjusted hourly rates for Marcel Hawiger, Matthew Freedman, Nina Suetake, and Tom Long. All of these requests have been previously approved in other Commission decisions awarding compensation to TURN. The adopting decisions have been noted in the section entitled Basis for Rate. No further adjustments are needed here.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim (Y/N)?**

No

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (*see* Rule 14.6(2)(6)) (Y/N)?

Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to Decision 12-12-033.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network's representatives 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 contribution is \$53,565.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network is awarded \$ 53,565.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas and Electric Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network their representative shares of the award, based on their California jurisdictional gas and electric revenues for the 2011 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. 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 May 12, 2013, the 75th day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. Rulemaking 11-03-012 remains open.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1212033	
Proceeding(s):	R1103012	
Author:	Administrative Law Judge Melissa K. Semcer	
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas and Electric Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	Feb 26, 2013	\$54,398	\$53,565	No	Excessive hours in general preparation.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted¹
Marybelle	Ang	Attorney	TURN	280	2011	\$280
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	350	2011	\$350
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	375	2012	\$375
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	350	2011	\$350
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	360	2012	\$370
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	315	2012	\$315
Tom	Long	Attorney	TURN	520	2011	\$520
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	TURN	190	2011	\$190
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	250	2011	\$250

(END OF APPENDIX)

¹ All hourly fees adopted in other decisions.