

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902M), Southern California Edison Company (U338E), Southern California Gas Company (U904) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39M) for Authority to Establish a Wildfire Expense Balancing Account to Record for Future Recovery Wildfire-Related Costs.	Application 09-08-020 (Filed August 31, 2009)
---	--

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 12-12-029

Claimant: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 12-12-029
Claimed (\$): \$86,420.58	Awarded (\$): \$86,450.58
Assigned Commissioner: Mark J. Ferron, succeeding Timothy A. Simon	Assigned ALJ: Maribeth Bushey

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	Decision denies application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) to establish a Wildfire Expense Balancing Account (WEBA) to recover wildfire-related costs.
--	--

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 (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	September 14, 2012	Yes
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	N/A
3. Date NOI Filed:	October 14, 2010	Yes
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding	Application (A.) 09-08-020	Yes

number:		
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 7, 2012	Yes
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	N/A
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:	A.09-08-020	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 7, 2012	Yes
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	N/A
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.12-12-029	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 28, 2012	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	February 26, 2013	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).

Contribution	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>1. TURN opposed the application throughout this proceeding in its formal filings and other advocacy related documents as well as in pleadings filed in coordination with Safety and Enforcement Division (SED), ORA,¹ and Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA)/CforAT.</p> <p>The final decision agreed with TURN’s recommendations and denied the Applicants’ request for a WEBA.</p>	<p>Ex. 5, Testimony of William Marcus on the Joint Utility Application for Wildfire Balancing Expense Balancing Account (henceforth, “TURN Testimony”), p. 5. See Joint Opening Brief of Center for Accessible Technology, Consumer Protection and Safety Division, Division of Ratepayer Advocates, and The Utility Reform Network in Application (A.) 09-08-020.</p> <p>D.12-12-029, p. 19, OP 1.</p>	Yes

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), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>2. TURN argued throughout this proceeding that the Applicants did not meet their burden of proof in support of their request.</p> <p>The final decision agreed with TURN (and other consumer groups), stating, “Remaining applicants have not met their burden of demonstrating that they had addressed all factual and legal issues necessary to justify the proposed balancing account, and that the proposed rates would be just and reasonable.”</p>	<p>Joint Opening Brief of Center for Accessible Technology, Consumer Protection and Safety Division, Division of Ratepayer Advocate and The Utility Reform Network in A.09-08-020 (henceforth “Joint Opening Brief”), filed on March 3, 2011, pp. 5-10. Protest of The Utility Reform Network to the Joint Amended Application of Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company (henceforth “TURN Protest”), filed September 8, 2010, p. 2. TURN Testimony, p. 2. CforAT/TURN Joint Comments on the Proposed and Alternate Decisions, filed on November 5, 2012 at p. 1, fn. 5.</p> <p>D.12-12-029, pp. 16-17; <i>Id.</i> p. 18, COL 1.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3. TURN argued that the Applicants failed to show how existing ratemaking mechanisms were inadequate to address the costs of third party claims stemming from wildfires.</p> <p>The final decision agreed with TURN, stating, “SDG&E has available options for seeking Commission authorization to allocate uninsured wildfire costs to ratepayers. This fact substantially undermines the applicants’ claim of necessity for the proposed balancing account.”</p> <p>The final decision also found that “SDG&E admitted that other ratemaking mechanisms are available under which SDG&E may seek recovery of uninsured wildfire costs from ratepayers.”</p>	<p>TURN Protest, p. 2. Joint Opening Brief, pp. 8-10. CforAT/TURN Joint Comments on the Proposed and Alternate Decisions, p. 2. Notice of <i>Ex Parte</i> Communication of the Consumer Protection and Safety Division, The Utility Reform Network, and the Center for Accessible Technology (henceforth “March 2012 Ex Parte Notice), dated March 15, 2012, p. 1 and the accompanying handout.</p> <p>D.12-12-029, pp. 17; <i>Id.</i> p. 18, FOF 5.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4. TURN argued that the Applicants’ proposal would place virtually all the risk of wildfires on ratepayers.</p>	<p>TURN Testimony, pp. 2-3. Joint Opening Brief, pp. 10-18. Joint Reply Brief submitted by CforAT,</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>The final decision agreed, finding, “The amended application continues to provide for unlimited potential for uninsured wildfire costs to ratepayers.”</p>	<p>SED, ORA and TURN on March 9, 2012, pp. 3-5. Attachment to March 2012 Ex Parte Notice. D.12-12-029, p. 18, FOF 3.</p>	
<p>5. TURN opposed SDG&E’s request to include costs from the 2007 wildfires in the WEBA mechanism, which would have provided for the allocation of those costs to ratepayers in a virtually automatic fashion. TURN did not oppose providing an opportunity for the utility to seek recovery of unanticipated wildfire costs so long as parties would be able to conduct a reasonableness review.</p> <p>The final decision rejects the WEBA mechanism but allows the Applicants to maintain their Wildfire Expense Memorandum Accounts with the opportunity to seek future reasonableness review and disposition of recorded costs for the 2007 wildfires.</p>	<p>See e.g. Joint Reply Brief submitted by CforAT, SED, ORA and TURN on March 9, 2012, p. 5. See also Notice of <i>Ex Parte</i> Communication of the Consumer Protection and Safety Division, The Utility Reform Network, and the Center for Accessible Technology, March 15, 2012, p. 1 and the accompanying handout. D.12-12-029, p. 19, OP 3.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<p>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: Consumer Protection and Safety Division, Disability Rights Advocates/Center for Accessible Technology, Mussey Grade Road Alliance, Ruth Henricks, 2007 Fire Plaintiffs.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<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>In order to avoid duplication of effort, TURN worked closely in this proceeding with ORA, SED, and DisabRA/CforAT, as the four parties agreed on most issues. TURN and the other consumer advocates prepared joint filings, participated in joint <i>ex parte</i> meetings, and even coordinated their cross examination of witnesses. Each party contributed its own expertise and particular focus to the joint effort. For example,</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

<p>TURN often focused on legal and ratemaking issues such as the burden of proof and scope of advice letter rulings while SED and DisabRA/CforAT focused on safety and impacts on ratepayers as a whole and on specific, higher risk ratepayer groups.</p> <p>Mussey Grade Road Alliance, while addressing the overall reasonableness of the Applicants’ request, primarily focused its efforts on the more technical issue of fire frequency and the likelihood and prevention of fire risk as well as the issue of preventing moral hazard in utility decision making.</p> <p>Intervenor Ruth Henricks, also a ratepayer advocate, focused primarily on the 2007 fire costs and the potential total costs from the 2007 fires that the would be included in the WEBA mechanism.</p>	
---	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

<p>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation:</p> <p>It is difficult to assign a specific dollar figure to the value of TURN’s participation because the application primarily dealt with a cost recovery mechanism rather than specific dollar figures. However, had the Applicants’ request been granted, ratepayers would have been at risk for unlimited costs stemming from wildfire related claims, which, by the utilities’ own admission, could total billions of dollars. The final decision agreed with TURN and the other intervenors that the utilities had not met their burden of proving the reasonableness of their request and declined to place this risk on ratepayers through the WEBA mechanism. The cost of TURN’s participation is minimal compared to the potential exposure ratepayers would have faced had the WEBA mechanism been authorized, and TURN limited its participation where possible through collaboration with other parties.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CPUC Verified</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Verified</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>The hours claimed by TURN are reasonable given the procedural complexities that arose during the course of the proceeding, which differed from a typical Commission proceeding. This proceeding included an application, an amended application, and an updated application for SDG&E and SoCalGas only, an Order to Show Cause, lengthy settlement attempts, various written motions from parties which required responses, modifications to the procedural schedule (including a request for a potential second phase of the proceeding), evidentiary hearings, public participation hearings, intense ex parte activity by many parties, and comments on a proposed decision and an alternate proposed decision. Due to the controversial nature of this proceeding, TURN actively participated on all these issues and activities.</p> <p>TURN Attorneys</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Verified</p>

Robert Finkelstein: As a senior TURN attorney, Mr. Finkelstein assisted Nina Suetake in crafting TURN's litigation position and strategy in this proceeding. Finkelstein also provided specific assistance on the relationship between the requested WEBA mechanism and the hazardous waste clean-up program cost allocation, which WEBA had been compared to, because Finkelstein had been TURN's attorney on the hazardous waste clean-up program proceeding. Finkelstein also provided input on the legal issues of burden of proof and production.

Marcel Hawiger: Mr. Hawiger was the original TURN attorney assigned to this proceeding and he was responsible for the initial review of the application and testimony and internal assessment of TURN's participation in the proceeding. Due to shifting workload responsibilities, TURN attorney, Ms. Suetake, assumed responsibility for this proceeding, and Hawiger no longer handled any aspect of the proceeding.

Tom Long: As TURN's new legal director, Mr. Long's very minimal hours reflect time spent being brought up to speed regarding TURN's litigation position in this proceeding. Long also provided specific assistance to Suetake regarding TURN's motion to lift stay and also on a potential records request by another party.

Nina Suetake: Suetake acted as TURN's lead attorney after assuming responsibility from Hawiger. Suetake's hours reflect the relative complexity of this proceeding and include time spent reviewing the original and amended testimony, participating in lengthy settlement discussions, preparing for and participating in evidentiary hearings, participating in several all-party meetings with Commissioners, dealing with various, atypical procedural issues (Order to Show Cause, ALJ stay, motion to lift stay, request for second phase, withdrawal of SCE and PG&E, etc.), crafting joint strategy with other intervenors, drafting and editing opening and reply briefs as well as comments and reply comments on the proposed decision (PD) and alternate PD, and participating in and dealing with extensive ex parte activity by most parties.

JBS Energy

William Marcus: Mr. Marcus acted as TURN's expert witness in this proceeding and his testimony focused on policies concerns about and unreasonableness of the Applicant's request. Marcus' participation in this proceeding was very limited, and this fact is reflected in the very modest number of hours recorded for Marcus.

TURN submits that the recorded hours are reasonable, both for each TURN staff member and expert witness and in the aggregate. Therefore, TURN seeks compensation for all of the hours recorded by our staff members and outside consultant as included in this request.

<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>(GP) General participation: Time spent on activities necessary to participate in the docket that typically do not vary by the number of issues addressed. Due to the complexity and length of this proceeding, Suetake devoted a higher than typical number of hours to activities which are deemed GP. Activities included in this category are the initial review of the application and testimony, reading Commissioner and ALJ Rulings, reading other party pleadings, reading and responding to extensive emails from other parties and the ALJ, dealing with voluminous ex parte notices, scheduling and attending ex parte meetings, and reading and commenting on the PD and APD.</p> <p>(Proc) Procedural: As noted above, this proceeding included extensive law and motion practice that is not typical in a Commission proceeding. Entries coded with Proc reflect time spent reading and commenting on other party motions as well as time spent drafting motions, usually with other parties.</p> <p>(Sett) Settlement: Parties were directed by the Commission to attempt to reach a negotiated settlement and entries coded Sett represent time spent on activities necessary to negotiate a multi-party settlement including coordinating schedules for settlement meetings, discussing specific substantive settlement issues with TURN consultants and other consumer advocates, participating in settlement negotiations, and discussing proposed settlement terms with other parties, and reviewing and drafting settlement terms.</p> <p>(GH) General Hearing: Time spent on activities necessary to prepare and participate in hearings (including the prehearing conference) that are not issue specific.</p> <p>(BP) Burden of Proof: Time spent on the substantive issue of burden of proof and the Applicants’ inability to meet their burden of proof. This category includes the related sub-issues of necessity of the request, availability of other ratemaking mechanisms, and the availability of insurance.</p> <p>(Reas) Reasonableness: Time spent on the issue of the reasonableness of the Applicants’ request. This category includes the related sub-issues of the potential cost to ratepayers (affordability), lack of reasonableness review, impact on public safety, potential for ratepayer coverage of negligent and criminal activity, and inflexibility of the WEBA mechanism.</p> <p># - Time entries that cover substantive issue work that cannot easily be</p>	<p>Verified</p>
---	------------------------

identified with a specific activity code. In most cases, hours were difficult to separate into specific substantive areas due to TURN's close coordination with other parties. Time spent discussing issues in all party meetings and ex parte meetings were coded as # because the discussions covered a wide range of topics within the two main issue areas. TURN requests compensation for all of the time included in this request for compensation, and therefore does not believe allocation of the time associated with these entries is necessary. However, if such allocation needs to occur, TURN proposes that the Commission allocate these entries in equal 50% shares to the broader issue-specific categories, BP and Reas.

Comp – Time devoted to compensation-related pleadings.

Travel – Time devoted to travel related exclusively to work in this proceeding.

TURN submits that under the circumstances this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission's rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein	2009	1.75	\$470	D.09-10-051, p. 20	\$822.50	1.75	\$470	\$822.50
Robert Finkelstein	2010	6.25	\$470	D.10-09-042	\$2,937.50	6.25	\$470	\$2,937.50
Robert Finkelstein	2011	1.5	\$470	D.12-03-024, p. 13.	\$705.00	1.5	\$470	\$705.00
Robert Finkelstein	2012	1	\$480	Res. ALJ-281	\$480.00	1	\$480	\$480.00
Marcel Hawiger	2009	4.75	\$325	D.10-04-050, p. 7	\$1,543.75	4.75	\$325	\$1,543.75
Marcel Hawiger	2010	0.5	\$350	D.11-09-037	\$175.00	0.5	\$350	\$175.00
Tom Long	2011	0.5	\$520	Request pending in A.09-10-013, <i>see</i> Comment 1	\$260.00	0.5	\$520	\$260.00
Tom Long	2012	0.75	\$530	Res. ALJ-281; D.13-05-007	\$397.50	0.75	\$530	\$397.50
Nina Suetake	2009	3	\$280	D.10-11-032	\$840.00	3	\$280	\$840.00

Nina Suetake	2010	78.25	\$280	D.11-05-044	\$21,910.00	77.5 ²	\$280	\$21,700.00
Nina Suetake	2011	53.75	\$295	D12-05-033, p. 8.	15,856.25	53.75	\$295	\$15,856.25
Nina Suetake	2012	114.5	\$315	Request pending in A.10-11-015, <i>see</i> Comment 1	\$36,067.50	114.5	\$315	\$36,067.50
William Marcus	2010	1.08	\$250	D.12-03-024	\$270.00	1.08	\$250	\$270.00
William Marcus	2011	5.25	\$250	D.12-03-024	\$1,312.50	5.25	\$250	\$1,312.50
Subtotal:					83,577.50	Subtotal:		\$83,367.50
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hou rs	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Nina Suetake	2012	3	\$157.50	1/2 2012 hourly rate	\$472.50	3.0	\$157.5	\$472.50
Subtotal:					\$472.50	Subtotal:		\$472.50
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hou rs	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Nina Suetake	2010	0.75	140	1/2 2010 hourly rate	\$105.00	0.75	\$140	\$105.00
Nina Suetake	2013	12	\$157.5	1/2 2012 hourly rate, <i>but see</i> Comment 2	\$1,890.00	12	\$160 ³	\$1,920.00
Subtotal:					\$1,995.00	Subtotal:		\$2,025.00
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1	Photocopies	Copies for testimony, pleadings, hearing room exhibits, and other proceeding documents			\$49.20			\$49.20
2	Lexis Research	Computerized research			83.34			\$83.34
3	Telecommunications	Calls relating to work on A.09-08-020			42.72			\$42.72
4	Postage	Mailing costs for pleadings			23.72			\$23.72
5	Travel	Airplane fare for TURN attorney attending public participation hearing			386.60			\$386.60
Subtotal:					\$585.58	Subtotal:		\$585.58
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$86,420.58	TOTAL AWARD \$:		\$86,450.58

² This reduction is due to a discrepancy in TURN's submitted timesheets.

³ Application of Resolution ALJ-287 2.0% Cost-of-Living Adjustment.

*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.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁴	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Robert Finkelstein	June 13, 1990	146391	No
Marcel Hawiger	January 23, 1998	194244	No
Thomas (Tom) Long	December 11, 1986	124776	No
Nina Suetake	December 14, 2004	234769	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment #1	Certificate of Service
Attachment #2	TURN's hours related to D.12-12-029
Attachment #3	TURN's expenses related to D.12-12-029
Attachment #4	TURN hours allocated by issue
Comment 1	<p>TURN generally seeks hourly rates for its staff attorneys at levels that the Commission has previously adopted for each individual's work in a given year, or at an increased level for 2012 consistent with Resolution ALJ-281. The following describes the basis for the requested rates that have not been previously awarded as of the date of this Request for Compensation.</p> <p><u>Nina Suetake</u>: TURN previously requested an increase to Suetake's hourly rate for work in 2012 in its compensation request in A.10-11-015 but the request is still pending. TURN anticipates a decision on that request issuing before a decision on the instant request, and that the hourly rate adopted in the earlier decision would establish the hourly rate for Suetake's work in 2012 here. For Suetake's work in 2012, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$315, an increase of 7.2% from the previously awarded rate of \$295 for 2011. The increase is the general 2.2% increase provided for in Res. ALJ-281, plus the second of two 5% step increases available with her move in 2009 to the 5-7 years experience tier.</p> <p><u>Thomas Long</u>: Long rejoined TURN's staff in 2011, and the Commission has not yet established a 2011 hourly rate for his work. TURN's request for a \$520 hourly rate for Long's work in 2011 was first presented and fully justified in its Request for Compensation filed in A.09-10-013 on February 17, 2012. TURN anticipates a decision on that request issuing</p>

⁴ This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

	<p>before a decision on the instant request, and that the hourly rate adopted in the earlier decision would establish the hourly rate for Long's work in 2011 here. Should the Commission wish to have the full justification for the requested rate here, TURN would be glad to provide it and would ask for an opportunity to file and serve a supplement or amendment to this Request for Compensation for that purpose.</p> <p>TURN also requests an hourly rate of \$530 for Long's work in 2012. This increase is the general 2.2% increase over 2011 rates provided for in Res. ALJ-281.</p>
Comment #2	<p><u>Compensation related hours:</u> TURN requests that the Commission apply the requested 2012 hourly rate for Suetake to the hours related to developing and drafting this compensation request due to the relatively few numbers of hours in 2013. TURN reserves the right to request an hourly rate increase for Suetake's work in 2013 for other proceedings at a later date if such an increase is applicable.</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:

#	Reason
1. Increase in 2013 hourly rates.	Abiding by Resolution ALJ-287, 2013 hourly rates have been raised to reflect the 2.0% Cost-of-Living Adjustment adopted by the resolution. The increase in Nina Suetake's 2013 hourly rate will not preclude TURN from requesting a step-increase for Suetake's 2013 hourly rate in future proceedings.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.12-12-029.
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 are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable contribution is \$86,450.58.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network is awarded \$86,450.58.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network their respective shares of the award, based on their California jurisdictional gas and electric revenues for the 2010 calendar year, reflecting the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning May 12, 2013, 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 waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1212029		
Proceeding(s):	A0908020		
Author:	ALJ Maribeth Bushey		
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	2/26/13	\$86,420.58	\$86,450.58	No	Resolution ALJ-287.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$470	2009	\$470
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$470	2010	\$470
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$470	2011	\$470
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$480	2012	\$480
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	\$325	2009	\$325
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	\$350	2010	\$350
Tom	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$520	2011	\$520
Tom	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$530	2012	\$530
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	\$280	2009	\$280
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	\$280	2010	\$280
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	\$295	2011	\$295
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	\$315	2012	\$315
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	\$315/\$157.50	2013	\$320/\$160
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$250	2010	\$250
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$250	2011	\$250

(END OF APPENDIX)