

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ KIM** (Mailed 1/28/2014)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of its 2012-2014 California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Energy Savings Assistance Programs and Budgets.	Application 11-05-017 (Filed May 16, 2011)
And Related Matters.	Application 11-05-018 Application 11-05-019 Application 11-05-020

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE FOR
 SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 12-08-044**

Claimant: The Greenlining Institute (Greenlining)	For contribution to Decision 12-08-044
Claimed (\$): \$96,375.25	Awarded (\$): \$44,602.50 (reduced 54%)
Assigned Commissioner: Catherine J.K. Sandoval	Assigned ALJ: Kimberly Kim

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	Decision (D.) 12-08-044 approves the programs and budgets for the Energy Savings Assistance (ESA) and California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) Programs for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), (collectively IOUs or Utilities) for the 2012-2014 program cycle.
--	--

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	August 8, 2011	Correct
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	n/a	n/a
3. Date NOI Filed:	September 7, 2011	Correct
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Rulemaking (R.) 10-02-005	Correct
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 29, 2010	Correct
7. Based on another CPUC determination:		
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:	R.08-12-009	Correct
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 29, 2010	Correct
11. Based on another CPUC determination:		
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.12-08-044	Correct
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	August 30, 2012	Correct
15. File date of compensation request:	October 29, 2012	Correct
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Claimant’s description of its contribution to the final decision

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record (Provided by Claimant)	Showing Accepted by CPUC
A. Energy Savings Assistance Program (ESAP) Willingness to		Yes

<p>Participate</p> <p>Greenlining contested all four IOUs' proposals to increase the estimate of customers unwilling or unable to participate in ESAP.</p> <p>D.12-08-004 rejected the IOUs proposed increases of the unwillingness factor and required that the current 5% factor be used for 2012-14.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining presented evidence that there was extremely variable data regarding customers "unwilling or unable to participate.</p> <p>D.12-08-004 found the IOU's data on unwillingness to be inadequate, and ordered better tracking for 2012-14. It also ordered, as part of a larger low-income needs assessment (discussed below), a determination of how many customers are unwilling to participate, and why.</p>	<p>(Protest of Greenlining of the Application of PG&E (PG&E Protest), p. 3; Protest of Greenlining of the Application of SDG&E (SDG&E Protest), p. 2; Protest of Greenlining of the Application of SoCalGas (SoCalGas), p. 2; Response of Greenlining to the Application of SCE (SCE Response), p. 2 (all filed on 6/20/11).</p> <p>Prepared Testimony of Enrique Gallardo (Gallardo Testimony), pp. 1-5 (served on 11/18/11, moved into evidence 12/30/11).</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 2-9 (filed on 2/2/11).</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 262, 264-265; FOF ## 154-157, COL ## 150-152, Order ## 114-116.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Gallardo Testimony, pp. 2-4; Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 3-5.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 258, 264-265; FOF ## 155-157, COL ## 150-151, Order # 114 Order ## 108(a), 109(c).</p>	
<p>B. ESAP Workforce Issues</p> <p>Greenlining argued that data collection and proactive planning are necessary to meet California's workforce needs. Greenlining argued that in order to</p>	<p>Opening Comments (May 24, 2012) on Proposed Decision (PD) at 1, 12-15; Reply Comments at 4-5.</p>	<p>No. Supporting the PD is not a substantial contribution.</p>

<p>fulfill the goals of the Energy Efficiency Strategic plan, the Commission must collect comprehensive workforce data, including demographic data, on a regular, ongoing basis. Greenlining also argued that the quality of ESA program delivery is directly related to the quality of investments made in the ESA workforce.</p> <p>Greenlining recommended targeted hiring policies to stimulate recruitment and employment of workers from disadvantaged communities. We recommended that the Workforce Education and Training (WE&T) working groups be a collaborative effort with input from a diverse group of stakeholders, including those with expertise in workforce development. Greenlining recommended that the Commission take concrete steps to link ESAP WE&T efforts with the mainstream EE programs in order to create career pipelines to increasingly higher-road jobs.</p> <p>The Decision embraced a “high-road” vision for the ESA program and provided initial guidance on steps taken toward that end. The Decision agrees that workforce data is necessary to effectively manage the needs of the ESAP workforce and the quality of its work.</p> <p>The decision agrees that the IOUs should proactively collect, review, and act on workforce data, including demographic data, to manage current and future workforce needs.</p> <p>The Decision found that there is a</p>	<p>D.12-08-044 at 178; FOF 93.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 at 178-9; COL 88, 91-96; OP 8, 9.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 at 179; FOF 97; COL 90.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 at 179, 180; Conclusion of Law 89, 91.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>nexus between quality of program delivery and workforce investments.</p> <p>The Decision prioritizes job creation for disadvantaged workers and alignment between ESAP and statewide WE&T efforts.</p>		
<p>C. CARE Categorical Enrollment</p> <p>Greenlining opposed the IOUs’ proposals to eliminate or greatly diminish Categorical Enrollment by requiring income documentation of categorically enrolled customers; demonstrated that the only evidence in the proceeding shows only a small percentage of categorically enrolled customers have incomes above eligibility guidelines.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 retained Categorical Enrollment, with some modifications.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining concurs with some IOUs proposals to examine eligibility requirements of public benefits programs and consider removal from Categorical Enrollment process through workshops</p> <p>D.12-08-044 ordered an examination of</p>	<p>PG&E Protest, p. 3; SDG&E Protest, pp. 1-2; SoCalGas Protest, pp. 1-2; SCE Protest, pp. 1-2.</p> <p>Gallardo Testimony, p. 6 (adopting by reference DRA Testimony on Categorical Enrollment.</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 9-15.</p> <p>Greenlining’s Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision (“Comments on PD”), pp. 1-7. (filed on 05/24/12)</p> <p>Greenlining’s Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision (“Reply Comments on PD”), pp. 1-3. (filed on 05/30/12)</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>Ex parte letters to Commissioners on 06/04/12, 08/21/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 206-213, FOF # 117, 123; COL ## 17, 21, Order # 88.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 9-10.</p> <p>Comments on PD, pp. 7-8.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 212-213, COL 22,</p>	<p>Yes, noting that this is partly duplicative of ORA.</p>

<p>public benefits programs via advice letter to determine whether any should be removed from Categorical Enrollment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining urged retention of 90% CARE enrollment goal; emphasized Categorical Enrollment as a means of efficiently achieving high CARE enrollment.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 retained the 90% CARE penetration goal, and retained Categorical Enrollment.</p>	<p>Order 88.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 11-14.</p> <p>Comments on PD, p. 1.</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>Ex parte letters to Commissioners on 06/04/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 15, 23, 186, 210-211, FOF# 117, 123; COL ## 17, 21.</p>	
<p>D. CARE Verification Processes</p> <p>Greenlining opposes IOUs proposals for 100% income verification; also opposes Proposed Decision’s proposal for annual income verification of up to 25% of all CARE customers.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 declined to adopt either the 100% or the 25% verification proposals, and ordered additional program controls to ensure that only eligible customers are enrolled.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining discusses administrative costs of high percentage of verifications; favors targeted verifications.</p>	<p>Comments on PD, pp. 3-6.</p> <p>Reply Comments on PD, pp. 1-3.</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>Ex parte letters to Commissioners on 06/04/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 211-17, FOF# 124, COL ## 17, 21.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 11-13.</p> <p>Comments on PD, pp. 3-4.</p> <p>Reply Comments on PD, pp. 1-3.</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12,</p>	<p>Yes, noting this is substantially similar to C.</p>

<p>D.12-08-044 ordered a probability-based process for targeted verification.</p>	<p>05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>Ex parte letters to Commissioners on 06/04/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 209-216, FOF## 123-127, COL ## 22-24, Order ## 89-95.</p>	
<p>E. CARE Recertification Processes</p> <p>Greenlining opposes IOUs and Proposed Decision’s proposal to require income documentation of all customers; emphasizes the administrative costs and removal of large numbers of eligible customers.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 ordered a probability based process for targeting income verification efforts, instead of requiring documentation from all recertifying customers.</p>	<p>Comments on PD, pp. 1-2, 5-6.</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>Ex parte letters to Commissioners on 06/04/12, 8/21/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 209-216, FOF## 123-127, COL ## 22-24, Order ## 89-95.</p>	<p>Yes, noting this is substantially similar to C and D.</p>
<p>F. CARE Audit of High Users</p> <p>Greenlining supports the process of auditing CARE customers with extremely high usage (for all utilities), as long as there are protections against removal of eligible customers.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 adopted a process for auditing CARE customers with extremely high usage, and implemented several protections against removal of legitimately eligible customers.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining urges proper notice to affected customers, including languages other than English.</p>	<p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 14-17.</p> <p>Reply Brief of Greenlining, p. 4.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 218-221, Order # 101.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 16-17.</p> <p>Comments on PD, pp. 8-9.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

<p>D.12-08-044 states that notice should be accessible to persons with limited English proficiency wherever possible.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining urges that CARE customers with usage above 600% of baseline be required to participate in ESAP and go through a well-organized income verification process.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 requires customers with usage over 600% of baseline to undergo income verification and apply for ESAP within 45 days of notice.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining urges that CARE customers with usage above 600% of baseline be provided an appeals process prior to removal from the program.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 ordered the IOUs to develop an expedited appeals process so that customers who believe they have been wrongly removed from the program can demonstrate that their usage is necessary, basic, and legitimate household usage.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Greenlining urges that CARE customers with usage above 600% of baseline have 180 days to lower their usage; opposes the Proposed Decision’s reduction of this time to 60 days.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 granted these customers 90 days to lower their usage or be</p>	<p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, p. 221, Order # 101(a).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 14-15.</p> <p>Reply Brief of Greenlining, pp. 3-4.</p> <p>Comments on PD, p. 9.</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 219-220, Order # 101(a).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 15-16.</p> <p>Reply Brief of Greenlining, p. 3.</p> <p>Comments on PD, p. 10.</p> <p>Ex parte meetings/calls on 05/29/12, 05/30/12, 06/18/12, 06/28, 07/31/12, 08/16/12, 08/17/12.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, p. 220, Order # 101(b).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">***</p> <p>Comments on PD, pp. 9-10.</p> <p>Reply Comments on PD, p. 3.</p>	
---	--	--

de-enrolled from the program.	D.12-08-044, p. 219; Order # 101(a).	
<p>G. Low-Income Needs Assessment</p> <p>Greenlining urges the ordering of a new low-income needs assessment; points out that the last one was conducted several years ago.</p> <p>D.12-08-044 determined that a new needs assessment should be conducted between 2012 and 2014, and set forth parameters for the assessment.</p>	<p>Reply Brief of Greenlining, pp. 0-2. Comments on PD, p. 7.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, pp. 256-259, FOF ## 151, 152, 158, COL# 147, Order # 107-109.</p>	Yes, noting that Greenlining's comments on this subject were late in the proceeding and simply support the comments of other parties.
<p>H. Low-Income Language Outreach</p> <p>Greenlining urges the addition of Tagalog as one of the languages for communication for low-income programs</p> <p>D.12-08-044 noted Greenlining's recommendation but did not address it.</p>	<p>Gallardo Testimony, pp. 6-7. Opening Brief of Greenlining, pp. 18-19.</p> <p>D.12-08-044, p. 188.</p>	No.

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)¹ a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to the Claimant's?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: DRA, The Utility Reform Network, Center for Accessible Technology, Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles (Joint Parties), Brightline Defense, Green for All.		Verified

¹ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<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>ESAP Willingness to Participate. Greenlining was the only party to oppose the IOUs’ proposal to increase the estimate of customers unwilling or unable to participate in ESAP and provided the most substantive treatment of this issue in testimony and briefing.</p> <p>ESAP Workforce Issues. Greenlining participated on a very limited basis on these issues, and in that participation complemented the work of others by refining the metrics the utilities would use to collect workforce data, for example.</p> <p>CARE Categorical Enrollment, Verification and Recertification Processes. Many parties opposed the IOU’s proposals regarding Categorical Eligibility. Throughout the proceeding, Greenlining coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication. Rather than file testimony regarding CARE enrollment issues, Greenlining signed onto DRA’s testimony. At the briefing stage and beyond, Greenlining provided unique perspectives on this issue, for example focusing on the statutory requirements of maintaining affordability.</p> <p>CARE Audit of High Users. Many parties commented on the proposal to audit high users. Throughout the proceeding, Greenlining coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication. Greenlining negotiated directly with PG&E to address some issues we thought were important, which were reflected in PG&E adopting certain positions in Reply Testimony and briefing. Rather than file testimony, Greenlining supported other testimony in this proceeding. At the briefing stage and beyond, Greenlining provided unique perspectives on this issue.</p> <p>Low-Income Needs Assessment. Greenlining supported other parties’ positions regarding the need for a new low-income needs assessment. Greenlining only incurred a small amount of time on this issue.</p> <p>Low-Income Language Outreach. Only Joint Parties also addressed this issue. Greenlining provided the most substantive contribution on this issue.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
---	------------------------

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
	X		The issue of CARE High Users and their likely ineligibility for CARE was first brought to light because of Greenlining’s work in the PG&E General Rate Case, Phase II – A.10-03-014 (<i>see</i> D.11-05-047, pp. 40-41).
		X	In support of its claimed substantial contributions, Greenlining refers to its opening brief as filed on 2/2/11. The correct filing date is 2/2/2012.
		X	While we appreciate Greenlining’s effort to coordinate, we do not fully agree that Greenlining “offered unique perspectives” on the enrollment, verification, recertification, and auditing issues (subjects C-F, above). Further,

		<p>Greenlining’s first and only comments on the need for a new low-income assessment (subject G, above) occurred late in the proceeding, as support for the position of other parties without advancing any new or materially different arguments.</p>
--	--	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

<p>a. Explanation by Claimant of how the cost of Claimant’s participation bore a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation:</p>	<p>CPUC Verified</p>
<p>The impact of Greenlining’s work was much greater than its cost.</p> <p>ESAP Issues</p> <p>If the IOUs were allowed to increase their estimate of customers unwilling or unable to participate in ESAP from 5% to 15% (or 19% for SoCalGas), they would treat approximately 100,000 less homes in the 2012-2014 cycle. (See D.12-08-044, pp. 30-31 (projecting treatment of 984,604 homes). These approximately 100,000 low-income customers receive valuable energy savings from ESAP. Greenlining’s intervention helped maintain approximately 20,000,000 kilowatt-hour and 1,500,000 therms in energy savings. (See <i>id.</i>, p. 30 for amount of savings from this number of homes).</p> <p>The Decision agreed with much of Greenlining’s arguments concerning the importance of collection, analysis and review of ESAP workforce data, including demographic data, to manage current and future workforce needs. This is a first step towards better management of the ESAP workforce. Thus, measurement of benefits is difficult at this time. Given the size of the customer base – low-income, small business customers, and disadvantaged workers – that stand to benefit from Greenlining’s advocacy in this proceeding, even if the benefit is only \$1 a year for each customer, the total benefits will vastly exceed Greenlining’s modest costs of participation.</p> <p>CARE Issues</p> <p>If the IOUs’ and the Proposed Decision’s proposals for requiring income documentation from a large proportion of Categorically Enrolled CARE customers were instituted, this would result in the de-enrollment of hundreds of thousands of CARE customers. The de-enrollment of CARE customers is expressed in D.12-08-044 as “subsidy savings.” (See <i>id.</i>, pp. 209-210). For example, increasing annual income verification to 25% of customers of just three IOUs (SCE, PG&E and SoCalGas) would result</p>	<p>Yes, with qualifications and adjustments as discussed in this decision.</p>

<p>in more than \$170 million in “subsidy savings”; this translates to the de-enrollment of hundreds of thousands of CARE customers. Greenlining’s intervention helped maintain these customers on the program.</p> <p>Such an increase in income verification would also increase administrative costs of the CARE program by almost \$10 million. Greenlining’s intervention helped keep administrative costs low while still maintaining high CARE enrollment.</p> <p>Greenlining first brought the issue of the likely ineligibility of CARE customers with excessive usage to light in the PG&E General Rate Case, Phase II – A.10-03-014. (See D.11-05-047, pp. 40-41) A small number of customers use \$84.5 million of CARE subsidies in PG&E’s service territory. Greenlining agreed with the need to audit these customers, require ESAP participation and remove those ineligible for CARE, while maintaining safeguard to protect legitimate customers.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>Greenlining narrowly focused on only a few issues of vital importance to its constituency, limiting its work and the resultant costs.</p> <p>One Greenlining staff person, Enrique Gallardo, performed the great majority of Greenlining’s work on issues involving CARE, as well as one issue involving the estimate of customers unwilling or unable to participate in ESAP. Thus, his work was streamlined and efficient, with little overlap in work performed internally. Stephanie Chen, Senior Legal Counsel, performed management functions and strategic coordination on CARE issues, and also participated in an All-Party Meeting in this proceeding, as Mr. Gallardo was unavailable.</p> <p>Greenlining’s work on ESAP Workforce issues was also efficiently performed by two staff person’s with expertise on workforce issues, Vien Truong and Ryan Young. Ryan Young, functioning as a junior attorney, was largely responsible for substantive research, the drafting of comments, and review of other parties’ comments. Vien Truong, functioning as a managing attorney, was largely responsible for management functions and strategic direction, review of comments, coordination between other parties and participating in ex parte meetings. There was little overlap in the work performed by these two staff persons.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue Greenlining’s time is allocated by issue category as follows:</p>	<p>We note that this table contains an arithmetic error: the percentages</p>

A. ESAP Willingness to Participate	19.51%	listed by issue sum to 139.8%, not 100% as shown.
B. ESAP Workforce Issues	2.12%	
C. CARE Categorical Enrollment	22.72%	
D. CARE Verification Processes	17.04%	
E. CARE Recertification Processes	14.63%	
F. CARE Audit of High Users	22.20%	
G. Low-Income Needs Assessment	1.78%	
H. Low-Income Language Outreach	5.22%	
I. General/Multiple Issues	34.54%	
Total	100%	

B. Specific Claim*:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY, EXPERT AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total
Enrique Gallardo	2011	107.6	\$370	D.12-04-043	\$39,812.00	2011	53.9	\$370	\$19,943.00
Enrique Gallardo	2012	124.2	\$370	D.12-04-043	\$45,954.00	2012	58.6	\$380 ²	\$22,268.00
Stephanie Chen	2011	4.6	\$185	D.12-04-043	\$851.00	2011	2.5	\$185	\$462.50
Stephanie Chen	2012	7.2	\$185	D.12-04-043	\$1,332.00	2012	2.8	\$220 ³	\$616.00
Ryan Young	2011	4.5	\$190	See comment below	\$855.00	2011	1.1	\$160 ⁴	\$176.00
Ryan Young	2012	14.6	\$190	See comment below	\$2,774.00	2012	0.0	\$165 ⁵	\$0.00
Vien Truong	2012	18.4	\$220	See comment below	\$4,048.00	2012	1.2	\$205 ⁶	\$246.00

² See D.13-10-018.

³ See D.13-10-033.

⁴ See D.13-06-021.

⁵ See D.13-06-021.

⁶ See D.13-06-021.

					Subtotal:	\$95,626.00						Subtotal:	\$43,711.50
OTHER FEES													
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total				
[Person 1]			\$		\$			\$	\$				
[Person 2]													
					Subtotal:							Subtotal:	\$0
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **													
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total				
Stephanie Chen	2012	8.1	\$92.50	D.12-04-043	\$749.25	2012	8.1	\$110	\$891.00				
					Subtotal:	\$749.25						Subtotal:	\$891.00
COSTS													
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount							
					\$	\$							
					Subtotal:	\$						Subtotal:	\$0
					TOTAL REQUEST :	\$96,375.25						TOTAL AWARD :	\$44,602.50
<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 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.</p> <p>** Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate (the same applies to the travel time).</p>													
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR7			Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation						
Enrique Gallardo		December 9, 1997			191670		No						
Stephanie Chen		August 23, 2010			270917		No						
Ryan Young		December 16, 2010			274828		No						
Vien Truong		January 9, 2009			262017		No						

⁷ This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov>.

C. Additional Comments on Part III:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
III(B)	X		The rates requested here for Ryan Young and Vien Truong were first requested in our request for intervenor compensation in R.09-11-014, along with all necessary supporting information. No decision has been made in that proceeding to date, but we make the same request here.
Attachment A	X		Recorded Hours for Greenlining Attorneys
Attachment B	X		Justification for Rates Claimed for Ryan Young and Vien Truong

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:

#	Reason																				
1. Disallowance for duplication of efforts.	<p>In order to account for the limited nature of some of Greenlining’s contributions and duplication of other parties, we adjust the allowed hours in each issue area by these factors:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Issue Areas</th> <th>Contribution Factor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. ESAP Willingness to Participate</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. ESAP Workforce Issues</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. CARE Categorical Enrollment</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D. CARE Verification Processes</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E. CARE Recertification Processes</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F. CARE Audit of High Users</td> <td>0.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>G. Low-Income Need Assessment</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>H. Low-Income Language Outreach</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>I. General/Multiple Issues</td> <td>0.25</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue Areas	Contribution Factor	A. ESAP Willingness to Participate	1	B. ESAP Workforce Issues	0	C. CARE Categorical Enrollment	0.5	D. CARE Verification Processes	0.5	E. CARE Recertification Processes	0.5	F. CARE Audit of High Users	0.5	G. Low-Income Need Assessment	0.25	H. Low-Income Language Outreach	0	I. General/Multiple Issues	0.25
Issue Areas	Contribution Factor																				
A. ESAP Willingness to Participate	1																				
B. ESAP Workforce Issues	0																				
C. CARE Categorical Enrollment	0.5																				
D. CARE Verification Processes	0.5																				
E. CARE Recertification Processes	0.5																				
F. CARE Audit of High Users	0.5																				
G. Low-Income Need Assessment	0.25																				
H. Low-Income Language Outreach	0																				
I. General/Multiple Issues	0.25																				

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(c)(6)) (Y/N)?	No
---	----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition
Greenlining	Greenlining filed comment.	We do not believe any revision to the proposed decision is necessary.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Greenlining Institute has made a substantial contribution to D.12-08-044.
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 \$44,602.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Greenlining Institute is awarded \$44,602.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company shall pay The Greenlining Institute their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2011 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning January 12, 2013, the 75th day after the filing of The Greenlining Institute'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**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1208044	
Proceeding(s):	A1105017 et al.	
Author:	ALJ Kimberly Kim	
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas and Electric Company, and Southern California Gas Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Greenlining Institute	10/29/12	\$96,375.25	\$44,602.50	No	Duplication of efforts.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Enrique	Gallardo	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$370	2011	\$370
Enrique	Gallardo	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$370	2012	\$380
Stephanie	Chen	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$185	2011	\$185
Stephanie	Chen	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$185	2012	\$220
Ryan	Young	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$190	2011	\$160
Ryan	Young	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$190	2012	\$165
Vien	Truong	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$220	2012	\$205

(END OF APPENDIX)