

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues for Electric Service in 2012, And to Reflect That Increase In Rates.

Application 10-11-015
(Filed November 23, 2010)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 12-11-051**

Claimant: Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet)	For contribution to: Decision (D.) 12-11-051
Claimed (\$): 122,971.54	Awarded (\$): 99,140.96 (19.4% reduction)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: Melanie M. Darling

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- A. Brief Description of Decision:** D.12-11-051 resolves Southern California Company's (SCE) test year 2012 general rate case. The decision adopted a 2012 revenue requirement representing the reasonable costs of providing safe and reliable electrical service to SCE's customers in that year. The Commission reduced SCE's request for 2012 operations and maintenance (O&M) expenses by \$258 million, and reduced the request for 2010-2012 capital spending by \$756 million. The decision also adopts post-test year increases for 2013 and 2014.

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	January 31, 2011	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		

3. Date NOI Filed:	February 25, 2011	Verified
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:	Application (A.) 10-11-015	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 3, 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:	A.10-11-015	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 3, 2011	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:	D.12-11-051	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 10, 2012	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	December 11, 2012	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Claimant’s description of the 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
1. <u>General</u> . See comment at Box 11 below for separation of 76.3 hours of professional time into eight separate activities. Aglet asserts that all of the “General” activities were necessary for Aglet’s full participation in the proceeding.		Verified
2. <u>All Aglet issues</u> . All hours listed for “All Aglet issues” in Attachment 3 and Attachment 4 are allocated to Contributions #3 through #9 below. See comment at Box 11.		Aglet does not sufficiently reference an issue here where it substantially contributed to the decision. “All Aglet issues” is not an independent issue in this proceeding.
3. <u>Scale of request</u> . Aglet submitted testimony on the scale of SCE’s request, including evidence on inflation and the Commission’s history of requested and adopted revenue requirements for previous general rate cases. Aglet showed that approval of entire SCE showings is not the norm. Aglet contributed to the Commission’s discussion of regulatory policy.	Exhibit Aglet-1, at 2-5; Aglet opening brief, at 1-4; Aglet reply brief, at 1-2. Citing the ongoing economic recession, Aglet stated, “SCE should respond by tightening its belt and acting to keep already high rates under control.” (Exhibit Aglet-1, at 3.) Aglet argued, “In the instant proceeding, the Commission should continue to focus on <u>necessary</u> test year expenses and capital-related costs.” (Aglet opening brief, at 15, emphasis in original.) The Decision states, “In order to keep rates just and reasonable, our decision imposes some belt tightening on SCE ... and disallowance of non-essential costs and projects.” (Decision, discussion at 2; see also discussion at 21.) The Decision states, “Historically, the Commission has made significant reductions to SCE’s	Verified

	<p>GRC requests” (Decision, discussion at 22.) Aglet presented the only record evidence of those reductions. (Exhibit Aglet-1, at 4, Table 1.) The Commission also states, “We confirm that the Commission’s mandate is specific and requires a balancing of interests to authorize rate recovery only for those just and reasonable costs necessary for safe and reliable service.” (Decision, at 9; see also at 5.)</p>	
<p>4. <u>Financial health.</u> Aglet was the only party to analyze SCE’s financial health. Aglet reviewed the company’s credit rating history, earnings and dividend history, confidential financial projections, and extensive financial community documents (<i>see</i> Exhibit Aglet-3). Aglet requested Commission findings that SCE is financially healthy, and that granting SCE its full revenue requests is not necessary for the company to maintain the financial health needed to provide adequate utility service.</p> <p>Based on Aglet showings, Commission decisions in SCE’s test year 2003 and 2006 general rate cases included discussion and findings on financial health. (<i>See</i> Aglet comments on the proposed decision in this proceeding, November 8, 2012, citing D.04-07-022 and D.06-05-016.) Aglet did not participate in SCE’s test year 2009 general rate case.</p> <p>Surprisingly, the Decision in this proceeding does not discuss financial health specifically or make findings about SCE’s financial health. Nonetheless, Aglet contributed indirectly in several ways. First, the Decision concluded, “SCE shareholders consistently earn the authorized return on their investment” Aglet presented evidence of SCE’s recent earnings. (Exhibit Aglet 3, Volume 2, at 61.) Second, in comments on the proposed decision, SCE argued that: (1) investors have absorbed financial carrying costs of the ERP Project; (2) ordering shareholders to pay for short-term incentives that benefit them would</p>	<p>Exhibit Aglet-1, at 5-11; supporting documents in Exhibit Aglet-3, Volumes 1 and 2; confidential Exhibit Aglet-4C; Aglet opening brief, at 4-10; Aglet reply brief, at 3-4; Aglet comments on the proposed decision, at 1-3; Aglet reply comments, at 1-3.</p> <p>SCE comments on the proposed decision, at 14, 17, 20.</p> <p>Decision, Conclusion of Law 330 at 855.</p>	<p>Correct, in part. Aglet raised the issues of the general impact of requested rates and adopted rate reductions on the financial health of SCE. However, this is not a new issue to the Commission and Aglet’s input did not contribute to the final GRC decision.</p> <p>Aglet receives partial compensation for a contributed to the decision by its support of current policy which provides for using customer deposits to offset rate base and rejection of SCE’s claim it impacts SCE’s credit rating. <i>See</i> reduction in Part III (C).</p>

<p>be contrary to a U.S. Supreme Court decision on cost of capital; and (3) using customer deposits to offset rate base would harm SCE's credit standing. The assertions all relate to SCE's financial health. Aglet opposed all three arguments. (<i>See</i> Aglet reply comments on the proposed decision.) The Decision does not mention them. Arguably, Aglet contributed to the Commission's decision to disregard SCE's positions.</p>		
<p>5. <u>Economic impacts</u>. As it did in two previous general rate cases, SCE submitted a consultant study to support SCE's claim that large capital expenditures have overall economic benefits due to "multipliers" that have the effect of spreading money through the economy. Aglet and other parties argued that the study is flawed because the claimed benefits are temporary, and the study fails to account for ratepayer costs over the financial life of the capital expenditures. The Decision gives SCE's study no evidentiary weight. Aglet played a leading role in opposing SCE's position.</p>	<p>Exhibit Aglet-1, at 11-14; Aglet opening brief, at 10-13; Aglet reply brief, at 2-3.</p> <p>Decision, discussion at 20-22, Conclusion of Law 4 at 820. The Decision states, "The potential for economic benefits of capital spending is not an appropriate factor in determining whether to authorize capital expenditures Instead we review capital spending to determine whether the investment is necessary for the delivery of safe and reliable electric service." (Decision, at 21-22.)</p>	<p>Not accepted. D.12-11-051 affirmed that the criteria for review of proposed capital additions in the GRC period is whether they are reasonable and necessary for the generation and distribution of electricity, not whether there is an economic benefit to the surrounding communities from new construction. See reduction in Part III(C).</p>
<p>6. <u>Total factor productivity</u>. In PG&E's test year 2011 general rate case, Aglet first proposed that the Commission rescind the requirement that applicant utilities must submit total factor productivity (TFP) studies in rate cases. The proposal was uncontested, and the Commission adopted it for PG&E. In the instant proceeding, SCE decided to "repeat the proposal." Aglet supported the proposal with testimony, and ORA agreed. The Commission eliminated the TFP requirement for SCE. Aglet prevailed and contributed to the outcome.</p>	<p>Exhibit Aglet-1, at 17-18; Aglet opening brief, at 32-33.</p> <p>Decision, discussion at 610-611, Finding of Fact 1017 at 817, Conclusion of Law 525 at 876. The Decision cites SCE's request that the Commission remove the TFP requirement. (Decision, 610, footnote 1291.) In the same paragraph of SCE's testimony, SCE explicitly cited Aglet's proposal to eliminate the TFP requirement in the PG&E proceeding. (Exhibit SCE-11, at 4, lines 4-7.)</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>7. <u>Uncollectibles</u>. Aglet was the only party to contest SCE's proposed uncollectibles factor.</p>	<p>Exhibit Aglet-1, at 14-17; Aglet opening brief, at 16-19; Aglet reply</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>DRA testimony did not address uncollectibles. The Commission adopted Aglet’s recommendation.</p>	<p>brief, at 4-5; Aglet PD comments, at 3-4. Decision, discussion at 336-337, Findings of Fact 547 and 548 at 764-765, Conclusion of Law 275 at 850.</p>	
<p>8. <u>Attrition</u>. DRA and Aglet were the only parties that served detailed testimony on post-test year ratemaking, also known as attrition. Aglet analyzed SCE’s showing on attrition, including coordination with smart meter costs and benefits. Aglet compared SCE’s request with past attrition allowances and with other cost of living indices. Aglet opposed SCE’s request that attrition adjustments be based on capital spending budgets. Aglet supported DRA’s recommendation that attrition adjustments be based on forecast changes to the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Aglet provided arguments that supplemented those made by DRA. Aglet opposed SCE’s arguments about stranding of construction-work-in-progress (CWIP) and treatment of other operating revenues (OOR) in the context of attrition adjustments.</p> <p>The Commission did not accept the recommendations of SCE, DRA or Aglet. Instead, it adopted an alternate DRA proposal. The Commission specifically rejected SCE’s arguments about stranding of CWIP and treatment of OOR.</p> <p>Aglet did not prevail on this issue, but Aglet contributed to the record and to the Commission’s rejection of SCE’s budget-based attrition adjustments and rejection of SCE’s arguments about stranding of CWIP and treatment of OOR. As calculated in Part III.A.a below, the adopted compromise will save ratepayers roughly \$378 million compared to SCE’s original attrition request. Aglet contributed to that outcome.</p>	<p>Exhibit Aglet-1, at 18-30; Aglet opening brief, at 19-32; Aglet reply brief, at 5-8.</p> <p>Decision, discussion at 599-609 (discussion of Aglet position at 606), Findings of Fact 1010-1015 at 816, Conclusions of Law 523-524 at 876.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>9. <u>Other issues, settlements</u>. Aglet spent relatively small amounts of time on several other issues: (a) use of 2010 recorded data; (b) SONGS refueling cycles; (c) rate of return</p>	<p>Aglet reply brief, at 3, “There is nothing in D.89-01-040 [rate case plan] that prohibits DRA, other parties or the Commission from</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>on legacy meters replaced by smart meters; (d) Eastern Sierra Ratepayers Association (ESRA) review of local capital projects; (e) customer bills and rates; and (f) update phase evidence. Aglet also reviewed separate settlements submitted by SCE and Disabled Rights Advocates (DisabRA), Vote Solar, and the Coalition of California Utility Employees (CCUE).</p> <p>Aglet prevailed on some issues but did not directly contribute to others, specifically SCE settlements with the three individual parties. However, review of the record on those issues was necessary for Aglet’s full participation in the proceeding.</p>	<p>relying on information from later years, for example 2010 or even 2011.”</p> <p>Decision, discussion at 13, “However, there is nothing in the Rate Case Plan which limits discovery of 2010 actual recorded expenditures and the Commission finds them informative.”</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* * *</p> <p>Aglet opening brief, at 33-34, discussion of rate of return on legacy meters. Aglet recommended that “the Commission should deny any rate of return, or at most order a reduced rate of return and a shortened amortization period for SCE’s legacy meters.” The Utility Reform Network (TURN) led the opposition to SCE’s request for a full rate of return on the scrapped meters.</p> <p>Decision, discussion at 645-650. The Decision summarizes Aglet’s position, discussion at 648, then adopts a shortened amortization period and reduced return on equity, discussion at 650. See Finding of Fact 1040 at 819, Conclusions of Law 545-546 at 878, Ordering Paragraph 38 at 888.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">* * *</p> <p>SCE attempted to support its revenue request by asserting that SCE’s residential customer bills, as of 2008, were below the national average. (Decision, discussion at 23.) Aglet elicited evidence in support of DRA’s position that SCE failed to take into account the moderate climate and lower energy consumption in SCE’s service territory. (Aglet cross-examination of SCE witness Litzinger, 8 RT 657:25-658:13.)</p> <p>Decision, discussion at p. 23, “The Commission finds that SCE’s comparison is not sufficiently supported to be given weight.”</p>	
---	---	--

<p>10. <u>Settlement negotiations.</u> Aglet requests compensation for its settlement efforts. Settlement attempts were a necessary element of Aglet’s participation in the proceeding. Commission denial of compensation for settlement work would discourage Aglet and other intervenors from trying to settle difficult issues, which would be contrary to Commission policy that encourages settlements. As well, utilities could use the threat of loss of compensation to coerce intervenors to accept settlements that they might otherwise reject.</p>	<p>Despite best efforts, the parties did not reach a settlement.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
--	--	-----------------

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<p>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)¹ a party to the proceeding?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	<p>Yes, in part</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN; Joint Parties (Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Hispanic Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles); California Black Chamber of Commerce (CBCC). The showings of ORA and TURN were comprehensive, covering many cost and ratemaking issues. Joint Parties argued against SCE’s position that all proposed capital additions are needed. (Decision, at 11-12.) Joint Parties and CBCC opposed the conclusions in SCE’s report on economic benefits of capital spending. (Decision, at 21.)</p>	<p>Verified</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: See Attachment 3, Aglet 2011 time and expense records, for 2011 coordination activities by Aglet with other parties, specifically: January 18 with ORA; January 19 with ESRA; January 27 with TURN; February 16 with ESRA; February 25 with TURN; March 8 with ORA; March 11 with TURN; May 12 with ESRA; July 7 with several parties; and July 12 with several parties. As a result of coordination with other parties: (a) Aglet testimony addressed attrition, and TURN testimony did not; (b) Aglet testimony addressed financial health, and ORA and TURN testimony did not; (c) Aglet testimony addressed the economic impacts of capital spending, and ORA testimony did not; and (d) Aglet testimony addressed uncollectibles, and ORA and TURN testimony did not. During settlement negotiations, Aglet coordinated extensively with ORA and TURN.</p>	<p>Verified. This collaboration is reflected in the timesheets submitted by Aglet.</p>	

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>In another proceeding the Commission stated, “Regarding contributions by other parties, we agree with Aglet that in a proceeding involving multiple participants, it is virtually impossible to completely avoid some duplication of work of other parties. Aglet states that it took all reasonable steps to keep duplication to a minimum and to ensure that its work served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showings[s] of the other very active parties in this proceeding, ORA and TURN. . . . We find that Aglet has reasonably avoided duplication of other participants.” (D.08-12-018, at 7-8.) In SCE’s general rate case Aglet has again taken reasonable steps to keep duplication to a minimum.</p>	
---	--

C. Additional Comments on Part II :

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
9	Issue numbers	Verified	See Attachment 3, Aglet 2011 time and expense records, at 10, and Attachment 4, Aglet 2012 time and expense records, at 4, for listings of the substantive topics and issues in which Aglet participated, along with professional hours recorded or allocated to each issue. Aglet’s daily time records categorize time spent in evidentiary hearings, most hearing preparation, review of hearing transcripts, preparation of briefs, and review of the briefs of other parties as “All Aglet issues” because minute-by-minute recording of hearing-related time and briefing time by issue was impractical. Aglet then allocated proportionally the “All Aglet issues” time to substantive issues #3 through #9, which were topics addressed in Aglet’s testimony. The “All Aglet issues” hours were not allocated to #1 General activities or #10 Settlement efforts.
9	General time	Verified	In Attachment 3, at 10, Aglet lists 76.3 hours of “General” time that cannot be assigned to specific issues. Aglet has separated that time to eight activities: coordination with other parties (4.1 hours); participation at the prehearing conference (2.7 hours); initial review and initial discovery related to SCE testimony, done prior to Aglet’s choice of issues (6.4 hours); review of the scoping ruling, ALJ rulings and e-mail instructions (2.7 hours); review of ORA testimony and pleadings, and testimony and pleadings submitted by other intervenors (25.5 hours); analysis, e-mail and telephone communications with other parties on procedural issues, including nondisclosure agreement, cross-examination estimates, hearing exhibits, comparison exhibit and common briefing outline (12.1 hours); Aglet responses to SCE discovery requests (20.7 hours); and review of public participation hearing transcripts (2.1 hours).
9	Aglet’s role in settlement negotiations	Verified	Aglet participated in extensive, good faith settlement negotiations with SCE, ORA and TURN. (<i>See</i> Item #10 following time listings in Attachment 3, at 10, and Attachment 4, at 4. Settlement work began August 11, 2011, and ended January 20, 2012. Aglet believes that public disclosure of the time listings does not contravene Rule 12.6 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure regarding confidentiality of settlement negotiations.) Time spent on settlement efforts is not allocated to the issues in Aglet’s testimony because the negotiations attempted to resolve all issues in the proceeding.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

<p>a. Explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation</p> <p><u>Attrition.</u> Before adjustment for smart meter costs and benefits that will be folded into SCE’s base revenue requirement beginning in 2013, and based on escalation factors estimated in SCE’s original testimony, SCE proposed a post-test year ratemaking scheme that would yield revenue requirement increases of \$504 million in AY 2013 and \$600 million in AY 2014. (Exhibit SCE-15, at 1, Table I-1, line 6.) In D.12-11-051 the Commission approved an AY 2013 increase of \$407 million and an AY 2014 increase of \$348 million. (Decision, discussion at 3.) These numbers apparently include net smart meter adjustments of \$34 million in AY 2013. (Aglet comments on proposed decision, September 8, 2012, 4.) Assuming a net adjustment of \$34 million, the Commission has disallowed \$63 million in AY 2013 and \$252 million in AY 2014. The net ratepayer savings will be roughly \$378 million (\$63 million for two years, \$252 million for one year.) ORA and Aglet were the only parties that made detailed showings on post-test year ratemaking. (See Exhibit Aglet-1, 18-30; Aglet opening brief, September 26, 2011, 19-32.) Any reasonable allocation of the \$378 million in ratepayer savings between ORA and Aglet would demonstrate that the benefits of Aglet’s participation will greatly exceed Aglet’s costs.</p> <p><u>Uncollectibles.</u> Aglet was the only party to contest SCE’s requested uncollectibles factor of 0.229%. Aglet recommended a factor of 0.205%. The Commission agreed with Aglet, and cited test year savings of \$1.649 million. (Decision, discussion at 337.) Base rate savings over SCE’s three year rate case cycle will amount to approximately \$4.9 million. Overall ratepayer benefits will roughly double this amount because SCE will apply the adopted uncollectibles factor to fuel-related revenue requirements that are outside the scope of this general rate case. (Cross-examination of SCE witness Worden, 24 RT 4032:11-17.) Uncollectibles benefits, even without consideration of attrition benefits, will greatly exceed Aglet’s costs of participation.</p> <p>Aglet also made substantial contributions in other subject areas, but the benefits of those contributions cannot be conveniently monetized.</p>	<p>CPUC Verified</p> <p>Aglet made a substantial contribution to D.12-11-051. Aglet’s request bears a reasonable relationship with the benefits realized in its contribution to the decision. After the disallowances we make to this claim, the remainder of Aglet’s hours are reasonable.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>As shown in Attachments 3 and 4, Aglet worked 380.8 hours of professional time on this proceeding. Considering that ratepayers will pay more than \$18 billion in base rates over SCE’s three year rate case cycle, and that the Decision resolves many substantive policy issues, Aglet’s costs are reasonable.</p> <p>Aglet recognizes that preparation of this compensation request took more than the usual number of hours. However, the increased hours are reasonable considering the scope of the proceeding, the extent of Aglet’s participation, and the number of issues in which Aglet participated. Attachment 3, the spreadsheet of 2011 time records for Aglet’s director James Weil, is 10 pages long. In</p>	<p>After the disallowances we make to this claim the remainder of Aglet’s hours are reasonable.</p>

<p>Part II, Section A of this request, Aglet lists nine major topics. Aglet’s time spent on the compensation request includes time to review D.12-11-051. The narrative portion of the Decision is 889 pages long.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>Combining Aglet’s professional time listings for 2011 and 2012, excluding compensation and travel time, Aglet’s total request is 380.8 hours. Separation by issue or activity is shown below. Item #2, shown as “All Aglet issues” in Attachment 3, is omitted because those hours are allocated to other topics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General activities 76.3 hours 3. Scale of request 8.1 hours 4. Financial health 88.4 hours 5. Economic impacts 12.1 hours 6. Total factor productivity 2.1 hours 7. Uncollectibles 20.9 hours 8. Attrition (post-test year) 104.6 hours 9. Other issues, settlements 22.4 hours 10. Settlement negotiations 45.9 hours 	<p>Confirmed. Aglet has properly allocated its time by major issue as required by Rule 17.4.²</p>

B. Specific Claim:*

Claimed						CPUC Award		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
James Weil	2011	322.1	\$300	D.08-05-033, Ordering Par. 2	96,630.00	251.1	\$300	75,330
James Weil	2012	58.7	\$305	Res. ALJ-281	17,903.50	58.7	\$305	17,903.50
Subtotal:					\$114,533.50	Subtotal:		\$93,233.50
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hour	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
James Weil (Travel LA)	2011	10.1	\$150	D.08-05-033, Ordering Par. 2	1,515.00	10.1	\$150	1,515.00
James Weil (Travel SF)	2011	12.1	\$150	D.08-05-033, Ordering Par. 2	1,815.00	0	\$150	0
James Weil (Travel SF)	2012	2.8	\$152.50	Res. ALJ-281	427.00	0	\$152.50	0

² See. D.98-04-059 and D.85-08-012.

PROPOSED DECISION (Rev. 1)

	Subtotal:				\$3,757.00	Subtotal:			\$1,515.00
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hour	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$	
James Weil (NOI, and amendment)	2011	3.1	\$150	D.08-05-033, Ordering Par. 2	465.00	3.1	\$150	465	
James Weil (Request)	2012	19.2	\$152.50	Res. ALJ-281	2,928.00	19.2	\$152.50	2,928.00	
	Subtotal:				\$3,393.00	Subtotal:			\$3,393.00
COSTS									
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount			
1	Postage, overnight delivery	See Attachment 3, at 9, and Attachment 4, at 3			\$292.30			105.75	
2	FAX	12 pages at \$1.00			\$12.00			12.00	
3	Office copies	1,101 pages at 11 cents			\$121.11			307.66	
4	Scan docs	Fedex; for amended NOI, per ALJ			\$3.90			3.90	
5a	Bridge toll	From OAK, for LA hearing			\$5.00			5.00	
5b	Bridge tolls	San Francisco meeting, hearings			\$30.00			0	
6a	Parking	OAK airport, for LA hearing			\$20.36			20.36	
6b	Parking	San Francisco meeting, hearings			\$81.00			0	
7a	Vehicle miles	2011: 101 miles at 51 cents, to and from OAK airport, for LA hearing			\$51.51			51.51	
7b	Vehicle miles	2011: 289 miles at 51 cents, for SF meeting, hearings			\$147.39			0	
7c	Vehicle miles	2012: 58 miles at 55.5 cents, for SF oral argument			\$32.19			0	
8	Air fare	OAK-BUR RT, for LA hearing			\$315.40			315.40	
9	Airport shuttle	BUR-Los Angeles, for LA hearing			\$48.00			48.00	
10	Hotel	Los Angeles, for LA hearing			\$127.88			127.88	
	Subtotal:				\$1,288.04	Subtotal:			997.46
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$122,971.54	TOTAL AWARD \$:			\$99,140.96
<p>* We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit its 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</p>									

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 rate.

C. CPUC Disallowances, Adjustments, and Comments:

#	Reason
Travel time and travel expenses	<p>The Commission awards fees and expenses for reasonable travel time but disallows compensation for time and expenses incurred during “routine travel.”</p> <p>In. D.10-11-032, the Commission further defined “routine travel” as travel that occurs with a one-way travel distance of 120 miles or less for attorneys, consultants, and other experts participating in Commission matters. Travel time and expenses occurring within this distance is considered to be “routine” in nature are non-compensable.</p> <p>The Commission disallows Aglet’s requested travel costs and travel time related to James Weil’s travel between Novato, California and San Francisco, California Commission hearings.</p>
Costs	<p>In accordance with Section 1802(d) of the Public Utilities Code, the Commission will generally reimburse reasonable out-of-pocket expenses directly related to the intervenor’s participation as long as the Commission finds the intervenor made a “substantial” contribution to the proceeding’s outcome. These expenses may include photocopying and mailing in order to meet the Commission’s service requirements.</p> <p>Though some necessary receipts were missing from Aglet’s initial claim, all necessary receipts were promptly produced upon request. After careful review of Aglet’s expenses and submitted receipts the Commission authorizes compensation of Aglet’s postage expenses in the amount of \$105.75, photocopying expenses in the amount of \$307.66, faxing expenses in the amount of \$12.00 and document scanning in the amount of \$3.90.</p>
Hourly Rate of James Weil	<p>Aglet requests an hourly rate of \$300 for James Weil’s work in 2011 and \$305 for James Weil’s work in 2012. These rates were previously adopted in D.13-01-015. We apply those rates here.</p>
Disallowance for lack of contribution for work on Financial Health (#4)	<p>Aglet’s time spent on the Financial Health issue are reduced by 2/3, approximately 59 hours for the reasons discussed in in Part II A</p>
Disallowance for lack of	<p>Aglet’s hours (12.1) dedicated to Economic Impacts are disallowed for the reasons discussed in Part II A</p>

contribution for work on Economic Impacts (#5)	
---	--

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. Aglet Consumer Alliance has made a substantial contribution to D.12-11-051.
2. The requested hourly rates for Aglet Consumer Alliance's representative, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$ 99,140.96.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Aglet Consumer Alliance is awarded \$99,140.96.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay Aglet Consumer Alliance the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release

H.15, beginning February 24, 2013, the 75th day after the filing of Aglet Consumer Alliance'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):	D1211051	
Proceeding(s):	A1011015	
Author:	ALJ Melanie M. Darling	
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier	Reason Change/Disallowance
Aglet Consumer Alliance (AGLET)	12/11/2012	\$122,971.54	\$99,140.96	No	Non-Compensable costs for routine travel. Lack of substantial contribution on some issues.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
James	Weil	Expert	AGLET	\$300	2011	\$300
James	Weil	Expert	AGLET	\$305	2012	\$305

(END OF APPENDIX)