

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity Concerning the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (Segments 4 through 11).

Application 07-06-031  
(Filed June 29, 2007)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS FOUNDATION FOR  
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 13-07-018**

<b>Claimant: The California State Parks Foundation (CSPF)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision 13-07-018</b>
<b>Claimed: \$31,466.84</b>	<b>Awarded: \$24,254.84 (22.92% reduction)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Jean Vieth</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	This decision granted a petition for modification of Decision (D.) 09-12-044, filed October 28, 2011, in which the City of Chino Hills (City) sought an alternative to previously approved Segment 8A of the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project (TRTP), a 500 kilovolt above-ground transmission line in Segment 8A in an existing 3.5 mile right of way (ROW) through the City. The petition for modification did not seek a single particular alternative, instead raising several potential alternatives including undergrounding the transmission line and an alternative above-ground route through Chino Hills State Park that the City had previously advocated. <i>See</i> Petition of the City of Chino Hills to Modify D.09-12-044, October 28, 2011 at 2, 9-10, 12. D.09-12-044 followed evidentiary hearings, briefs and the Commission's preparation and release of an
--	---

	<p>Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report and ultimately ordered an underground transmission option as described below.</p> <p>The decision concluded that the design of the above-ground transmission line, “ ... with its massive, new transmission towers reaching 195-198 feet tall (more than double the height of the prior, 75 foot structures) and set in a narrow, 150-foot ROW, effectively ignores community values and places an unfair and unreasonable burden on the residents of Chino Hills.” The decision “rectifies that disproportionate burden and finds that it is in the public interest to construct an underground alternative based on a single circuit, two cables per phase design (option UG5), using cross linked polyethylene (XLPE) cable. Underground construction of UG5 in Segment 8A is feasible, can be completed on a timely basis and can be built at a reasonable cost.”</p> <p>After accounting for multiple factors, the decision estimated the costs of undergrounding in Chino Hills to be approximately \$224 million, including offset for Chino Hills’ financial contribution of real property, which the decision valued at about \$17 million. This sum adjusted Southern California Edison Company’s (SCE’s) estimate to exclude reactive compensation, reduced the environmental multiplier to 10% from 26% and reduced the contingency from 35% to 15%, the same contingency applied to the Project overall. On a per mile basis, this is approximately \$64 million per mile. The decision found that, to the extent that undergrounding costs elsewhere provide a benchmark of sorts, the cost to underground UG5 was comparable and reasonable.</p> <p>The decision also released a stay on construction of Segment 8A during the pendency of the administrative proceedings and ordered SCE to underground UG5 in Segment 8A.</p>
	<p>On July 2, 2012, assigned Commissioner Michael Peevey issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling of Assigned Commissioner (Scoping Memo) which required SCE to develop prepared testimony regarding undergrounding options, set dates for prepared testimony by the City of Chino Hills, and scheduled limited evidentiary hearings, briefing and filing of a proposed decision. This Scoping Memo explicitly held that all options through Chino Hills State Park were to be excluded. <i>Id.</i> at 5.</p>

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

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	12/5/11	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI Filed:	1/4/12	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 07-06-031	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	3/1/12	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.07-06-031	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	3/1/12	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.13-07-018	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	7/16/13	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	9/12/13	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**C. Additional Comments on Part I (use line reference # as appropriate):**

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
	X	Verified	Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Vieth found that CSPF has status as a “customer” on the basis that it represents a group or organization authorized pursuant to its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers, to represent “small commercial customers” who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation, or to represent another eligible group. (Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling on Showing of Significant Financial Hardship, March 1, 2012 at 1, A.3).
	X	Verified	ALJ Vieth found that CSPF has demonstrated “financial hardship” on the basis that the economic interest of the individual members of the group or organization is small in comparison to the costs of effective participation in the proceeding. ( <i>Id.</i> at 3, A.2, and 6, No. 4).

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**

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

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
Issue A: In response to Chino Hills’ (“City”) petition for modification, the November 10, 2011 AC ruling and scoping memo directed SCE to prepare new testimony to include the feasibility, cost, and timing of Alternative 4CM, the City’s preferred alternative through Chino Hills State Park (CHSP). (Ruling at 1, 2-3.) SCE in turn, prepared testimony in January 2012 that included data on the CHSP alternative ( <i>see</i> D.13-07-018 at n. 20); even though D.09-12-044 had already rejected alternatives through	December 8, 2011 (meeting with Colette Kersten, Assistant to Commissioner Catherine J. K. Sandoval), and December 14, 2011 (meetings with Matthew Tisdale, Advisor to Commissioner Michel Peter Florio, Bishu, Advisor to Commissioner Simon, Assigned Commissioner Michael R. Peevey, and Carol Brown, Advisor to Commissioner Peevey).  In addition, Claimant held 17 ex parte meetings between 2007 and 2011 with current and former Commissioners and their staff to discuss Issue A, briefed and responded to pleadings, and testified before the Commission in prior proceedings on SCE’s application up to the time of the City’s petition for	Verified. The Scoping Memo, however, is dated July 02, 2012.

<p>CHSP.</p> <p>In response, Claimant demonstrated the continuing infeasibility of any proposed route through CHSP. Specific references to Claimant’s presentations are provided herein, and its opposition to City’s preferred route, in part ultimately led City to abandon its advocacy of a route through CHSP. <i>See</i> D.13-07-018 at 56-57.</p> <p>As a result, an AC ruling and scoping memo of July 2, 2012 excluded all alternatives through CHSP. Claimant continued to demonstrate the infeasibility of any proposed route through CHSP and D.13-07-018 cited to the July 2, 2012 ruling and scoping memo in excluding all options through CHSP, Claimant’s desired outcome.</p>	<p>modification. Claimant is not seeking intervenor compensation for these activities, but the extensive discussions and arguments made by Claimant prior to 2011 demonstrating the continuing infeasibility of any proposed route through CHSP was substantially supported by this work.</p> <p>Claimant’s Opening Brief, May 6, 2013 at 2-3; Claimant’s Response to the Petition of the City of Chino Hills to Modify Decision 09-12-044 to Reopen the Record with Regard to Segment 8 of the Proposed Route, November 22, 2011 at 2-4.</p> <p>D.13-07-018 at 8.</p> <p><i>See, also</i>, Scoping Memo dated July 2, 2011, at 5.</p>	
<p>Issue B: In addition to demonstrating the infeasibility of a proposed route through CHSP, Claimant also raised issues of transmission line configuration and raised concerns about the likelihood of the need for a future transmission route through CHSP. While not reflected in the Decision, the City ultimately provided testimony of its willingness to accept any disruption that might be caused by the construction of a second</p>	<p>Claimant’s Opening Brief at 4-5; Ex Parte meetings with Commissioners and Commission staff on June 26, 2013 (meetings with Charlyn Hook, Advisor to Commissioner Mark Ferron, Julie Fitch, Chief of Staff to Commissioner Carla J. Peterman, Melicia Charles, Advisor to Commissioner Peterman, Colette Kersten, Assistant to Commissioner Sandoval, Commissioner Florio, and Rachel Peterson, Advisor to Commissioner Florio), December 8, 2011 (meeting with Colette Kersten, Assistant to Commissioner Sandoval), and December 14, 2011</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>circuit in the existing right of way and contended in its opening brief that any second circuit could be constructed in the existing right of way – outside of CHSP – in a manner that would not cause service disruption to the first circuit. Chino Hills Opening Brief at 46-47, 61.</p>	<p>(meetings with Matthew Tisdale, Advisor to Commissioner Florio, Bishu, Advisor to Commissioner Simon, Assigned Commissioner Peevey and Carol Brown, Advisor to Commissioner Peevey). A.07-06-031, Scoping Memo dated July 2, 2012, 5.</p>	
--	--	--

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

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p><b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?</b><sup>1</sup></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> The California Department of Parks and Recreation (“DPR”)</p>		<p>Verified</p>
<p><b>d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b> CSPF worked with DPR to ensure coordination and eliminate duplication. Only CSPF filed a Response to the Petition (filed November 22, 2011) and an Opening Brief in this proceeding (filed May 6, 2013). DPR commented on the proposed decisions in a letter dated June 26, 2013; CSPF did not (though it did participate in properly noticed ex parte meetings with Commission staff and Commissioner Florio).</p>		<p>Verified</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

**C. Additional Comments on Part II (use line reference # or letter as appropriate):**

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
	X		<p>Although the Commission ultimately decided to authorize a single circuit configuration for the undergrounded line, CSPF raised an important and relevant issue that would otherwise not have been considered.</p> <p>In addition, CSPF has steadfastly and strongly advocated on behalf of Chino Hills State Park from the very beginning of the entire process, having been granted party status on April 29, 2009, setting the stage for the decision of both the City of Chino Hills and Assigned Commissioner Peevey to eliminate Chino Hills State Park from consideration as an alternative route. (A.07-06-031, Ruling at 5; Scoping Memo at 5.)</p>

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<p><b>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate).</b></p> <p>As discussed at length in CSPF’s NOI, CSPF falls under the CPUC’s exception for environmental organizations ( at 3-4), confirmed in ALJ Vieth’s Ruling (at 4). As such, CSPF is not required to identify direct monetary benefits to ratepayers (Intervenor Compensation Program Guide , Sec. III.12.a). However, substantial non-monetary benefits were obtained for CSPF’s 130,000 members and, further, all Californians, due to CSPF’s activities in this case. As stated in CSPF’s Opening Brief and in the NOI (at 1 &amp; 4, and 6, respectively), CSPF’s primary concern is the integrity and protection of CHSP, as well as the policy implications and impact on the entire California State Parks system. The ability of Californians to peacefully enjoy opportunities for tranquility, solitude and relief from the hectic urban life that surrounds CHSP was successfully protected by CSPF’s actions in this case.</p>	<p><b>CPUC Verified</b></p> <hr/> <p>Verified, <i>but see</i> “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.</p>
--	---

<p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b></p> <p>CSPF allocated a significant portion of work to internal staff (Sara Feldman, Vice President for Programs) and limited attorney hours to those necessary to successfully present its case to the CPUC.</p>	<p>Verified, <i>but see</i> “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.</p>
<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue.</b></p> <p>100% of CSPF’s time was spent directly on the overall issue of protection of CHSP and the California State Park system.</p>	<p>Verified, <i>but see</i> “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.</p>

**B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Bradly S. Torgan, attorney	2011	44.4	\$200/hr*	Resolution ALJ-287	\$8,880.00	23.9 [1][2] <sup>2</sup>	\$200.00 [3]	\$4,780.00
Bradly S. Torgan, attorney	2012	42.3	\$200/hr*	Resolution ALJ-287	\$8,460.00	24.8 [4][5]	\$200.00	\$4,960.00
Bradly. S Torgan, attorney	2013	39.7	\$200/hr*	Resolution ALJ-287	\$7,940.00	38.7 [6]	\$200.00 [7]	\$7,740.00
*Please note that since the rate charged is well below the range given in Resolution ALJ-287, no additional justification for the requested rate is provided.								
<b>Subtotal: \$25,280.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$17,480.00</b>		

<sup>2</sup> The bracketed number ([x]) refers to the reason listed in the section labeled “CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments” in Part III.C of this decision.

OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Sara Feldman, Vice President for Programs, CSPF	2011	25	68/hr.	See Attachment C	\$1,700.00	11.2 [8][9]	\$65.00 [10]	\$728.00
Sara Feldman, Vice President for Programs, CSPF	2012	10	68/hr.	See Attachment C	\$680.00	8.6 [11]	\$65.00	\$559.00
Sara Feldman, Vice President for Programs, CSPF	2013	21.2	68/hr.	See Attachment C	\$1,441.60	13.7 [12]	\$65.00 [13]	\$890.50
Bradly Torgan	2011					4	\$100.00	\$400.00
Bradly Torgan	2012					13.5	\$100.00	\$1,350.00
Sara Feldman	2011					10	\$34.00	\$340.00
Sara Feldman	2013					7.5	\$35.50	\$266.25
<b>Subtotal: \$3,821.60</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$4,533.75</b>		

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Bradly S. Torgan	2011	1.5	100/hr	One-half of attorney's hourly rate for the matter	\$150.00	1.5	\$100.00	\$150.00
Bradly S. Torgan	2012	.4	100/hr	One-half of attorney's hourly rate for the matter	\$40.00	.4	\$100.00	\$40.00
Bradly S. Torgan	2013	4.8	100/hr	One-half of attorney's hourly rate for the matter	\$480.00	3.8 [14]	\$100.00	\$380.00
Sara Feldman	2011	4.9	34/hr	One-half of Sara Feldman's hourly rate for this matter	\$166.60	4.9	\$32.50	\$159.25
Sara Feldman	2012	.2	34/hr	One-half of Sara Feldman's hourly rate for this matter	\$6.80	.2	\$32.50	\$6.50
Sara Feldman	2013	11	34/hr	One-half of Sara Feldman's hourly rate for this matter	\$374.00	11	\$32.50	\$357.50
<b>Subtotal: \$1,217.40</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$1,093.25</b>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1	Parking	Bradly S. Torgan, attorney, parking at LAX			\$52.65	\$52.65		
2	BART	Bradly S. Torgan, attorney, travel to/from CPUC			\$48.60	\$48.60		
3	Taxi	Bradly S. Torgan, attorney, travel to/from CPUC			\$15.00	\$15.00		
4	Mileage	Bradly S. Torgan, attorney, travel to/from CPUC			\$18.99	\$18.99		

**PROPOSED DECISION**

5	Parking	Sara Feldman, VP CSPF, travel to/from CPUC	\$95.00	\$95.00
6	BART	Sara Feldman, VP CSPF, travel to/from CPUC	\$12.00	\$12.00
7	Mileage	Sara Feldman, VP CSPF, travel to/from CPUC	\$96.00	\$96.00
8	Air fare	Sara Feldman, VP CSPF, travel to/from CPUC	\$809.60	\$809.60
<b>Subtotal: \$1,147.84</b>			<b>Subtotal: \$1,147.84</b>	
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$31,466.84</b>			<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$24,254.84</b>	

\* 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 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.

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>3</sup>	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Bradly S. Torgan	June 11, 1996	183146	No.

<sup>3</sup> This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

**C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
[1]	In 2011, Torgan spent 10.2 hours traveling to the Commission or to the CHSP. Travel to the Commission must be billed at ½ rate and has been added to the travel request. Torgan’s travel time to the CHSP is non-compensable.
[2]	The Commission finds that 10.3 hours of Torgan’s 2011 timesheet, while spent on issues related to the CHSP, were <u>not</u> related specifically to matters concerning A.07-06-031. These hours are non-compensable.
[3]	The Commission approves the rate of \$200.00 for Torgan (attorney).
[4]	In 2012, Torgan spent 13.5 hours traveling to the Commission. Travel to the Commission must be billed at ½ rate and has been added to the travel request.
[5]	The Commission finds that 4 hours of Torgan’s 2012 timesheet, while spent on issues related to the CHSP, were <u>not</u> related specifically to matters concerning A.07-06-031. These hours are non-compensable.
[6]	The Commission finds that 1 hour of Torgan’s 2013 timesheet, the audit letter response, is not related to matters concerning A.07-06-031. This hour is non-compensable.
[7]	The Commission applied a 2% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to Torgan’s 2013 rate. This COLA adjustment, after rounding to the nearest \$5, did not alter the 2013 rate. <i>See Res. ALJ-287 and D.13-07-017.</i>
[8]	In 2011, Feldman spent 16.2 hours traveling to the Commission or to the CHSP. Travel to the Commission must be billed at ½ rate and has been added to the travel request. Feldman’s travel time to the CHSP is non-compensable.
[9]	The Commission finds that .6 hours of Feldman’s 2011 timesheet, while spent on issues related to the CHSP, were <u>not</u> related specifically to matters concerning A.07-06-031. These hours are non-compensable.
[10]	The Commission approves a rate of \$65.00 for Feldman (advocate).
[11]	The Commission finds that 1.4 hours of Feldman’s 2012 timesheet, while spent on issues related to the CHSP, were <u>not</u> related specifically to matters concerning A.07-06-031. These hours are non-compensable.
[12]	In 2013, Feldman spent 7.5 hours traveling to the Commission. Travel to the Commission must be billed at ½ rate and has been added to the travel request. Feldman’s travel time to the CHSP is non-compensable.
[13]	The Commission applied a 2% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to Feldman’s 2013 rate. This COLA adjustment, after rounding to the nearest \$5, did not alter the 2013 rate. <i>See Res. ALJ-287 and D.13-07-017.</i>

[14]	The Commission finds that Torgan spent 3.8 hours preparing the intervenor compensation claim in 2013.
------	---

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

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

<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(2)(6))?</b>	Yes
--	-----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. California State Parks Foundation has made a substantial contribution to Decision 13-07-018.
2. The requested hourly rates for California State Parks Foundation's representatives, 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 \$24,254.84.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. California State Parks Foundation is awarded \$ 24,254.84.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay Claimant 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 November 26, 2013, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

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

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

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1307018		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A0706031		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Vieth		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Southern California Edison Company		

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
California State Parks Foundation	09/12/2013	\$31,466.84	\$24,254.84	No	See Part III.C of this decision.

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Bradly	Torgan	Attorney	CSPF	\$200.00	2011	\$200.00
Bradly	Torgan	Attorney	CSPF	\$200.00	2012	\$200.00
Bradly	Torgan	Attorney	CSPF	\$200.00	2013	\$200.00
Sara E.	Feldman	Advocate	CSPF	\$68.00	2011	\$65.00
Sara E.	Feldman	Advocate	CSPF	\$68.00	2012	\$65.00
Sara E.	Feldman	Advocate	CSPF	\$68.00	2013	\$65.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**