

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ YACKNIN** (Mailed 4/11/2014)

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

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) for Authority to Enter into Purchase Power Tolling Agreements with Escondido Energy Center, Pio Pico Energy Center and Quail Brush Power.

Application 11-05-023  
(Filed May 19, 2011)

**DECISION DENYING COMPENSATION TO THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL FOR FAILURE TO MAKE A SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 13-03-029**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Claimant: Natural Resources Defense Council</b> | <b>For contribution to D.13-03-029</b>     |
| <b>Claimed (\$): \$17,774.00</b>                   | <b>Awarded (\$): \$0.00 (Reduced 100%)</b> |
| <b>Assigned Commissioner: Peevey</b>               | <b>Assigned ALJ: Hallie Yacknin</b>        |

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b> | Decision (D.) 13-03-029 determines a local capacity requirement need and directs San Diego Gas & Electric Company to procure up to 298 megawatts of local generation capacity beginning in 2018. It grants SDG&E authority to enter into a purchase power tolling agreement with Escondido Energy Center, but denies the purchase power tolling agreements with Pio Pico Energy Center and with Quail Brush Power, without prejudice to a renewed application for their approval if amended to match the timing of the identified need, or upon a different showing of need. |
|--|--|

**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 (PHC):   | January 31, 2012                           | Verified             |
| 2. Other Specified Date for NOI:  | n/a  | Yes                  |
| 3. Date NOI Filed:  | March 1, 2012                              | Verified             |
| 4. Was the NOI timely filed?  |  | Yes                  |
| <b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>                |  |                      |
| 5. Based on Administrative Law Judge ( ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:   | Application (A.) 10-07-007 and A.11-09-016 | Verified             |
| 6. Date of ALJ ruling:  | February 21, 2013                          | 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:                               | A10-07-007 and A.11-09-016                 | Verified             |
| 10. Date of ALJ ruling:   | February 21, 2013                          | 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.13-03-029                                | Verified             |
| 14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:                                  | 03/28/2013                                 | Verified             |
| 15. File date of compensation request:  | 05/24/2013                                 | Verified             |
| 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).**

| <b>Contribution to D.13-03-029</b>  | <b>Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision</b>   | <b>Showing Accepted by CPUC</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The following italicized headers correspond to the substantive issue areas used to categorize staff timesheets.</li> </ul>   |  |  |
| <p><i>1. Implementing the State's Loading Order for preferred resources (A)</i></p> <p>NRDC advocated throughout the proceeding to ensure that any authorization for long term procurement in the local areas comply with the State’s Loading Order, which requires that all cost-effective energy efficiency be procured before any conventional resources. NRDC strongly advocated for compliance with the Loading Order a cornerstone of the proposed authorizations. The Commission agreed, noting its grant of procurement authority must account for energy efficiency first, before procuring non-preferred resources.</p> | <p>D.13-03-029, FOF 9: “The California Energy Action Plan established the “loading order” for how new resources are prioritized.”</p> <p>D.13-03-029, at 9: “For the Commission’s purposes, it is appropriate to take into account reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency . . . in determining whether to authorize the procurement of additional generation resources. Such action is consistent with the California Energy Action Plan, which established the “loading order” for how new resources are prioritized.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Opening Testimony of Sierra Martinez on Behalf of NRDC</i>, (May 18, 2012) at 2: “The loading order established in the EAP II correctly identifies energy efficiency as the state’s top priority resource and is the standard against which the Commission should consider the long-term plans.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Opening Brief of the Natural Resources Defense Council</i>, (July 13, 2012) at 2: “In order to comply with the State’s loading order, the Commission must include a reasonable estimate of energy efficiency</p> | <p>Showing not accepted. Most of NRDC’s presentation made no substantial contribution:</p> <p>NRDC’s presentation challenged SDG&amp;E’s assumptions regarding uncommitted energy efficiency (EE) and advocated that the assumed amounts of EE should be the standardized planning assumptions from the 2010 LTPP Joint Scoping Memo.</p> <p>D.13-03-029 does not adopt this position: D.13-03-029 adopts SDG&amp;E’s EE assumption for purposes of adjusting the results of the California Independent Operator’s Once-</p> |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
|   | <p>before making a determination of local capacity need.”</p>   | <p>Through Cooling (OTC) study.</p> <p>However, NRDC’s challenge to the CAISO’s assumption of zero EE substantially contributed to D.13-03-029’s determination to adjust the results of the OTC study by SDG&amp;E’s assumed amounts of these resources. However, as discussed below this contribution was duplicative.</p> |
| <p>2. <i>Whether California ISO’s model results contain a reasonable amount of energy efficiency (B)</i></p> <p>NRDC advocated that ISO’s model results from its 2021 OTC Study omitted substantial amounts of uncommitted energy efficiency that was “reasonably expected to occur.” NRDC advocated that the CPUC should instead adopt a need determination that <i>did</i> include a reasonable amount of energy efficiency. In the final decision, the Commission agreed with this recommendation.</p> | <p>D.13-03-029, FOF 5: “The CAISO’s OTC study did not model forecasted additions of uncommitted energy efficiency or demand response, or incremental CHP.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Opening Brief of the Natural Resources Defense Council</i>, at 3: “CAISO claims a need for new procurement in the San Diego local area based on this 2009 CEC Demand Forecast. However, CAISO omits all uncommitted efficiency, which is unjustifiable.”</p> <p>D.13-03-029, at 10: “it is reasonable to subtract conservative forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response from the OTC study results for purposes of determining the LCR.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Opening Testimony of Sierra Martinez on Behalf of NRDC</i>, at 3-4: “The “uncommitted DSM” in the</p> | <p>Showing not accepted. (See discussion above.)</p>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>CEC’s 2009 Incremental Impacts Report is what the CEC stated should be subtracted from its 2009 base forecast, (which is the base forecast that CAISO used in its assessment of local capacity need).”</p> <p>COL 5: “The CAISO’s modeling assumptions, other than with respect to uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response and incremental CHP, are reasonable.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Opening Testimony of Sierra Martinez on Behalf of NRDC</i>, at 4: “CAISO’s estimate of zero savings for uncommitted efficiency is both unreasonable and factually incorrect.”</p>   |  |
| <p>3. <i>Ensuring that authorization in the San Diego local area relies on a reasonable amount of energy efficiency (C)</i></p> <p>NRDC proposed that the CPUC should authorize local capacity resources in the San Diego local area that based on calculations that subtract a reasonable forecast of energy efficiency, a position with which the Commission agreed.</p> | <p>COL 4: “In the absence of a power flow modeling study that models these resources, it is reasonable to account for conservative but reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response and for incremental CHP by subtracting them from the results of the OTC study.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Opening Testimony of Sierra Martinez on Behalf of NRDC</i>, at 1: “In order to comply with the State’s loading order, a reasonable estimate of energy efficiency must be included before making a determination of local capacity need.”</p> <p>D.13-03-029, at 9: “For the Commission’s purposes, it is appropriate to take into account reasonable forecasts of uncommitted energy efficiency and demand response, as well as incremental demand-side CHP, in determining whether to authorize the procurement of additional generation resources. . . . These resources can reasonably be</p> | <p>Showing not accepted. (See discussion above.)</p> |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  | <p>expected to occur as a result of State and Commission policies, and to reduce LCR needs in the San Diego area.”</p> <p>NRDC, <i>Reply Brief of the Natural Resources Defense Council</i>, (July 27, 2012) at 4: “Therefore, the Commission should reject CAISO’s argument that the uncertainty over the quantity of future energy efficiency savings warrants an omission of all future energy efficiency.”</p> |  |
|--|--|--|

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

|   | <b>Claimant</b> | <b>CPUC Verified</b>   |
|---|-----------------|--|
| <b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)<sup>1</sup> a party to the proceeding?</b>  | <b>Yes</b>      | <b>Verified</b>  |
| <b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>   | <b>Yes</b>      | <b>yes</b>   |
| <p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> To some extent: Sierra Club California, Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (CEERT), California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA), Clean Coalition, and the Vote Solar Initiative.</p> |                 | <p>CEJA was a party with similar position to that of NRDC. Utility Consumers Action Network (UCAN) was also a party with similar position to that of NRDC. The other listed entities were not parties to the proceeding.</p> |
| <b>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or</b>   |                 | NRDC’s participation   |

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

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>contributed to that of another party:</b></p> <p>NRDC worked with other environmental and consumer stakeholders throughout the proceeding to avoid redundancy, find common ground, and put forth positions that resolved issues before reaching the formal Commission process. This was in accordance with general Commission direction for the parties to work together to advocate as effectively and efficiently as possible in the proceeding. NRDC worked cooperatively with other parties to ensure no duplication in our separate comments and NRDC developed unique recommendations for consideration in the proceeding. In particular, we coordinated with DRA and other environmental organizations to discuss our positions in the proceeding, and to avoid duplicating work. NRDC claims zero hours for work coordinating with other parties and only claims for time writing actual testimony, briefs, and reviewing parties' briefs and testimony.</p> <p>In addition, NRDC's advocacy was spearheaded by Sierra Martinez, with substantial contributions from Devra Wang who provided substantive additions to both written and oral work testimony, briefs, and comments. This enhanced NRDC's contributions and minimized any internal duplication. However, we claim no hours for Ms. Wang's contributions, nor for other staff members who supported Martinez's work throughout this proceeding, even though those hours were substantive.</p> | <p>duplicated that of DRA, CEJA and UCAN. Those parties also challenged SDG&amp;E's EE assumption for deviating from the standardized planning assumptions from the 2010 LTPP Joint Scoping Memo and CAISO's OTC study for assuming zero EE.</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:</b></p> <p>Throughout the proceeding, NRDC advocated for policies to ensure that the need determinations for the SDG&amp;E local area in this application would rely on an energy forecast that includes a reasonable amount of energy efficiency. Including energy efficiency assumptions is critical to make a well-informed decision about whether new local resources are needed, and if so, what resources will best meet the Commission’s criteria.</p> <p>NRDC’s participation in these proceedings directly contributed to CPUC decision to rely on uncommitted energy efficiency (which describes efficiency that is not yet funded) in the SDG&amp;E local needs assessment. The original proposal from the Independent System Operator was to completely omit this efficiency and thus authorize additional conventional power, which would have been more costly and polluting. NRDC provided detailed information about the ability of energy efficiency to reduce expected demand and therefore the need for local resources, which the Commission ultimately adopted and will save customers money and reduce pollution.</p> <p>The contribution of NRDC was substantive and required significant staff hours to ensure productive recommendations. NRDC presented unique recommendations to advance customer and environmental interests, which was distinct from other competing proposals in the proceeding. When recommendations overlapped or where there were opportunities for resolving issues prior to formal filings, NRDC worked with other parties as noted above. This ultimately reduced the need for NRDC to respond to these parties in formal comments, reducing the hours (and therefore costs) of participation and thus increasing the benefit to customers. This also ensured a robust record from which the Commission had sufficient information to determine a local needs assessment that included estimated energy efficiency to reduce the amount of conventional power being authorized.</p> <p>As shown above, NRDC’s contribution to the record and final decision in this proceeding vastly exceeds the cost of NRDC’s participation.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>CPUC<br/>Verified</b></p> <hr/> <p>Showing not accepted.</p>  |
| <p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b><br/><i>NRDC’s Claims are Reasonable and Conservative</i></p> <p>Sierra Martinez led NRDC’s efforts in this proceeding, but worked closely with other NRDC staff who consulted regularly on the issues at stake in the proceeding, provided substantive work, technical support, and/or guidance particular to their area of expertise. However, and to be extremely conservative, we claim no hours for staff time other than Martinez.</p> <p>The rates requested by NRDC are purposefully conservative and low on the ranges approved by the Commission, even though the levels of expertise of would justify higher rates. NRDC maintained detailed time records indicating</p>  | <p>Showing not accepted. Because we disallow 100% of the requested compensation, we do not reach the issue of reasonableness of the claim</p> |

|   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <p>the number of hours that were devoted to proceeding activities. All hours represent only substantive work related to this proceeding. No hours were claimed for proof reading, quality checks, or filing of comments.</p> <p>The amounts claimed are further conservative for the following reasons: (1) No time is claimed for internal coordination, only for substantive policy development; (2) although NRDC spent substantial time developing and coordinating positions with other stakeholders, we claim no hours for this coordination over the entire proceeding (only for actual writing of testimony as noted above); (3) we do not claim time for substantive review by other NRDC staff, even though their expertise was critical to ensuring productive recommendations; (4) we do not claim time for regulatory requirements associated with our advocacy (e.g., time spent writing ex parte notices for the proceeding), and (5) no time was claimed for advocacy blogs to influence the outcome of the Commission’s final decision, even though they were used as advocacy similar to comment writing in the formal proceeding.</p> <p>In addition, we do not claim all the time needed to prepare for this claim. We also do not claim for ongoing timekeeping or maintenance related to intervenor compensation, even though it is extremely time consuming.</p> <p>The amount requested preparing this claim is also conservative because NRDC is only claiming time spent by Martinez - who was the main author of the claim - even though others helped compile various sections of the claim. We also use Martinez’s lowest rate (2012) as the basis for the preparation portion of this claim (as identified in Comment 1 below).</p> <p>In sum, NRDC made numerous and significant contributions on behalf of environmental and customer interests, all of which required extensive research, analysis, and development of policy recommendations. As noted above, we took every effort to coordinate with other stakeholders to reduce duplication and increase the overall efficiency of the proceeding. Since our work was efficient, hours extremely conservative, and billing rates judiciously low, NRDC’s request for compensation should be granted in full.</p> | <p>amount, hours, or fees.</p> |
| <p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue:</b> See Attachment 1</p>   |                                |

**B. Specific Claim:\***

| CLAIMED                             |      |       |       |                                   |             | CPUC AWARD |                    |          |
|-------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-----------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|----------|
| ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES |      |       |       |                                   |             |            |                    |          |
| Item                                | Year | Hours | Rate  | Basis for Rate*                   | Total \$    | Hours      | Rate               | Total \$ |
| S. Martinez                         | 2012 | 74.60 | \$215 | Comment 2, Res ALJ 267, D0804010. | \$16,039.00 | 0          | \$215 <sup>2</sup> | 0        |
| S. Martinez                         | 2013 | 4.50  | \$290 | Comment 2,                        | \$1,305.00  | 0          | \$220 <sup>3</sup> | 0        |

<sup>2</sup> Adopted in D.13-05-032.

<sup>3</sup> Application of COLA in Resolution ALJ-287.

|   |      |  |                                 | Res ALJ 267,<br>D0804010.         |                      |                        |   |               |
|---|------|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|---------------|
| <b>Subtotal:</b>  |      |  |                                 |                                   | <b>\$17,344.00</b>   | <b>Subtotal:</b>       |   | \$0.00        |
| <b>OTHER FEES</b>   |      |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):   |      |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| Item  | Year | Hours                                      | Rate                            | Basis for Rate*                   | Total \$             | Hours                  | Rate  | Total \$      |
| n/a   |      |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| <b>Subtotal:</b>  |      |  |                                 |                                   | n/a                  | <b>Subtotal:</b>       |   | \$0.00        |
| <b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>   |      |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| Item  | Year | Hours                                      | Rate                            | Basis for Rate*                   | Total \$             | Hours                  | Rate  | Total \$      |
| S. Martinez   | 2013 | 4  | ½ of \$215 (which is 2012 rate) | Res ALJ 287<br>1/2 of normal rate | \$430                | 0                      | \$110   | 0             |
| <b>Subtotal:</b>  |      |  |                                 |                                   | <b>\$430</b>         | <b>Subtotal:</b>       |   | \$0.00        |
| <b>COSTS</b>  |      |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| #   | Item | Detail                                     |                                 |                                   | Amount               | Amount                 |   |               |
|   | n/a  |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| <b>Subtotal:</b>  |      |  |                                 |                                   | n/a                  | <b>Subtotal:</b>       |   | \$0           |
| <b>TOTAL REQUEST \$:</b>  |      |  |                                 |                                   | <b>\$17,774.00</b>   | <b>TOTAL AWARD \$:</b> |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <p>. *We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Claimant's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p> |      |  |                                 |                                   |                      |                        |   |               |
| <b>Attorney</b>   |      | <b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>4</sup></b> |                                 |                                   | <b>Member Number</b> |                        | <b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)<br/>If "Yes", attach explanation</b> |               |
| Sierra Martinez   |      | December 4, 2008                           |                                 |                                   | 260510               |                        | No.   |               |

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

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

| <b>Attachment or Comment #</b> | <b>Description/Comment</b>  |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Attachment 1                   | Staff time records and allocation of time by issue area   |
| Comment 1                      | <p><b>Rationale for Sierra Martinez’s rate:</b></p> <p><u>2012 Rationale:</u> Sierra Martinez was previously awarded a 2011 hourly rate of \$200 in D.13-02-013 for work done in Rulemaking (R.) 09-11-014. We requested a 2012 rate of \$210 for Martinez for work done in R.10-05-006. Martinez was a fourth year attorney in 2012. The requested rate included one step increase of 5%, which is allowable within “any given level of experience” per D.08-04-010 (at 8). We now request an updated 2012 rate of \$215, which includes a 2.2% COLA per Resolution ALJ-281. (<math>\\$210 \times 1.022 = \\$214.62</math>, rounded to \$215) We use this lower rate to claim work done preparing this claim, which occurred in 2013.</p> <p><u>2013 Rationale:</u> Martinez is now a fifth year attorney. We request the hourly rate of \$290 for work done in 2013, per Resolution ALJ-287 and per D.08-04-010 (at.8). Intervenors can qualify for a rate increase when “moving to a higher experience level: where additional experience since the last authorized rate moved a representative to a higher level of experience.”</p> <p>Martinez represents NRDC at state and local fora to promote clean energy solutions to climate change. Martinez is the Legal Director of California Energy Projects at NRDC and holds a J.D. from Stanford Law School and a B.A. from Stanford University.</p> |

**D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:**

| #  | <b>Reason</b>   |
|----|---|
| 1. | To the extent that CEJA’s presentation contributed to D.13-03-029, it duplicated that of DRA.   |
| 2. | Because we disallow 100% of the requested compensation, we do not reach the issue of reasonableness of the claim amount, hours or fees. |

**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 (see Rule 14.6(2)(6))?</b> | No |
|---|----|

If not:

| <b>Party</b> | <b>CPUC Disposition</b>          |
|--------------|----------------------------------|
| NRDC         | No factual or legal error shown. |
| CEJA         | No factual or legal error shown. |
| UCAN         | No factual or legal error shown. |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Natural Resources Defense Council has not made a substantial contribution to Decision 13-03-029.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Natural Resources Defense Council intervenor compensation claim should be denied.

**ORDER**

1. Natural Resources Defense Council's intervenor compensation claim is denied.
2. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

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> | D1303029    |                           |    |
| <b>Proceeding(s):</b>            | A1105023    |                           |    |
| <b>Author:</b>                   | ALJ Yacknin |                           |    |
| <b>Payer(s):</b>                 | N/A         |                           |    |

**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>           |
|--|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---|
| Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) | 5/24/13           | \$17,774.00             | \$0.00                | N/A                | Failure to make a substantial contribution. |

**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> |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Sierra            | Martinez         | Atty.       | NRDC              | \$219                       | 2012                             | \$215                     |
| Sierra            | Martinez         | Atty.       | NRDC              | \$290                       | 2013                             | \$220                     |

**(END OF APPENDIX)**