

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

| | |
|---|--|
| Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Economic Development Rate for 2013-2017 (U39E). | Application 12-03-001 (Filed March 1, 2012) |
|---|--|

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN COALITION AND LATINO BUSINESS CHAMBER OF GREATER LOS ANGELES FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 13-10-019

| | |
|---|--|
| Claimant: Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater L.A. (collectively, Joint Parties) | For contribution to D.13-10-019 |
| Claimed (\$): \$60,603.65 ¹ | Awarded (\$): \$58,148.75 (reduced by 4.0%) |
| Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey ² | Assigned ALJ: Richard W. Clark |

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

| | |
|--|--|
| A. Brief Description of Decision: | D.13-10-019 authorizes Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) to offer both a Standard and an Enhanced Economic Development Rate (EDR) tariff to retain load or to stimulate new or expanded load and employment opportunities within PG&E's service territory. |
|--|--|

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

| | Claimant | CPUC Verified |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)): | | |
| 1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC): | 1 st PHC: May 17, 2012; 2 nd PHC: July 23, 2012. | Verified |

¹ The original filed claims list \$59,442.40 as the total amount claimed by the Joint Parties. Upon review of Joint Parties' timesheets, the actual amount claimed by the Joint Parties is \$60,603.65. This correction has been applied throughout the Decision.

² Assigned February 6, 2014.

| | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 2. Other Specified Date for Notice of Intent (NOI): | --- | |
| 3. Date NOI Filed: | August 1, 2012 ³ | Verified |
| 4. Was the NOI timely filed? | | |
| Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)): | | |
| 5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number: | A.10-12-005/006 | See Comments in Part I.C. |
| 6. Date of ALJ ruling: | November 14, 2011 | See Comments in Part I.C. |
| 7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify): | --- | |
| 8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status? | | Yes, in part. See Comment in Part IC |
| Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)): | | |
| 9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number: | A.10-12-005/006 | Verified |
| 10. Date of ALJ ruling: | November 14, 2011 | Verified |
| 11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify): | --- | |
| 12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship? | | Yes |
| Timely request for compensation (§ 1804I): | | |
| 13. Identify Final Decision: | D.13-10-019 | Verified |
| 14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision: | October 9, 2013 | Verified |
| 15. File date of compensation request: | December 6, 2013 | See Comments in Part I.C. |
| 16. Was the request for compensation timely? | | Yes |

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

| # | Claimant | CPUC | Comment |
|---|----------|------|--|
| 1 | X | | An August 31, 2012 ruling by ALJ Clark deemed the NOI timely filed. |
| | | X | <p><u>Showing of Customer or Customer-Related Status</u></p> <p>Joint Parties rely on the November 14, 2011 ruling in Application (A.)10-12-005/-006 to address their showing of customer or customer-related status (November 14 Ruling). The November 14 Ruling acknowledged the July 8, 2011 ruling in A.10-11-015 directing the Joint Parties to submit signed amended bylaws when the Joint Parties file a request for intervenor compensation. Based on the July 8, 2011 ruling and the amended NOI filed in A.10-11-015, the November 14</p> |

³ The Joint Parties filed a Motion for Leave to Late File its NOI in this proceeding. ALJ Clark ruled on said Motion on August 31, 2012. ALJ Clark noted that the Motion was “not necessary” as the Joint Parties’ NOI was made within nine days after they became parties and nine days after the second PHC in this Proceeding.

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>Ruling determined that the Joint Parties demonstrated status as a “customer” for purposes of this proceeding. This preliminary determination of customer eligibility would be supported only when Joint Parties submitted signature pages reflecting the adoption of its amended bylaws.</p> <p>On May 12, 2014, the Latino Business Chamber of Greater L.A. (LBCGLA) submitted signed bylaws, meeting the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer. On May 16, 2014, the National Asian American Coalition (NAAC) submitted signed amendments to its bylaws, meeting the requirements of § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as a Category 3 customer. The Black Economic Council (BEC) does not have signed bylaws on file with the Commission and as of the issuance date of this award decision, has not satisfied the requirements of Public Utilities Code § 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers.</p> |
| | | X | <p><u>Timeliness of Filing</u></p> <p>The Commission, through decisions, has adopted and applies a policy of awarding interest from the 75th day after the date of the filing of a complete compensation request. If a compensation request is not filed in compliance with the statute and any applicable additional requirements, and an amendment is necessary to bring that request into compliance, then interest should accrue from the 75th day after the date the amendment to the request for compensation was filed. <i>See Decision 98-04-059 at 51.</i></p> |

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Claimant’s description of its contribution to the final decisions (see Public Utilities Code § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).

| Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution | Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision | CPUC DISCUSSION |
|--|--|------------------------|
| <p>1. Metrics to Track Benefits</p> <p>The Joint Parties argued extensively for the CPUC, if it were to approve the EDR, to require metrics and tracking mechanisms to evaluate job creation benefits. These recommended tracking mechanisms and metrics included evaluations of the number of jobs, and the demographics of those who filled the jobs. The Joint Parties also, among other recommendations, endorsed tracking the salaries of created jobs.</p> <p>Although the Commission ultimately did not adopt <u>all</u> of the Joint Parties’ recommendations, the final decision</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. 13-10-019 at 35-37. • Joint Parties’ (JP) Opening Brief at 6-7, 13-15, 17-19, 26-29. • JP Reply Brief at 4, 7. • Rebuttal Testimony of JP Experts Bautista and Corralejo (Oct. 19, 2012) at 3-4. • JP Opening Comments on Proposed Decision at 2-3. • JP Reply Comments on | <p>Verified.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| <p>acknowledges the importance of tracking job creation benefits with regularity, and making available aggregated information for the use of civil society organizations.</p> <p>The Joint Parties’ time invested in this issue should be duly compensated in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1802(i), where they “substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.”</p> <p>Furthermore, pursuant to § 1802(i), the Joint Parties believe that in many instances their “participation has resulted in substantial contribution, even if the decision adopt[ed] that customer’s contention or recommendation only in part. . . .”</p> | <p>Proposed Decision at 2.</p> | |
| <p>2. Externalities and Third-Party Impacts</p> <p>The Joint Parties sought to ensure that safeguards existed in any approved EDR so as to limit negative impacts on nonparticipating customers, and to ensure that the EDR was in fact being offered to companies that were at risk of relocating.</p> <p>Decision (D.) 13-10-019 ensures that, through affidavits and CTM standards, nonparticipating customers will not be forced to cover certain costs, and free riders will be reduced.</p> <p>Even though D.13-10-019 does not reflect many of the Joint Parties’ recommendations, the time invested in this issue should be duly compensated in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 1802(i), where they “substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.”</p> <p>Furthermore, pursuant to §1802(i), the Joint Parties believe that in many instances their “participation has resulted in substantial</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D. 13-10-019 at 672-682. • JP Opening Brief at 6, 20, 22, 25-27, 29. • JP Reply Brief at 8-9. • JP Reply Comments on Proposed Decision at 1. • Rebuttal Testimony of JP Experts Bautista and Corralejo (Oct. 19, 2012) at 5-6. | <p>First citation is incorrect; Verified as to all other citations.</p> <p>The Commission will apply the policy of awarding a participant for substantial contribution even when the participant’s positions are not adopted in the final determination of the issues considered in the proceeding. (<i>See</i> Decision 06-03-001 at 4.)</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| <p>contribution, even if the decision adopt[ed] that customer’s contention or recommendation only in part. . . .”</p> | | |
| <p>3. Energy Conservation</p> <p>During this proceeding, the Joint Parties argued that, if the Commission approved the EDR, that there should be requirements for participating companies to conserve energy. The Joint Parties believe that the discounted rate comes with an imperative to reduce energy consumption to assist CTM and assist in California’s energy conservation goals.</p> <p>D.13-10-019 requires PG&E to achieve a 5% energy reduction over the life of the enhanced EDR, across all Enhanced EDR customers.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.13-10-019 at 33-35. • JP Opening Brief at 21-22. • JP Opening Comments on Proposed Decision at 3. | <p>Verified.</p> |
| <p>4. Greater Focus on Small Businesses</p> <p>The Joint Parties argued for the EDR, should it be adopted, to be designed so that it was more inclusive and feasible for small business participation. The Joint Parties also advocated for outreach to small businesses, particularly diverse owned business so that, as sources of significant job creation, they could better participate.</p> <p>Even though these recommendations were not embraced by D. 13-10-019, the Joint Parties provided valuable context and policy considerations, and the time invested in this issue should be duly compensated in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1802(i), where they “substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.”</p> <p>Furthermore, pursuant to §1802(i), the Joint Parties believe that in many instances their “participation has resulted in substantial contribution, even if the decision adopt[ed] that customer’s contention or recommendation only in part. . . .”</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP Motion Requesting Party Status at 3. • JP Opening Brief at 11-13, 16. • JP Reply Brief at 7. • Rebuttal Testimony of Michael Phillips (Oct. 19, 2012) at 2. • Testimony of Michael Phillips (Aug. 24, 2012) at 5-6. • Testimony of JP Experts Bautista, Canty, and Corralejo (Aug. 24, 2012) at 6, 9. • Rebuttal Testimony of JP Experts Bautista and Corralejo (Oct. 19, 2012) at 3. | <p>Verified.</p> |
| <p>5. Fundamental Policy Rationales and EDR Design</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP Motion Requesting Party Status at 4. | <p>Verified.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| <p>The Joint Parties argued against the CPUC approving the EDR or, in the alternative, implementing the aforementioned (<i>supra</i> 9.1-9.4) modifications to the EDR.</p> <p>The Joint Parties argued that the underlying premise of the EDR (that electricity discounts were needed to prevent business relocation out-of-state) was incorrect.</p> <p>Even though these recommendations were not embraced by D.13-10-019, the Joint Parties provided valuable context and policy considerations, and the time invested in this issue should be duly compensated in accordance with Cal. Pub. Util. Code §1802(i), where they “substantially assisted the Commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.”</p> <p>Furthermore, pursuant to §1802(i), the Joint Parties believe that in many instances their “participation has resulted in substantial contribution, even if the decision adopt[ed] that customer’s contention or recommendation only in part. . . .”</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP Opening Brief at 6, 9-11, 14, 21-24, 29. • JP Reply Brief at 3-4, 9. • Testimony of Michael Phillips (Aug. 24, 2012) at 3-5. • Testimony of JP Experts Bautista, Canty, and Corralejo (Aug. 24, 2012) at 6-8. • Rebuttal Testimony of JP Experts Bautista and Corralejo (Oct. 19, 2012) at 3, 5-7. | |
| <p>6. General Issues and Procedural Requirements</p> <p>This category includes procedural requirements, reviewing briefs of other parties or filings related to procedural or discovery issues, as well as motion practice. This category also includes time spent in engaging in coordination with other intervenors.</p> | <p><i>See, e.g.:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP Motion Requesting Party Status • JP Motion for Leave to Late-File Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation | <p>Verified.</p> |

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

| | | |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | <p>Claimant</p> | <p>CPUC Verified</p> |
|--|------------------------|-----------------------------|

| | | |
|--|--|----------|
| a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA)⁴ a party to the proceeding? | Yes | Verified |
| b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours? | Yes | Verified |
| c. If so, provide name of other parties: The Greenlining Institute | | Verified |
| <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>Time was spent, as reflected in the billing records attached herein, to coordinate with many parties and ensure limited overlap.</p> <p>Furthermore, ORA does not represent, except only generally, the same communities as the Joint Parties, and does not have the same grassroots involvement in those communities. Accordingly, ORA's is necessarily different, though many times complementary, to the positions of the Joint Parties.</p> <p>Finally, with regard to the Greenlining Institute, a well-respected and strong advocate for communities of color and low-income persons before this Commission, our positions either did not cover the same issue areas the Joint Parties addressed, or did not cover issues in the <i>same way</i> or with similar positions to the Joint Parties.</p> | Many of the Joint Parties' pleadings were duplicative of work done by other participants in this proceeding. | |

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation:</p> <p>The Joint Parties' advocacy reflected in D. 13-10-019 addressed broad policy matters from the perspective of for low-income communities and communities of color. For the most part, the Joint Parties cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from their work related to D.13-10-019, given the nature of the issues presented.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Joint Parties' issues are not conducive to easy quantification of benefit. The issues raised, and the benefits that accrue from diversity of hiring, supplier diversity, and customer outreach are not readily quantifiable, though the Joint Parties argued strongly for metrics that <i>would allow quantification of benefit</i>.</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">CPUC Verified</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Verified.</p> |
| <p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes approximately 180.4 total hours for the Joint Parties' attorneys and staff. The Joint Parties submit that this is a</p> | |

⁴ The 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>reasonable amount of time, given the issues examined. These hours were devoted to substantive pleadings as well as to procedural matters.</p> <p>The Joint Parties' request is also reasonable because they were as efficient as possible in staffing this proceeding. Ms. Swaroop, and subsequently Mr. Lewis, as their hourly rates are much lower than Mr. Gnaizda's, were utilized as much as could be possible.</p> <p>The Joint Parties' request also includes 11.5 hours devoted to the preparation of this request for compensation. Mr. Lewis prepared this claim, avoiding the need for any of Mr. Gnaizda's time, which is several times more costly.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>A. Metrics to Track Benefits</td> <td>10.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Externalities and Third-Party Impacts</td> <td>5.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Energy Conservation</td> <td>2.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D. Greater Focus on Small Businesses</td> <td>16.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E. Fundamental Policy Rationales and EDR Design</td> <td>13.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F. General Issues and Procedural Requirements</td> <td>52.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> </table> | | A. Metrics to Track Benefits | 10.2% | B. Externalities and Third-Party Impacts | 5.1% | C. Energy Conservation | 2.3% | D. Greater Focus on Small Businesses | 16.3% | E. Fundamental Policy Rationales and EDR Design | 13.3% | F. General Issues and Procedural Requirements | 52.8% | Total | 100% |
| A. Metrics to Track Benefits | 10.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B. Externalities and Third-Party Impacts | 5.1% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| C. Energy Conservation | 2.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| D. Greater Focus on Small Businesses | 16.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| E. Fundamental Policy Rationales and EDR Design | 13.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| F. General Issues and Procedural Requirements | 52.8% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 100% | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

B. Specific Claim*:

| CLAIMED | | | | | | CPUC AWARD | | |
|-------------------------------------|------|-------|-------|-----------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|
| ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES | | | | | | | | |
| Item | Year | Hours | Rate | Basis for Rate* | Total \$ | Hours | Rate | Total \$ |
| Robert Gnaizda | 2012 | 32.5 | \$545 | Attachment B | \$17,712.50 | 32.5 | \$545 | \$17,712.50 |
| Robert Gnaizda | 2013 | 22.7 | \$545 | Attachment B | \$12,371.50 | 21.3 | \$555 ⁵ | \$11,821.50 |
| Shalini Swaroop | 2012 | 81.9 | \$220 | Attachment C | \$18,018 | 79.1 | \$185 | \$14,633.50 |
| Shalini Swaroop | 2013 | 21.2 | \$231 | Attachment C | \$4,897.2 | 21.2 | \$190 ⁶ | \$4,028.00 |
| Aaron Lewis | 2013 | 8.7 | \$195 | Attachment F | \$1,696.50 | 8.7 | \$185 | \$1,609.50 |
| Faith Bautista | 2012 | 3.4 | \$306 | Attachment D | \$1,040.40 | 3.4 | \$155 | \$527.00 |
| Faith Bautista | 2013 | 1.7 | \$306 | Attachment D | \$520.20 | 1.7 | \$160 | \$272.00 |
| Michael Phillips | 2012 | 7.4 | \$383 | Attachment E | \$2,834.20 | 7.4 | \$390 | \$2,886.00 |

⁵ Application of 2.0% COLA adopted by Resolution ALJ-287.

⁶ Application of 2.0% COLA adopted by Resolution ALJ-287.

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Michael Phillips | 2013 | 0.9 | \$391 | Attachment E | \$351.90 | 0.9 | \$395 ⁷ | \$3,555.00 |
| Subtotal: | | | | | \$59,442.40 | Subtotal: | | \$57,045.00 |
| INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION ** | | | | | | | | |
| Item | Year | Hours | Rate | Basis for Rate* | Total \$ | Hours | Rate | Total \$ |
| Aaron Lewis | 2013 | 11.5 | \$97.5 | Attachment F | \$1,121.25 | 11.5 | \$92.50 | \$1,063.75 |
| Subtotal: | | | | | \$1,121.25 | Subtotal: | | \$1,063.75 |
| COSTS | | | | | | | | |
| # | Item | Detail | | | Amount | Amount | | |
| 1 | Printing | Printing CPUC decisions, parties' filings, etc. | | | \$40 | | | \$40.00 |
| Subtotal: | | | | | \$40 | Subtotal: | | \$40.00 |
| TOTAL REQUEST \$: | | | | | \$60,603.65 | TOTAL AWARD \$: | | \$58,148.75 |
| <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>** Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.</p> | | | | | | | | |
| ATTORNEY INFORMATION | | | | | | | | |
| Attorney | | Date Admitted to CA BAR⁸ | | | Member Number | | Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation | |
| Robert Gnaizda | | January 9, 1962 | | | 32148 | | No | |
| Shalini Swaroop | | June 11, 2010 | | | 270609 | | No | |
| Aaron Lewis | | December 5, 2012 | | | 285526 | | No | |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Attachment or Comment# | Description/Comment |
| 1 | Certificate of Service |

⁷ Application of 2.0% COLA Adopted by Resolution ALJ-287

⁸ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Attachment A | Time Recording for Attorneys, Experts, and Staff |
| Attachment B | 2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate for Counsel Robert Gnaizda |
| Attachment C | 2011 and 2012 Hourly Rate for Shalini Swaroop |
| Attachment D | 2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate for Expert Faith Bautista |
| Attachment E | 2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate for Michael Phillips |
| Attachment F | 2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate for Counsel Aaron Lewis |

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:

| # | Reason |
|--|---|
| 1. Adoption of Robert Gnaizda's hourly rate(s). | Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$545 for Gnaizda's work in 2012. The Commission adopted a 2010 and 2011 hourly rate for Gnaizda of \$535 in D.12-07-015. We apply the 2.2% Cost-Of-Living-Adjustment (COLA) adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$545 for Gnaizda's 2012 work in this proceeding. Furthermore, we apply the 2.0% COLA adopted by Resolution ALJ-287 to adopt an hourly rate of \$555 for Gnaizda's 2013 work in this proceeding. |
| 2. Adoption of Shalini Swaroop's hourly rate(s). | Joint Parties seek the rate of \$220 for 2012 and \$231 for 2013 for work Swaroop completed in this proceeding. The Commission does not have a pre-established hourly rate for Swaroop's work in Commission proceedings. As such, the Commission defers to Resolution ALJ-281 in establishing an hourly rate reflective of Swaroop's experience. Swaroop became a licensed attorney in June 2010 and had approximately one-year of experience as an attorney when she began working on this proceeding. Resolution ALJ-281 sets 2012 attorney hourly rates with 0-2 years of experience at \$155-\$210 per hour. Swaroop's experience coupled with ALJ-281's guidelines supports the Commission's adoption of Swaroop's 2012 hourly rate of \$185. We apply the 2.0% COLA in Resolution ALJ-287, and adopt the rate of \$190 per hour for work Swaroop completed in 2013. |
| 3. Adoption of Faith Bautista's hourly rate(s). | Joint Parties seek an hourly of \$306 for 2012-2013 for work Bautista completed in this proceeding. The Commission has pre-established hourly rates for Bautista, adopted by D. 12-07-015. For 2010 and 2011, the Commission adopted the rate of \$150 per hour for work Bautista completed in this proceeding. For 2012, the Commission applies the 2.2% COLA adopted by Resolution ALJ-281, and adopts Bautista the rate of \$155 per hour. For 2013, the Commission applies the 2.0% COLA adopted by Resolution ALJ-287, and adopts Bautista the rate of \$160 per hour. |
| 4. Adoption of Michael Phillips' hourly rate(s). | Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$383 and \$391 for Phillips' work in this proceeding. The Commission adopted a 2010 hourly rate of \$360 for Phillips in D. 12-04-033. The Commission supports Joint Parties position of a 5%-step increase for Phillips in 2011, and adopts Phillips the rate of \$390 per hour for 2012. This 2012 rate is reflective of both a step-increase for Phillips' 2011 rate and the 2.2% COLA adopted by Resolution ALJ-281. The Commission applies the 2.0% COLA to Phillips 2012 rate, to adopt for him the rate of \$395 for work he completed in 2013. |
| 5. Adoption of Aaron Lewis' hourly rate(s). | Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$195 for Lewis' work in 2013. Having only become licensed in 2012, Lewis falls into the 0-2 year range of experience for attorneys, pursuant to Resolution ALJ-287. As such, we adopt the rate of \$185 per |

| | |
|--|---|
| | hour for work Lewis completed in this proceeding in 2013. |
| 6. Disallowance for clerical and administrative tasks. | The Commission disallows time for administrative overhead. ⁹ In accordance with this practice, we disallow hours related to Joint Parties' administrative tasks (e.g. filing, formatting, serving, etc.). Disallowances result in 1.8 hours from Swaroop's 2012 claimed hours. |
| 7. Disallowance for failure to allocate by issue. | Joint Parties are disallowed 1.1 hours for failure to sufficiently justify the linkage to this proceeding. |

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles rely on the November 14, 2011 ruling in A.10-12-005/006 to support their claim as eligible Category 3 customers in their Notice of Intent in Application 12-03-001.

2. The November 14, 2011 ALJ ruling in Application (A.) 10-12-005/006 relied on Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles' fulfillment of the requirements set by the July 8, 2011 ruling in A.10-11-015 requiring the parties to submit signed bylaws with their claim in A. 10-11-015 to uphold its preliminary finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers, defined by § 1802(b)(1).

3. On May 12, 2014, Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles submitted signed bylaws completing the statutory requirements of § 1802(b)(1) and establishing eligibility as a Category 3 customer.

4. On May 16, 2014, National Asian American Coalition submitted signed bylaws completing the statutory requirements of § 1802(b)(1) and establishing eligibility as a Category 3 customer.

5. Black Economic Council does not have signed amended bylaws with the Commission and has not established customer eligibility under §1802(b)(1).

6. Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles have made a substantial contribution to Decision 13-10-019, but only Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles and National Asian American Coalition are customers eligible for compensation, pursuant to §1802(b)(1).

⁹ See Decision 12-02-034 at 13 and D.11-07-024.

7. The hourly rates for the representatives of Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles, as adjusted herein, are comparable to the market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services, and consistent with the past hourly rates awarded to Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles' representatives.

8. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

9. The total of reasonable compensation is \$58,148.75.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles' intervenor compensation claim, as adjusted herein, satisfies the requirements of Public Utilities Code Sections 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles are awarded \$58,148.75.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles the total award. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning July 30, 2014, the 75th days after the filing of Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles' request was completed, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

4. Application 12-03-001 remains open.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|----|
| Compensation Decision: | | Modifies Decision? | No |
| Contribution Decision(s): | D1310019 | | |
| Proceeding(s): | A1203001 | | |
| Author: | ALJ Richard W. Clark | | |
| Payer(s): | Pacific Gas and Electric Company | | |

Intervenor Information

| Intervenor | Claim Date | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Multiplier? | Reason Change/Disallowance |
|--|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--|
| Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater L.A. (collectively, Joint Parties) | 12/6/13 Date of Claim's Completion: 5/16/14 | \$60,603.65 | \$58,148.75 | N/A | Duplication of efforts; failure to allocate by issues; change in hourly rates. |

Advocate Information

| First Name | Last Name | Type | Intervenor | Hourly Fee Requested | Year Hourly Fee Requested | Hourly Fee Adopted |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Robert | Gnaizda | Attorney | NAAC | \$545 | 2012 | \$545 |
| Robert | Gnaizda | Attorney | NAAC | \$545 | 2013 | \$555 |
| Shalini | Swaroop | Attorney | NAAC | \$220 | 2012 | \$185 |
| Shalini | Swaroop | Attorney | NAAC | \$231 | 2013 | \$190 |
| Aaron | Lewis | Attorney | NAAC | \$195 | 2013 | \$185 |
| Faith | Bautista | Advocate | BEC | \$306 | 2012 | \$155 |
| Faith | Bautista | Advocate | BEC | \$306 | 2013 | \$160 |
| Michael | Phillips | Expert | Joint Parties | \$383 | 2012 | \$390 |
| Michael | Phillips | Expert | Joint Parties | \$391 | 2013 | \$395 |

(End of Appendix)