

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) For Authority To Update Marginal Costs, Cost Allocation, And Electric Rate Design.

Application 11-10-002
(Filed October 3, 2011)

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN COALITION AND LATINO BUSINESS CHAMBER OF GREATER LOS ANGELES FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-01-002

Claimant: Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater L.A.	For contribution to D.14-01-002
Claimed (\$): \$70,274.51	Awarded (\$): \$48,926.00 (reduced by 30.06%)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Peevey	Assigned ALJ: Stephen C. Roscow

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	In Decision (D.) 14-01-002, the Commission addressed the marginal cost, revenue allocation, and rate design proposals submitted by San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E). The Commission approved the Revenue Allocation and Rate Design Settlement, which resolved some but not all of the issues in the proceeding. The Decision also modified SDG&E's California Alternatives Rates for Energy discount allocation methodology, rejected without prejudice SDG&E's proposal for a Basic Service
--	---

¹ The total of the Joint Parties' intervenor compensation request was miscalculated. The correct amount is \$69,954.60.

	Fee, and denied SDG&E's proposed Prepay Program.
--	--

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

C.	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	December 9, 2011	Verified
2. Other Specified Date for Notice of Intent (NOI):	---	
3. Date NOI Filed:	July 9, 2012 (filing authorized by ALJ Yip-Kikugawa per e-mail of 6/28/2012)	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		No, See comment in Part IC below.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 10-12-005 A.10-12-006	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 14, 2011	Verified
7. Based on another California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) determination (specify):	---	
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes. See comment in Part IC below.
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.11-11-017	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 9, 2012	Verified
11. Based on another Commission determination (specify):	---	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-01-002	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	January 23, 2014	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	March 21, 2014	Verified ²
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
4		X	<p>Permission to Late File NOI</p> <p>An NOI to Claim Intervenor Compensation must be filed within 60 days of the prehearing conference (PHC). In this case, 60 days from December 9, 2011. On June 28, 2012, the ALJ granted Joint Parties Motion to Late File their NOI to File Intervenor Compensation. Joint Parties filed their NOI to Claim Intervenor Compensation on July 9, 2012.</p>
8		X	<p>Showing of Customer or Customer-Related Status</p> <p>Joint Parties rely on the November 14, 2011 ruling in A.10-12-005/006 to address their showing of customer or customer-related status (November 14 Ruling). The November 14, 2011 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, 2011 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>

² "The Commission, through decisions, has adopted an 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. See D.98-04-059 at 51.

			<p>On May 12, 2014, the Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles (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 Section 1802(b)(1) for a finding of eligibility as Category 3 customers.</p> <p>As noted below, the amount of the total award granted on this claim is the same as that which would have been granted if BEC were also found to be a customer. However, the award is granted to LBCGLA and NAAC only, because BEC has not been found to be a customer.</p>
16		X	<p>Timeliness of Filing</p> <p>When a compensation request is not filed in compliance with the statutory requirements and any applicable additional requirements, it is deemed incomplete.³ The request is deemed complete on May 16, 2014, when the NAAC submitted eligibility documentation required by the July 8, 2011 ruling in A.10-11-015.</p>

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(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. Customer Outreach, Research, and Consultation for SDG&E’s Proposed Prepay Program</p> <p>The Joint Parties sought to ensure that SDG&E had adequately consulted with customers in its service area and offered a program that would ensure informed participation of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.14-01-002 at 52, 54. • JP Opening Brief at 1-2, 6-10. • JP Reply Brief at 1-2, 4-7. • JP Opening Comments on Proposed Decision at 2-3. • JP Reply Comments on Proposed Decision at 1-2. 	<p>Verified</p>

³ See D.98-04-059 at 51.

<p>communities of color and low-income communities, as well as provide real benefit. As became clear through the proceeding, SDG&E had not done any meaningful research on its service area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Testimony of the Joint Parties at 7-12. • Rebuttal Testimony of the Joint Parties at 5-6. 	
<p>2. Program Design, Prepay Consumer Protections, and Program Customer Communications</p> <p>The Joint Parties argued strenuously for the Commission to reject the proposed prepay program, as it lacked significant consumer protections, especially protections for those who spoke English as a second language, and for low-income customers who may have difficulty with electronic-only communications.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.14-01-002 at 52, 54-55. • JP Opening Brief at 2-6, 9-10. • JP Reply Brief at 1-4. • Testimony of the Joint Parties at 5-6, 8. • Rebuttal Testimony of the Joint Parties at 4, 7. 	<p>Verified</p>
<p>3. General Issues and Procedural Requirements</p> <p>This category includes time spent for law and motion relating to SDG&E’s opposition to the Joint Parties’ participation, on procedural requirements, reviewing briefs of other parties or filings related to procedural issues. This category also includes time spent in engaging in coordination with other intervenors.</p>	<p>See, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JP Motion for Party Status and for Leave to Late-File Intervenor Testimony JP Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation. • JP Motion for Leave to Late-File NOI. • JP Reply to Response of SDG&E to JP Motion for Party Status and for Leave to Late-File Intervenor Testimony. 	<p>Verified</p>

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?⁴	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, The Utility Reform Network (TURN), and the National Consumer Law Center (NCLC).		Verified
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: Time was spent, as reflected in the billing records attached herein, to coordinate with many parties and ensure limited overlap, as well as coordination. 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 positions are necessarily different, though many times complementary, to the positions of the Joint Parties. Finally, with regard to the Greenlining Institute, TURN, and NCLC, all well-respected and strong advocates for ratepayers before this Commission, our positions aligned with regard to the opposition to the Prepay Program. The Joint Parties and the perspective they bring are distinct and unique from those of the aforementioned groups as the Joint Parties all provide direct services to their constituencies in a way that TURN, Greenlining and the NCLC do not. Accordingly, though the positions might have been similar, they are informed in a unique way through the Joint Parties’ experience which lends credibility to Commission decision making.		Verified. The time records submitted by the Joint Parties support their efforts to coordinate with ORA and TURN to avoid duplication.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation: The Joint Parties’ advocacy reflected in D.14-01-002 addressed policy matters and consumer protection concerns relating to SDG&E’s proposed prepay pilot program. For the most part, the Joint Parties cannot easily identify	CPUC Verified Rates requested by the Joint Parties are largely not reasonable. Hourly Rates
---	---

⁴ 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: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from their work related to D.14-01-002, given the nature of the issues presented and the fact that the program had yet to be implemented.</p>	<p>requested for one representative are much higher than those previously adopted by the Commission in other decisions and rates for other representatives are higher than those allowed by ALJ Resolutions. See Part III(D) for further explanation.</p>								
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes approximately 213.85 total hours for the Joint Parties’ attorneys and staff. The Joint Parties submit that this is a 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 possible.</p> <p>The Joint Parties’ request also includes 11.8 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>Joint Parties requested several hours for non-compensable activities including preparation for and attendance at public participation hearings.</p>								
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="240 1167 1135 1430"> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1167 1003 1262">A. Customer Outreach, Research, and Consultation for SDG&E’s Proposed Prepay Program</td> <td data-bbox="1003 1167 1135 1262">19.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1262 1003 1335">B. Program Design, Prepay Consumer Protections, and Program Customer Communications</td> <td data-bbox="1003 1262 1135 1335">24.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1335 1003 1371">C. General Issues and Procedural Requirements</td> <td data-bbox="1003 1335 1135 1371">56.1%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="240 1371 1003 1430">Total</td> <td data-bbox="1003 1371 1135 1430">100%</td> </tr> </table>	A. Customer Outreach, Research, and Consultation for SDG&E’s Proposed Prepay Program	19.1%	B. Program Design, Prepay Consumer Protections, and Program Customer Communications	24.8%	C. General Issues and Procedural Requirements	56.1%	Total	100%	<p>This allocation of hours by issue accurately reflects those of the time sheets submitted.</p>
A. Customer Outreach, Research, and Consultation for SDG&E’s Proposed Prepay Program	19.1%								
B. Program Design, Prepay Consumer Protections, and Program Customer Communications	24.8%								
C. General Issues and Procedural Requirements	56.1%								
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	42.2	\$545	Attachment B	\$23,162.50 ⁵	29.2	\$545	\$15,914.00	
Robert Gnaizda	2013	30.8	\$555	Attachment B	\$17,094.00	30.8	\$555	\$17,094.00	
Shalini Swaroop	2012	28.5	\$220	Attachment C	\$6,270.00	27	\$185	\$4,995.00	
Aaron Lewis	2012	34.1	\$195	Attachment F	\$6,649.50	33.7	\$90	\$3,033.00	
Aaron Lewis	2013	9.5	\$215	Attachment F	\$2,042.50	9.1	\$180	\$1,638.00	
Faith Bautista	2012	12.4	\$306	Attachment D	\$3,794.40	8.3	\$155	\$1,286.50	
Faith Bautista	2013	16.7	\$312	Attachment D	\$5,210.40	8.8	\$160	\$1,408.00	
Michael Phillips	2012	.8	\$391	Attachment E	\$469.20 ⁶	0	\$360	\$0	
					Subtotal:	\$64,692.50 ⁷	Subtotal:		\$45,368.50
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 \$	
Ian Brown	2012	38.85	\$110	Attachment G	\$4,273.50	24.85	\$100	\$2,485.00	
					Subtotal:	\$4,273.50	Subtotal:		\$2,485.00

⁵ The total request for Robert Gnaizda's 2012 work was miscalculated in the Joint Parties' request. The correct amount is \$22,999.

⁶ The total request for Michael Phillips' 2012 work was miscalculated in Joint Parties' request. The correct amount is \$312.80.

⁷ The subtotal of the Joint Parties' requested Attorney, Expert, and Advocate Fees was miscalculated. The correct amount is \$64,372.60.

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Aaron Lewis	2014	11.8	\$107.5	Attachment F	\$1,268.50	11.8	\$90	\$1,062.00
Subtotal:					\$1,268.50	Subtotal:		\$1,062.00
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1	Printing	Printing CPUC decisions, parties' filings, etc.			\$40			\$10.50
Subtotal:					\$40	Subtotal:		\$10.50
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$70,274.50⁸	TOTAL AWARD \$:		\$48,926.00

We remind all intervenor 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 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate.

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁹	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Robert Gnaizda	Jan. 9, 1962	32148	No
Shalini Swaroop	Jun. 11, 2010	270609	No
Aaron Lewis	Dec. 5, 2012	285526	No

C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

#	Reason
2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate of Robert Gnaizda	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$545 for Robert Gnaizda's work in 2012 and \$555 for Gnaizda's work in 2013. The Commission adopted a 2011 hourly rate for Gnaizda of \$ 535 in D.12-07-015. We apply the 2.2% Cost Of Living Adjustment adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$545 for Gnaizda's 2012 work in A.11-10-002. We apply the 2% Cost of Living Adjustment adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-287 to adopt an hourly rate of \$555 for Gnaizda's 2013 work in A.11-10-002.

⁸ The total of the Joint Parties' intervenor compensation request was miscalculated. The correct amount is \$69,954.60.

⁹ This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

2012 Hourly Rate for Shalini Swaroop	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$220 for Swaroop's work performed in 2012 in this proceeding. An hourly rate for Shalini Swaroop has not been adopted by the Commission in the past. Swaroop became a licensed member of the California bar in June of 2010. We base Swaroop's new rates on the 2012 rate described in Resolution ALJ-281 and apply the 2.2% Cost Of Living Adjustment adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$185 for Swaroop's 2012 work.
2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate for Advocate Faith Bautista	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$306 for Faith Bautista's work in 2012 and \$312 for Bautista's work in 2013. The Commission adopted a 2011 hourly rate for Bautista of \$150 in D.12-07-015. We apply the 2.2% Cost Of Living Adjustment adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-281 to adopt an hourly rate of \$155 for Bautista's 2012 work in A.11-10-002. We apply the 2% Cost of Living Adjustment adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-287 to adopt an hourly rate of \$160 for Bautista's 2013 work in A.11-10-002.
2012 and 2013 Hourly Rate for Aaron Lewis	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$195 for Aaron Lewis' work performed in 2012 and \$215 for Lewis 2013 work in A.11-10-002. Lewis became a licensed member of the California Bar in December of 2012. Prior to becoming a licensed attorney in December 2012, the Commission adopted a 2011 hourly rate for Lewis, a legal intern, of \$90 in D.12-07-015. For Lewis' 2012 work in A.11-10-002 we adopt an hourly rate of \$90. For Lewis 2013 work in A.11-10-002, with 0 years of experience as a licensed attorney, we adopt an hourly rate of \$180 pursuant to Resolution ALJ-287.
2012 Hourly Rate for Ian Brown	The Joint Parties seek an hourly rate of \$110 for Ian Brown's work performed in 2012 in A.11-10-002. An hourly rate for Brown has not been awarded by the Commission in the past. In D.13-10-014, a law student with a comparable level of experience was awarded an hourly rate of \$100. We apply this hourly rate to Brown's 2012 work.
Disallowance of Robert Gnaizda's hours in 2012	The Joint Parties seek compensation for several hours of Gnaizda's work on activities that are not compensable. These disallowed hours are associated with activities in preparation for public participation hearings, for example drafting statements for PPH speakers and drafting press releases.
Disallowance of Shalini Swaroop's hours in 2012	The Joint Parties seek compensation for hours of Swaroop's work on activities that are not compensable. These disallowed hours are associated with activities on clerical work, for example filing and serving motions, and preparation for public participation hearings, for example outreach strategy for public participation hearings, and have been disallowed.
Disallowance of Aaron Lewis' hours in 2013	The Joint Parties seek compensation for Lewis' work on activities that are not compensable. These disallowed hours are associated with activities including clerical work, for example filing and serving briefs.
Disallowance of Hours for Faith Bautista in 2012 and 2013	The Joint Parties seek compensation for several hours of Bautista's work on activities that are not compensable. These disallowed hours are associated with activities in preparation for public participation hearings, for example discussions with Gnaizda on upcoming public participation hearings and hours for activities not within the record, for example drafting a letter to Paul Clanon, and have been disallowed.
Disallowance of Hours for Ian Brown in 2012	The Joint Parties seek compensation several hours of Brown's work on activities that are not compensable. These disallowed hours are associated with activities preparing for public participation hearings, for example constructing press materials and meetings regarding organizing for public participation hearings, and have been disallowed.

Disallowance of Hours for Michael Phillips in 2012	The Joint Parties seek compensation for Phillips' work on activities that are not compensable. These disallowed hours are associated with activities not reflected in the record, for example designing surveys and outreach.
Printing Expenses	Expenses claimed over \$20 must be accompanied by an itemized receipt. The Joint Parties were notified by email on June 13, 2014, to provide such a receipt by June 19, 2014. No receipt was provided. After review of the Joint Parties' filings, printing expenses of \$10.50 are reasonable to reflect the printing necessary to the fulfill Joint Parties' service requirements.

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(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Joint Parties reply on the November 14, 2011 ruling in A.10-12-005/006 to address their showing of customer or customer-related status (November 14 Ruling). The November 14, 2011 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 intervent compensation.
2. On May 12, 2014, LBCGLA submitted signed bylaws completing the statutory requirements of § 1802(b)(1) and establishing eligibility as a Category 3 customer.
3. On May 16, 2014, NAAC submitted signed bylaws completing the statutory requirements of § 1802(b)(1) and establishing eligibility as a Category 3 customer.
4. BEC does not have signed bylaws on file with the Commission, and has not established customer eligibility under § 1802(b)(1).
5. BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA have made a substantial contribution to D.14-01-002 but only LBCGLA and NAAC are customers eligible for compensation, pursuant to § 1802(b)(1).

6. The hourly rates for the representatives of BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA, 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 BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA's representatives.
7. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
8. The total of the reasonable compensation is \$ 48,926.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

BEC, NAAC, and LBCGLA's 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 \$ 48,926.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall pay National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles, the 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 day 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.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1401002		
Proceeding(s):	A1110002		
Author:	ALJ Stephen Roscow		
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas & Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles.	03/21/2013 Date of Completed Filing: 5/16/2014	\$70,275.50 ¹⁰	\$48,926.00	No	Award only to National Asian American Coalition and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles. No award to Black Economic Council for lack of statutory eligibility. Disallowances for lack of substantial contribution on certain issues, clerical tasks, duplication of effort, incomplete timesheets, unreasonable hours, and adjusted hourly rates.

¹⁰ The total of the Joint Parties' intervenor compensation request was miscalculated in their claim. The correct amount is \$69,954.60.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$545	2012	\$545
Robert	Gnaizda	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$555	2013	\$555
Shalini	Swaroop	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$220	2012	\$185
Aaron	Lewis	Law Student	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$195	2012	\$90
Aaron	Lewis	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business	\$215	2013	\$180

			Chamber of Greater Los Angeles			
Aaron	Lewis	Attorney	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$215	2014	\$90/\$180
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	National Asian American Coalition	\$306	2012	\$155
Faith	Bautista	Advocate	National Asian American Coalition	\$312	2013	\$160
Ian	Brown	Law Student	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$110	2012	\$100
Michael	Phillips	Expert	Black Economic Council, National Asian American Coalition, and Latino Business Chamber of Greater Los Angeles	\$391	2012	\$360

(END OF APPENDIX)