

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Application of Southern California Edison Company to Establish Marginal Costs, Allocate Revenues, Design Rates, and Implement Dynamic Pricing Rates	Application 11-06-007 (Filed June 6, 2011)
---	---

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO AGRICULTURAL ENERGY  
CONSUMERS ASSOCIATION FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO  
DECISION 13-03-031**

<b>Claimant: Agricultural Energy Consumers Association (AECA)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 13-03-031</b>
<b>Claimed (\$): 70,768.28</b>	<b>Awarded (\$): \$70,660.42 (0.15% reduction)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Stephen L. Roscow</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	D.13-03-031 Adopts the Marginal Cost, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design Settlements in SCE's Phase II GRC
--	---

**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:	September 12, 2011	Yes.
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI Filed:	October 12, 2011	Yes.
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	A.10-03-014	Yes.

**PROPOSED DECISION**

number:		
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 30, 2010	Yes.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.13-02-019	
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.10-03-014	Yes.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 30, 2010	Yes.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.13-02-019	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes.
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.13-03-031	Yes.
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	April 2, 2013	Yes.
15. File date of compensation request:	May 31, 2013	Yes.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes.

**C. Additional Comments on Part I:**

#	Claimant	Comment
9	X	In multiple decisions over the past two decades (D.95-07-093; D.96-08-040; D.96-11-048; D.02-06-014; D.03-09-067, D.06-04-065), and most recently in D.13-02-019, the Commission has found that AECA represents individual member farmers who have annual electricity bills of less than \$50,000, and that members’ economic interest has been considered small in comparison to the costs of participation. For purposes of this proceeding, AECA had 309 active individual members (excluding agricultural associations and water district members) with 211 of those members having electricity bills of less than \$50,000. As a result AECA is seeking 68% (211÷309) of the total compensation found reasonable in this proceeding.

**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>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution</b>	<b>Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision</b>	<b>Showing Accepted by CPUC</b>
<p>1. AECA litigation position set forth in testimony:</p> <p>a. Revise marginal cost and revenue allocation methodologies.</p> <p>b. Cap agricultural rate schedules at zero percent.</p> <p>c. Maintain the existing differential between peak and off-peak energy charges for super off-peak customers.</p> <p>d. Definition of “agricultural customer” should be modified.</p> <p>e. Develop virtual agricultural meter aggregation rate.</p>	<p>a. Exh. 300, pp. 4-36</p> <p>b. Exh. 300, p. 13</p> <p>c. Exh. 300, pp. 29-32</p> <p>d. Exh. 300, pp. 35-42</p> <p>e. Exh. 300, pp. 43-46</p> <p>As described in the following sections, AECA was a party to the Settlements, approved by the Commission that resolved through negotiation and mutual compromise the marginal cost, revenue allocation, and agricultural rate issues raised by AECA in testimony. (D.13-03-031, and Attachment A, Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement, and Attachment E, Agricultural and Pumping Rate Group Rate Design Settlement Agreement.</p>	Verified.
<p>2. AECA was an active party to the Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>The Settlement Agreement resolved all marginal cost and revenue allocation</p>	<p>D.13-03-031, pp. 4-5 and Attachment A, Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement, pp. 1-2.</p> <p>D.13-03-031, pp. 2, 6-8, and Attachment A, pp. 8, 13.</p>	Verified.

<p>issues. While it did not address all of the issues AECA raised in testimony, it covered the saliency of them through the settled rates, which were closer to AECA’s position than any other party’s, and included specific consideration of key issues, such as customer class definition and the development of an aggregation study.</p> <p>“This Agreement does not reflect approval or acceptance of any of the Settling Parties’ marginal cost proposals as the basis for this Agreement. The Settling Parties agree that it is reasonable to use the marginal costs set forth in paragraphs 4.a.i,ii, and iii below for the purpose of establishing unit marginal costs that are used in SCE’s revenue allocation and rate design model . . . .”</p>	<p>D.13-03-031, pp. 2, 6-8, and Attachment A, p. 8.</p>	
<p>3. AECA was an active party to the Agricultural and Pumping Rate Group Rate Design Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>“The parties to the Agricultural and Pumping Rate Group Rate Design Settlement Agreement reached an agreement that resolves all the issues raised in this proceeding with respect to rate design for rate schedules in the Agriculture and Pumping Rate Groups.”</p> <p>AECA’s participation in the Settlement Agreement contributed to a lower rate increase for the agricultural class (8.8%) compared to proposed 12.9% increase. (See 1.a-c above, raised by AECA testimony.)</p>	<p>D.13-03-031, pp. 4-5, and Attachment E, Agricultural and Pumping Rate Group Rate Design Settlement Agreement, pp. 1-2.</p> <p>D.13-03-031, p. 34, and Attachment E, Table Ag-4.</p> <p>D.13-03-031, pp. 34-35, 37-39, and Attachment E, pp. 9-20 and Appendix B (to Attachment E).</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>AECA’s participation in the Settlement Agreement contributed to different treatment of off-peak/peak differentials than originally proposed by SCE or any other party. (See 1.c above, raised by AECA in testimony.)</p>	<p>D.13-03-031, pp. 35, 37, and Attachment E, pp. 13-15, 17.</p>	
<p>AECA developed the Aggregation Study proposal and work plan ultimately adopted in lieu of aggregation rates. (See 1.e above, raised by AECA in testimony.)</p>	<p>D.13-03-031, p. 37, and Attachment E, pp. 9-11.</p>	
<p>AECA’s participation in the Settlement Agreement contributed to a modification of the definition of “Agricultural Power Service”. (See 1.d above, raised by AECA in testimony.)</p>	<p>D.13-03-031, p. 37, and Attachment E, pp. 7-8.</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 (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>1</sup></b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b></p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF)</p>		<p>Yes.</p>
<p><b>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:</b>  AECA and CFBF have historically submitted separate testimony in CPUC proceedings, raising distinct, non-duplicative issues, including recommended rate changes. During settlement negotiations the two agricultural groups</p>		<p>Agreed.</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.

<p>coordinated our efforts. While both parties seek reasonable rates for agricultural customers, AECA has also specifically advocated for rate stability and demand management incentives, and effectively identified flaws in SCE’s development of marginal costs to calculate rates for the agricultural class. AECA has consistently documented allocation inconsistencies and volatility in SCE’s application of EPMC principals to the agricultural class. Here, AECA’s efforts resulted in substantially lower rate increases than those proposed by SCE. In this proceeding, AECA also pursued the creation of demand-side management incentives, such as appropriate off-peak/peak energy rate differentials, creation of aggregation options to encourage load shifting away from system peaks, and revision of “Agricultural Power Service” definition.</p> <p>AECA’s efforts to avoid duplication with other parties and dedicated pursuit of important issues should be recognized by the Commission.</p>	
---	--

**C. Additional Comments on Part II:**

<b>Claimant</b>	<b>Comment</b>
X	<p>AECA was an active party to the Settlement Agreement on Marginal Costs and Revenue Allocation filed on July 27, 2012 and adopted in D.13-03-031 (Attachment A).</p> <p>As in previous SCE Phase II proceedings, the Settlement Agreement did not adopt any of the settling parties’ specific marginal cost principles or proposals as the basis for the Revenue Allocation Settlement. The settling parties agreed to the negotiated settlement without litigating their various positions. AECA played a significant role in the final Revenue Allocation proposal reached as a part of the settlement. AECA successfully advocated for a moderated increase for agricultural customers. SCE had proposed to adjust all agricultural rates by 12.9% over system average rates. AECA’s efforts in the proceeding, which cast considerable doubt on SCE’s marginal cost methodologies, calculations and allocations as applied to the agricultural class, directly resulted in the 8.8% agricultural increase ultimately adopted.</p> <p>AECA’s active participation and expertise in the Agricultural Rate Design Settlement (D.13-03-031, Attachment E) directly led to reduced adverse impacts on the agricultural class and more appropriate allocation of class-specific revenue. In addition, AECA successfully modified the definition of Agricultural Power Service, enabling previously excluded agricultural operations to take service on the Agricultural Power Service tariff. AECA’s active review and analysis of rate design proposals and associated implications also contributed substantially to the settlement. Finally, AECA’s active pursuit of virtual aggregation rates led directly to the agreement on inclusion of an aggregation study in the final settlement. AECA developed the final aggregation study scope and tasks included in the final settlement.</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>AECA’s request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of \$70,768.28 (\$104,071 X .68). The requested award is reasonable in light of the benefits achieved through AECA’s participation in the proceeding. AECA’s efforts on marginal cost and revenue allocation resulted in a direct decrease from SCE’s proposed 12.9% increase to 8.8% for agricultural customers. The adopted agricultural class revenue requirement was based entirely on a broad settlement, which AECA played a significant role in achieving.</p> <p>AECA also played a significant role in the agricultural rate design aspect of this proceeding, and in developing the aggregation study proposal. While direct ratepayer benefits are hard to calculate for these efforts, aggregation study results could, at a minimum, be used to enliven Smartmeter data in cost-effective, beneficial ways.</p> <p>AECA’s role in adding packing houses, cotton ginning, nut hulling, and associated cold storage to the Agricultural Power Service definition has already resulted in several operations reducing their monthly bill by between 25% and 30%.</p> <p>In sum, the Commission should conclude that AECA’s overall request is reasonable in light of the substantial benefits to SCE’s agricultural customers that are directly attributable to AECA’s participation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CPUC Verified</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Verified.</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</b></p> <p>AECA’s request is reasonable in light of the scope of the proceeding and the length and complexity of settlement negotiations. AECA’s requested amount is far below its NOI total estimate of \$145,500. The reduced amount of the request reflects AECA’s efforts to effectively manage participation costs. AECA is not seeking travel or other costs of participation. In addition, AECA relied on well-priced economic experts to conduct research, respond to discovery, review data responses and conduct bill impact analysis and rate design scenarios, further keeping costs in check. While the case was not fully litigated, settlement discussions were lengthy, complex and sometimes contentious, as reflected in the number of conference calls required to achieve settlement of the agricultural rate design. While fewer hours of AECA’s attorney were required, more of Mr.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Verified. <i>But see</i> Part III.D.</p>

<p>Boccardo's time was necessary due to the unfortunate loss of Mr. Geis in early 2011. Given the number of parties involved in the agricultural settlement, and the complexity of the issues at stake, it should not be surprising that the negotiations extended over a 6-month period.</p> <p>AECA submitted comprehensive testimony documenting the continued shortcomings in SCE's marginal cost and revenue allocation calculations. AECA expert testimony also comprehensively addressed rate design issues, including development of an aggregation tariff option.</p> <p>AECA submits that the requested hours are reasonable, both for each attorney and expert individually and in the aggregate. AECA respectfully asks that its request be granted.</p>	
<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b></p> <p>In general, all of AECA's efforts in this proceeding focused on ensuring just and reasonable rates for the agricultural class, through use of a correct marginal cost methodology and appropriate rate design. In addition, rate design issues could have beneficial implications to other ratepayers, through system efficiencies. A detailed allocation of hours by issue is provided in the time record spreadsheets included as Attachment 2 hereto.</p>	Verified.

**B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Ann Trowbridge Attorney	2011	1.2	\$375	D.13-02-019 ALJ-267	\$ 450	1.2	\$375.00	450.00
Ann Trowbridge Attorney	2012	21.1	\$385	D.13-02-019 D.07-01-009 ALJ-281	\$ 8,123.50	21.1	\$385.00 [1]	8,123.50
Steven Moss Consultant	2011	38	\$205	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-267	\$7,790	38	\$200.00 [2]	7,600.00
Steven Moss	2012	107.75	\$205	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-281	\$22,088.75	107.75	\$205.00 [3]	22,088.75

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Consultant								
Richard McCann Consultant	2011	11	\$205	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-267	\$2,255	11	\$195.00 [4]	2,145.00
Richard McCann Consultant	2012	69.75	\$205	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-281	\$14,298.75	69.75	\$200.00 [5]	13,950.00
Michael Boccadoro Executive Director/ Advocate	2011	2.2	\$200	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-267	\$440	2.2	\$200.00	440.00
Michael Boccadoro Executive Director/ Advocate	2012	130.8	\$200	D. 13-02-019 D.07-01-009 ALJ-281	\$26,160	130.8	\$205.00 [6]	26,814.00
Beth Olhasso Asst. Executive Director/ Advocate	2012	80.4	\$150	ALJ-281	\$12,060	80.4	\$150.00 [7]	12,060.00
Ashley Spalding Consultant	2011	34.75	\$85	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-267	\$2,953.75	34.75	\$85.00	2,953.75
Ashley Spalding Consultant	2012	58.50	\$85	D. 13-02-019 ALJ-281	\$4,972.50	58.50	\$85.00	4,972.50
	<b>Subtotal:</b>				\$101,592.25		<b>Subtotal:</b> \$101,597.50	
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Ann Trowbridge Attorney	2013	6.3	\$200	D. 13-02-19 D.07-01-009 ALJ-287	\$ 1260	6.3	\$197.50 [8]	1,244.25

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Michael Boccadoro Executive Director/ Advocate	2013	2.25	\$100	D.13-02-19 D.07-01-009 ALJ-287	\$225	.75 [9]	\$102.5 0	76.88
Beth Olhasso Asst. Executive Director/ Advocate	2013	13.25	\$75	ALJ-267	\$993.75	13.25	75.00	993.75
<b>Subtotal:</b>					\$2,478.75	<b>Subtotal:</b>		\$2,314.88
<b>TOTAL REQUEST \$:</b>					<b>\$104,071</b> (actual request of \$70,768.28)	<b>TOTAL AWARD \$:</b>		103,912.38
<b>AECA's Requested Reduction (Part I. C) of 32%: -(33,251.96)</b>								
<b>AMOUNT AWARDED: \$ 70,660.42</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. Intervenor'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>								
<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>								
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>2</sup></b>		<b>Member Number</b>		<b>Actions Affected Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation</b>			
Ann Trowbridge	December 15, 1993		169591		No.			

**C. Attachments or Comments Documenting Specific:**

Comment #	Comment
Comment 1	AECA is not claiming any costs in this request. AECA has used electronic mail

<sup>2</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

**PROPOSED DECISION**

	communication, phone and conference calls to reduce filing and meeting costs and keep overall costs to a minimum, further adding to the reasonableness of its claim.
Comment 2	Rationale for Michael Boccadoro's hourly rates: He last received \$200 per hour for work performed in 2011 (D.13-02-019). He has over 20 years of experience as an energy policy and resource management expert.
Comment 3	Rationale for Ann Trowbridge's hourly rates: AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$375 in 2011, \$385 in 2012, and \$400.00 in 2013. Ms. Trowbridge last received \$375 for work performed in 2011 (D. 13-02-19). Ms. Trowbridge's 2012 rate is slightly above a 2.2% COLA (ALJ-281), and Ms. Trowbridge's 2013 rate is between a 2% COLA (ALJ-287) and a 5% step increase (D.07-01-009), and still is at the low end of the rate for attorneys with 13-plus years of experience.
Comment 4	Rationale for Steven Moss' hourly rates: AECA is requesting an hourly rate of \$205 per hour for Mr. Moss' time in 2011 and 2012. Mr. Moss last received \$200 for work performed in 2010-2011 (D. 13-02-019). Mr. Moss has over 20 years of experience in energy consulting.
Comment 5	Rationale for Richard McCann's hourly rates: AECA is requesting \$205 for Dr. McCann's time in 2011-12. He last received \$195 per hour for work performed for AECA in 2012 (D. 13-02-019) and has over 20 years of experience in energy consulting.
Comment 6	Rationale for Ashley Spalding hourly rates: AECA is requesting \$85 per hour for work performed by Ms. Spalding in 2011 and 2012. She last received \$85 per hour for work performed for AECA in 2012 (D.13-02-019). The requested rate (\$85) is below the energy expert floor of \$125 per hour for energy experts with 0-6 years of experience and is therefore reasonable.
Comment 7	Rationale for Beth Olhasso hourly rates: AECA is requesting \$150 per hour for work performed by Ms. Olhasso in 2012 and 2013. The requested rate (\$150) is the beginning of the range for Intervenor Hourly Rates for individuals with 0-2 years experience (ALJ-281 and ALJ-287).
Comment 8	Issue Codes for detailed time sheets POL – Policy SETT – Settlement MC/RA – Marginal cost and revenue allocation RD – Rate design LEG – Legal GP – General Participation INT – Intervenor Compensation Preparation

**PROPOSED DECISION****D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments**

#	Reason
[1]	The Commission applies a 2.2% cost-of-living adjustment to Trowbridge's 2011 rate. After rounding, Trowbridge's 2012 rate is approved at \$385.
[2]	Moss's 2011 rate was approved by the Commission in D.13-02-019 and will not change for this proceeding.
[3]	The Commission applies a 2.2% cost-of-living adjustment to Moss's 2011 rate. After rounding, Moss's 2012 rate is approved at \$205.
[4]	McCann's 2011 rate was approved by the Commission in D.13-02-019 and will not change for this proceeding.
[5]	The Commission applies a 2.2% cost-of-living adjustment to McCann's 2011 rate. After rounding, McCann's 2012 rate is approved at \$200.
[6]	The Commission applies a 2.2% cost-of-living adjustment to Boccadoro's 2011 rate. After rounding, Boccadoro's rate is approved at \$205.
[7]	The Commission approves a rate of \$150 for Olhasso in 2012.
[8]	The Commission applies a 2.0% cost-of-living adjustment to Trowbridge's 2012 rate, established above at \$385. After rounding, the Commission approves Trowbridge's 2013 rate at \$395.
[9]	On May 29, 2013, both Boccadoro and Olhasso reviewed Trowbridge's edits to the intervenor compensation claim. Such work is internally duplicative and produces excessive claimed for the preparation of intervenor compensation material. Accordingly, the Commission removes 1.5 hours from Boccadoro's total.

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

**A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim (Y/N)?**

No.

**B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(C)(6))?**

Yes.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Agricultural Energy Consumer Association has made a substantial contribution to D.13-03-031.
2. The claimed fees and costs, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

3. The total of reasonable compensation is \$70,660.42.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. Agricultural Energy Consumer Association is awarded \$70,660.42.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay Agricultural Energy Consumer Association 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 August 14, 2013, the 75 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>	D1303031		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A1106007		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Roscow		
<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>
Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	05/31/2013	\$70,768.26	\$ 70,660.42	No	<i>See Part III.D and Intervenor's own request for reduction in Part I.C.</i>

**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>
Ann	Trowbridge	Attorney	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$375	2011	\$375.00
Ann	Trowbridge	Attorney	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$385	2012	\$385.00
Ann	Trowbridge	Attorney	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$400	2013	\$395.00
Steven	Moss	Consultant	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$205	2011	\$200.00
Steven	Moss	Consultant	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$205	2012	\$205.00
Richard	McCann	Consultant	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$205	2011	\$195.00
Richard	McCann	Consultant	Agricultural	\$205	2012	\$200.00

**PROPOSED DECISION**

			Energy Consumer Association			
Michael	Boccardo	Executive Director	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$200	2011	\$200.00
Michael	Boccardo	Executive Director	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$200	2012	\$205.00
Michael	Boccardo	Executive Director	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$200	2013	\$205.00
Beth	Olhasso	Assistant Executive Director	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$150	2012	\$150.00
Beth	Olhasso	Assistant Executive Director	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$150	2013	\$150.00
Ashley	Spalding	Consultant	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$85	2011	\$85.00
Ashley	Spalding	Consultant	Agricultural Energy Consumer Association	\$85	2012	\$85.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**