

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) To Establish Marginal Costs, Allocate Revenues, Design Rates, and Implement Additional Dynamic Pricing Rates.

Application 11-06-007  
(Filed June 6, 2011)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE CALIFORNIA BLACK  
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO  
DECISION 13-03-031**

<b>Claimant: California Black Chamber of Commerce (CBCC)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 13-03-031</b>
<b>Claimed (\$): \$46,423.45</b>	<b>Awarded (\$): 40,962.55 (11.76% reduction)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Stephen C. Roscow</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	D.13-03-031 addresses the application of Southern California Edison Company (SCE) to establish marginal costs, allocate revenues, and design rates for service provided to its customers. It also addresses 5 settlement agreements, namely: Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement; Residential Rate Group Settlement Agreement; Medium and Large Power Commercial Customer Rate; Design Settlement Agreement; Agricultural and Pumping Rate Group Rate Design Settlement Agreement; and Street Light and Traffic Control Rate Group Settlement Agreement.
--	--

**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:	October 12, 2011	Yes.
3. Date NOI Filed:	December 5, 2011 <sup>1</sup>	Yes.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Although not filed within 30 days of the Prehearing Conference, the Notice of Intent is timely due to the leave granted by the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.10-11-015	Agreed.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 3, 2011	Agreed.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, <i>See</i> California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Rules of Practice and Procedure 17.2.
<b>Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:		
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify): Pursuant to Section 1804(a)(2)(B), a showing of "significant financial hardship" is being provided in this Claim per following:  The cost of CBCC's participation this CPUC proceeding, which is \$46,423.45, substantially outweighs the benefit to the individual member businesses CBCC represents. CBCC members are individual professionals and small and micro		Agreed.

<sup>1</sup> CBCC was granted leave to file its NOI by ALJ Roscow, via phone conversation, on December 2, 2011.

<p>businesses whose individual interests in this proceeding range from a few dollars to no more than a few hundred dollars in potential annual rate savings per individual business. Accordingly, these economic interests are small relative to the costs of participation. It is unlikely that CBCC's members will see financial benefits that exceed CBCC's costs of intervention.</p>		
<p>12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?</p>		<p>Yes. The Commission agrees that the California Black Chamber of Commerce (CBCC) demonstrated significant financial hardship.</p>
<p><b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b></p>		
<p>13. Identify Final Decision:</p>	<p>D.13-03-031</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:</p>	<p>April 2, 2013</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>15. File date of compensation request:</p>	<p>June 3, 2013</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>16. Was the request for compensation timely?</p>		<p>Yes.</p>

**C. Additional Comments on Part 1:**

Claimant	Comment
<p>X</p>	<p>CBCC intervened in Application (A.) 11-03-007 on October 6, 2011. As shown below, CBCC has participated fully and made substantial contributions. All of CBCC's efforts should be compensated in full.</p> <p>CBCC served testimony, submitted data requests to SCE, filed comments, participated in hearings, attended and participated in hearings on settlement agreement for small commercial customers, and reviewed comments on the proposed decision.</p>

**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).**

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution	Specific References Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. Direct Testimony of Steven C. McClary on behalf of the California Black Chamber of Commerce and County of Los Angeles, dated February 6, 2012.</p>	<p>CBCC/LAC Exh. 1, <i>Direct Testimony of Steven C. McClary on behalf of the California Black Chamber of Commerce and County of Los Angeles</i>, dated February 6, 2012.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

2. Attended evidentiary hearings to put CBCC/LAC Exh. 1 on the record and to make sure concerns of small business were addressed.	RT 112:12-14 (ALJ Roscow).	Verified.
3. CBCC filed and served reply comments on the Proposed Decision, arguing that the Proposed Decision be revised to order mandatory time-of-use rates for small commercial and industrial customers by January 1, 2014 and that SCE implement the remaining terms of the small commercial and industrial customer rate design settlement on April 1, 2013.	<i>Reply Comments of The California Black Chamber of Commerce and The County of Los Angeles to Opening Comments of Southern California Edison Company on Proposed Decision</i> , dated March 12, 2013. D.13-03-031, p. 47.	Verified.
4. CBCC participated in settlement discussions on behalf of small commercial and industrial customers, including the Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation Settlement Agreement, filed July 27, 2012; and Small Commercial and Industrial Customer Rate Design Settlement Agreement, filed September 7, 2012.	D.13-03-031, pp. 4, 20, 28, 46, 48, and 49.	Verified.

**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) a party to the proceeding?</b> <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Verified.
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	Yes	Verified.
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> The California Small Business Roundtable & California Small Business Association participated in the proceeding.		Verified.
<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> CBCC coordinated with DRA and with the Small Business Roundtable, who raised issues similar to those raised by CBCC, prior to filing testimony and briefs and during settlement discussions. CBCC held numerous phone conferences with consultants to Small Business		Agreed.

<sup>2</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) 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>Roundtable and with DRA analysts. At the outset of the proceeding CBCC reviewed parties’ protests and avoided addressing general ratemaking issues raised by DRA and other parties. (See e.g. CBCC <i>Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation</i>, filed December 5, 2011, <i>Motion of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E)</i>, <i>The Division of Ratepayer Advocates</i>, <i>The County of Los Angeles</i>, <i>The California Black Chamber Of Commerce</i>, and <i>California Small Business Roundtable &amp; California Small Business Association for Adoption of Small Commercial and Industrial Customer Rate Design Settlement Agreement</i>, filed September 7, 2012.)</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>CBCC argued several issues related to small commercial rate schedules including (1) customer outreach and education programs for introduction of time-of-use and critical peak pricing rate schedules; (2) address the disproportionate allocation of revenue requirements to small customer classes; (3) introduction of time-of-use rates should be phased in and optional to allow customer adoption; (4) new TOU and CPP rates should be based on full cost recovery in order to provide accurate price signals to customers; and (4) bill protection for new TOU and CPP customers to ease potential sudden changes in costs to small businesses.</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>CBCC spent a significant portion of its time (1) demonstrating that increased allocation of overall revenue requirement to small commercial customers would unduly burden those customers; (2) examining the impact of different approaches to revenue allocation on small commercial customers; (3) developing and estimating the impact of TOU and CPP rates on small commercial customers; and (4) engaging in extended settlement negotiations with other parties in the proceeding to arrive at revenue allocation and rate design proposals. Prevailing on revenue allocation issues resulted in a significant lessening of the disproportionate allocation of costs to small commercial customers and resultant lower overall rates for that customer class, though still above estimated cost of service. The final TOU and CPP proposals presented in settlement and adopted by the Commission represent a significant easing of the transition difficulties and cost impact on small commercial customers.</p> <p>CBCC significantly reduced its costs by partnering with (and sharing costs with) the County of Los Angeles. A significant fraction of the time spent by CBCC in Phase 1 was spent in settlement negotiations and analysis of the various proposals</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Verified, but <i>see</i> “CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments” in Part III.C.</p>

<p>discussed in the course of those negotiations. In addition, CBCC engaged in the general work necessary for participation in the proceeding, such as reviewing the initial application and statements by other parties to identify potential issues, reviewing other parties’ pleadings and filings, and attending evidentiary hearings. Given the size and complexity of SCE’s application and the number of other parties, the amount of time spent was reasonable.</p>									
<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b>  <b>Please see CBCC's timesheets for more detail on how CBCC's time was allocated to the following issue categories:</b></p> <p>Issues Areas (with letter code) (includes other fees such as paralegal and IT specialists) - % of time</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">A. Small and Medium Commercial Customers are Key to Economic Development in SCE Service Area</td> <td style="width: 30%;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Rate Allocation re Small Commercial Businesses</td> <td>45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Mandatory Time-Of-Use Rates for Small Commercial and Industrial Customers</td> <td>29%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D. Miscellaneous Case Development</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </table>		A. Small and Medium Commercial Customers are Key to Economic Development in SCE Service Area	10%	B. Rate Allocation re Small Commercial Businesses	45%	C. Mandatory Time-Of-Use Rates for Small Commercial and Industrial Customers	29%	D. Miscellaneous Case Development	15%
A. Small and Medium Commercial Customers are Key to Economic Development in SCE Service Area	10%								
B. Rate Allocation re Small Commercial Businesses	45%								
C. Mandatory Time-Of-Use Rates for Small Commercial and Industrial Customers	29%								
D. Miscellaneous Case Development	15%								

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Phyllis A. Marshall	2012	2.80	\$545	Of Counsel	\$1,526.00	2.8	\$460.00 [1]	\$1,288.00
Randall W. Keen	2011	0.80	\$535	Managing Partner	\$428.00	0.80	\$355.00	\$284.00
Randall W. Keen	2012	9.30	\$545	Managing Partner	\$5,068.50	9.30	\$360.00 [2]	\$3,348.00
Randall W. Keen	2013	0.20	\$555	Managing Partner	\$111.00	0.20	\$370.00 [3]	\$74.00
Tara Kaushik	2011	1.10	\$325	Senior Litigation Associate	\$357.50	1.1	\$300.00	\$330.00
Tara Kaushik	2012	12.30	\$330	Senior Litigation	\$4,059.00	12.30	\$310.00	\$3,813.00

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
				Associate				
Tara Kaushik	2013	3.50	\$335	Senior Litigation Associate	\$1,172.50	3.5	\$315.00 [4]	\$1,102.50
Jack Stoddard	2011	7.30	\$300	Litigation Associate	\$2,190.00	7.30	\$280.00	\$2,044.00
Jack Stoddard	2012	13.60	\$305	Litigation Associate	\$4,148.00	13.60	\$290.00	\$3,944.00
Steven McClary	2012	147.50	\$150	Expert	\$22,125.00	147.50	\$150.00 [5]	\$22,125.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>					<b>\$41,185.50</b>	<b>Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$38,352.50</b>
OTHER FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Demetrio A. Marquez	2011	5.20	\$215	Paralegal	\$1,118.00	5.2	\$110.00	\$572.00
Demetrio A. Marquez	2012	2.70	\$215	Paralegal	\$580.50	2.7	\$115.00	\$310.50
Demetrio A. Marquez	2013	0.40	\$215	Paralegal	\$86.00	0.4	\$115.00 [6]	\$46.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>					<b>\$1,784.50</b>	<b>Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$928.50</b>
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate @ 50%	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Randall W. Keen	2013	0.60	\$277.50	Managing Partner	\$166.50	.6	\$185.00	\$111.00
Stoddard, Jack	2011	2.20	\$150.00	Litigation Associate	\$330.00	2.2	\$140.00	\$308.00
Stoddard, Jack	2012	0.20	\$153.00	Litigation Associate	\$30.60	.2	\$145.00	\$29.00
Marquez, Demetrio A	2011	2.20	\$108.00	Paralegal	\$237.60	2.20	\$55.00	\$121.00
Marquez, Demetrio A	2013	19.70	\$108.00	Paralegal	\$2,127.60	12 [7]	\$57.50	\$690.00

CLAIMED				CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES						
			<i>Subtotal:</i>	<b>\$2,892.30</b>	<i>Subtotal:</i>	<b>\$1,259.00</b>
COSTS						
#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount \$		
1.	Transcripts	VENDOR: Public Utilities Commission; INVOICE#: R0009790; DATE: 10/26/2012 - Transcript: A.11-06-007	\$260.00	260.00	[8]	
2.	Photocopying	487 Copies UserId: Vicente Agustin, Jr. Desc: COPY	\$97.40	48.70		
3.	Photocopying	401 Copies UserId: Vicente Agustin, Jr. Desc: COPY	\$80.20	40.10		
4.	Photocopying	135 Copies UserId: Tina Barreto Desc: PRINT JOB	\$27.00	13.50		
5.	Taxi	VENDOR: Speck Cab Co., Inc. dba Arrow Cab; INVOICE#: 13001.247; DATE: 3/31/2012 - Tara Kaushik Voucher	\$14.20	14.20		
6.	Taxi	VENDOR: Speck Cab Co., Inc. dba Arrow Cab; INVOICE#: 1210465; DATE: 10/31/2012 - Jack Stoddard Voucher	\$12.65	12.65		
7.	Photocopying	11 Copies UserId: Demetrio Marquez Desc: No Description	\$2.20	1.10		
8.	Photocopying	32 Copies UserId: Demetrio Marquez Desc: No Description	\$6.40	3.20		
9.	Postage	San Francisco Postage Log 12/11	\$2.05			
10.	Photocopying	190 Copies UserId: Vicente Agustin, Jr. Desc: COPY	\$38.00	19.00		
11.	Photocopying	5 Copies UserId: Vicente Agustin, Jr. Desc: COPY	\$3.25	0.50		
12.	Postage	SFO Postage Log for February 2012	\$1.30	1.30		
13.	Postage	SFO Postage Log for February 2012	\$1.90	1.90		
14.	Postage	SFO Postage Log for February 2012	\$4.20	4.20		
15.	Photocopying	4 Copies UserId: Jeffry Sacramento - Pitney Bowes - SF Desc: PRINT	\$0.80	0.40		
16.	Photocopying	3 Copies UserId: Jeffry Sacramento - Pitney Bowes - SF Desc: PRINT	\$0.60	0.30		
17.	Photocopying	45 Copies UserId: Demetrio Marquez Desc: No Description	\$9.00	4.50	[9]	
			<i>Subtotal:</i>	<b>\$561.15</b>	<i>Subtotal:</i>	<b>\$422.55</b>

CLAIMED		CPUC AWARD	
<b>ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES</b>			
<b>TOTAL REQUEST \$:</b>		<b>\$46,423.45</b>	<b>TOTAL AWARD:</b>
			<b>\$40,962.55</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>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate.</p>			
<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR:	Member Number	Actions Affected Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Phyllis Marshall	December 27, 1991	156830	No
Randall Keen	December 3, 1998	198477	No
Tara Kaushik	February 13, 2004	230098	No
Jack Stoddard	June 22, 2006	243615	No

**C. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:**

#	Reason
[1]	In Decision 14-06-045, the Commission set Marshall’s 2011 rate at \$450. After applying the 2012 cost-of-living adjustment established in Resolution ALJ-281 of 2.2%, and rounding to the nearest 5 dollar increment, the Commission sets Marshall’s 2012 rate at \$460.
[2]	In Decision 14-06-045, the Commission set Keen’s 2011 rate at \$355. After applying the 2012 cost-of-living adjustment established in Resolution ALJ-281 of 2.2%, and rounding to the nearest 5 dollar increment, the Commission sets Keen’s 2012 rate at \$360.
[3]	The Commission applies the 2% cost-of-living adjustment set in Resolution ALJ-287 to Keen’s 2012 rate to produce, after rounding, a rate of \$370. The Commission sets Keen’s 2013 at \$370.
[4]	The Commission applies the 2% cost-of-living adjustment set in Resolution ALJ-287 to Kaushik’s 2012 (set in D.14-06-051) rate to produce, after rounding, a rate of \$315. The Commission sets Kaushik’s 2013 at \$350.
[5]	McClary billed CBCC at a rate of \$150. Although McClary’s rates have been set higher in other proceedings, the Commission will apply the rate that McClary sought from the intervenor.

[6]	The Commission applies the 2% cost-of-living adjustment set in Resolution ALJ-287 to Marquez’s 2012 (set in D.14-06-051) rate to produce, after rounding, a rate of \$115. The Commission sets Marquez’s 2013 at \$115, which is unchanged from the 2012 rate.
[7]	The Commission notes that the claimed hours for preparing the CBCC intervenor compensation request are excessive. The Commission deducts 7.7 hours Marquez’s claimed hours.
[8]	The Commission awards CBCC the fees associated with obtaining transcripts because CBCC has now obtained a finding of significant financial hardship.
[9]	<p>As the Commission instructed The Utility Reform Network (TURN) in D.13-05-031, “[e]xpenses must be reasonable. TURN has claimed the costs of 1,049 pages of internal copying at 20 cents per page plus additional copies at the UPS Store. TURN has previously requested and been awarded compensation for photocopying at this rate. However, after careful review, it appears that the market rate for photocopies is considerably lower than 20 cents. For example, the UPS Store on Van Ness Avenue in San Francisco charges 15 cents per page and offers discounts for volume copying. The per page charge for 100 copies is 10 cents. Based on this, we have reduced the award for photocopying to 10 cents per page for internal copying. For future intervenor compensation requests, we ask that TURN evaluate its internal photocopy expenses taking into account local market rates including volume discounts. In addition, TURN should include information on the number of pages copied and the per page cost.”</p> <p>Here, we have similarly reduced the award for photocopying to 10 cents per page for internal copying.</p>

**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(C)(6))?</b>	Yes.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. California Black Chamber of Commerce (CBCC) has made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) 13-03-031.
2. The requested hourly rates for CBCC’s representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$40,962.55.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. California Black Chamber of Commerce is awarded \$40,962.55.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay California Black Chamber of Commerce 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 17, 2013, the 75th day after the filing of California Black Chamber of Commerce's request, 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**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	
<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>
California Black Chamber of Commerce	6/3/2013	\$46,423.45	\$40,962.55	No	See Part III.C.

**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>
Phyllis	Marshall	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$545	2012	\$460.00
Randall	Keen	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$535	2011	\$355.00
Randall	Keen	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$545	2012	\$360.00
Randall	Keen	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$555	2013	\$370.00
Tara	Kaushik	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$325	2011	\$300.00

**PROPOSED DECISION**

<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>
Tara	Kaushik	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$330	2012	\$310.00
Tara	Kaushik	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$335	2013	\$315.00
Jack	Stoddard	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$300	2011	\$280.00
Jack	Stoddard	Attorney	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$305	2012	\$290.00
Steven	McClary	Expert	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$150	2012	\$150.00
Demetrio	Marquez	Paralegal	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$215	2011	\$110.00
Demetrio	Marquez	Paralegal	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$215	2012	\$110.00
Demetrio	Marquez	Paralegal	California Black Chamber of Commerce	\$215	2013	\$115.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**