

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 AWARDING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO D.14-01-002

Claimant: Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-01-002
Claimed: \$59,335	Awarded: \$57,610.60 (~2.91% reduction)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJs: Yip-Kikugawa & Roscow

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	This decision addresses the application of San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E) to establish marginal costs, allocate revenues, and design rates for service provided to its customers. Among other issues, it addresses SDG&E's requests for changes to the design of residential rates, denying all such requests without prejudice.
--	--

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	12/9/11	Yes.
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI Filed:	1/9/12	Yes.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, CforAT timely filed the notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.13-03-008	Yes.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	6/14/13	Yes.
7. Based on another California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, CforAT demonstrated appropriate status as a customer.
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.13-03-008	Yes.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	6/14/13	Yes.
11. Based on another Commission determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, CforAT demonstrated

		significant financial hardship.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-01-002	Yes.
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	1/23/14	Yes.
15. File date of compensation request:	3/24/14	Yes.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, CforAT timely filed the request for compensation.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Description of Claimant’s contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059).

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p><u>Overview:</u></p> <p>CforAT opposed SDG&E’s various proposals that would result in increased costs for low-income and/or low-usage customers, including the utility’s proposed prepayment pilot program, various proposed changes to residential rate design, and various changes that would impact CARE customers, including lifting the cap on CARE</p>	<p>For a summary of CforAT’s position on the various residential rate design proposals, see CforAT’s Opening Brief, submitted jointly with the Greenlining Institute (Greenlining), on November 16, 2012. As described below, CforAT worked jointly with Greenlining on many aspects of the proceeding concerning residential rate design, as Greenlining also represented the interests of low-income, low usage customers and</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

<p>Tier 3 rates and changing the CARE cost allocation.</p> <p>SDG&E’s proposed prepayment program (addressed in detail below) and changes to the CARE cost allocation were rejected on the merits. All of the other residential rate design changes that CforAT opposed were rejected without prejudice with the recognition that issues concerning residential rate design are all under consideration in R.12-06-013, where the Commission can consider various rate elements for all electric utilities in a comprehensive manner.</p>	<p>focused on issues of affordability.</p> <p>The Final Decision, D.14-01-002, addresses issues related to residential rate design, CARE and prepayment at 38-55. By redirecting consideration of residential rate design issues to the pending Rulemaking, the Commission found it appropriate “to give all interested parties the opportunity to affect the outcome in that proceeding based on an up-to-date record in the contest of the new legislative guidance that has emerged since SDG&E made this proposal two years ago.” Final Decision at 43 (in discussing tier consolidation, but equally applicable to all rate design issues).</p>	
<p><u>Prepayment:</u></p> <p>CforAT worked in conjunction with other consumers to oppose the prepayment pilot program offered by SDG&E on legal and policy grounds. This coordinated effort began even before the application was filed, as SDG&E gave advanced notice to various consumer groups regarding its proposal.</p>	<p><i>See</i> Prepared Direct Testimony of John Howat addressing prepayment, served on June 12, 2012 on behalf of the National Consumer Law Center (NCLC), The Utility Reform Network (TURN), CforAT and Greenlining; <i>see also</i> the joint Opening Brief on prepayment, filed by TURN, NCLC, CforAT and Greenlining on November 16, 2012.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

<p>CforAT worked with the other consumer groups to develop the testimony offered by NCLC’s leading expert on the subject and sponsored by multiple consumer groups. This allowed CforAT to avoid duplication and to address the prepayment proposal efficiently.</p> <p>In particular, with regard to prepayment, CforAT focused on the issue of what would happen if a registered prepayment customer became ineligible (due to disability or age, for example) while on the proposed rate structure. CforAT also worked with the other consumer groups on the brief and all other issues regarding prepayment, with particular focus on effective communication, adequacy of notice (particularly for customers who cannot use standard forms of communication) and the impact of prepayment on the most vulnerable customer groups.</p> <p>All of the coordination</p>	<p>As summarized in the Final Decision, the Consumer Groups argued that the proposed prepayment program violated existing provisions of the Public Utilities Code and those provisions cannot be waived as a matter of law. Final Decision at 52.</p> <p>SDG&E’s proposed prepayment pilot program was rejected and the Commission found that the proposal was not in the public interest. Final Decision at 54. The Commission specifically rejected the notion that customers could voluntarily forgo statutory prior notice requirements, and found that SDG&E’s argument in favor of its proposal “relies on inappropriate precedent and is unconvincing.” <i>Id.</i></p>	
---	---	--

<p>between consumer groups led to a well-rounded presentation, while avoiding undue duplication, allowing the arguments put before the Commission to effectively represent the concerns of multiple constituencies.</p>		
<p>3. Affordability (Residential Rate Design): In addressing SDG&E’s residential rate design proposals, CforAT focused on the impact that such proposals would have on the affordability of essential supplies of electricity, particularly with regard to the most vulnerable customer groups. This was the focus of CforAT’s testimony and cross-examination of witnesses at hearing, as well as our briefing after hearing (in conjunction with Greenlining). <i>See e.g.</i> Testimony of Nicolie Bolster (providing the only evidence in the record regarding the direct affordability impacts of changes to electricity rates on vulnerable consumers), Testimony of Dmitri</p>	<p>The Final Decision declined to adopt any of the utility’s proposals for changes to residential rate design, rejecting them all without prejudice in order to allow consideration of residential rates in the pending rulemaking focused on this issue. <i>See</i> Final Decision at 41 (denying proposed basic service fee without prejudice); at 42 (denying tier consolidation without prejudice); at 45 (denying removal of CARE Tier 3 rate cap without prejudice). CforAT is an active party in the rulemaking, in conjunction with Greenlining. In that proceeding, as in this one, CforAT’s focus is on ensuring that any changes to residential rate design appropriately take affordability into account.</p> <p>While no final resolution of the rate design issues was adopted in this proceeding, the effect of deferring the proposal for consideration in the rulemaking at minimum prevents changes that impact affordability for</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

<p>Belser; Kasnitz examination of SDG&E witnesses Yunker and Fang (Tr. Vol. 4 at 188-207 (Yunker) and at 43-262 (Fang), Opening Brief of the Greenlining and the CforAT.</p>	<p>vulnerable consumers from being implemented at this time. This provides an immediate benefit for vulnerable consumers who are not seeing a rate increase in the immediate term.</p> <p>Additionally, the fact that no final decision on the merits was issued on the “affordability” proposals does not prevent compensation from being awarded. CforAT (in conjunction with Greenlining) was the only part to focus on the statutory requirement that rates must be affordable. This contribution enriched the record and the issues addressed continue to have significant play before the Commission in related proceedings. Thus, the work done in this proceeding to develop the issue substantially contributes to the policy discussion of how to best ensure that rates remain affordable for vulnerable consumers.</p> <p>The Commission has previously granted intervenor compensation awards in situations, such as here, in which a decision on the merits is not issued. TURN has previously proposed a test of substantial contribution in such circumstances with a list of factors to be considered, including: (1) the circumstances that led to the proceeding’s conclusion;</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>(2) the appropriateness of the intervenor’s participation in the underlying proceeding; (3) the reasonableness of the intervenor’s participation in the underlying proceeding; and (4) where available, the intervenor’s past record in similar proceedings. While the Commission has not explicitly adopted these factors as a test, it has used them on a case-by-case basis in the past. Here, all of the factors favor a finding of substantial contribution by CforAT on affordability issues, despite the fact that the utility’s proposals were rejected without prejudice. This result is due to the Commission’s decision to open a new rulemaking on residential rates, in which CforAT is an active party raising similar arguments to those made here. Throughout, CforAT advocated vigorously for its constituency in a manner that was reasonable and appropriate for a rate design proceeding, and which has been found compensable in prior rate design proceedings in which CforAT or its predecessor, Disability Rights Advocates, participated.</p>	
<p>4. Other input: CforAT participated modestly on briefing Utility</p>	<p>CforAT joined TURN in supporting UCAN’s motion to remove the proposed Network</p>	<p>Yes.</p>

<p>Consumers’ Action Network (UCAN) early motion to strike a proposed Network Use Charge that would impact net metering customers and on comments on the proposed decision addressing the CARE allocation, as each of these issues would also impact CforAT’s constituency.</p>	<p>Use Charge. <i>See</i> Response of TURN and CforAT, filed on November 17, 2011. The Motion was granted and the utility refiled its application without the Network Use Charge. <i>See</i> Scoping Ruling, filed on January 18, 2012.</p> <p>CforAT joined multiple other groups in commenting on the proposed change to the CARE allocation away from equal cents per Kilowatt (kWh) in the proposed decision; the Final Decision retains the CARE allocation based on an equal cents per kWh basis. Final Decision at 49.</p>	
---	---	--

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<p>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?¹</p>	Yes	Yes.
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	Yes	Yes.
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: ORA, The Greenlining Institute, TURN, National Consumer Law Center, UCAN/SDCAN</p>		Verified.
<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</p>		Verified.

¹ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

Consistent with our NOI, CforAT focused our efforts in this proceeding on issues that impact residential customers, primarily including SDG&E's prepayment proposal, its proposals for changes to residential rate design, and proposals that would impact the CARE program.

With regard to prepayment, an issue of concern to a number of consumer groups (as described above), CforAT worked closely with the other consumer groups to sponsor testimony via a witness proffered by the NCLC, an organization with national expertise on this issue. CforAT worked closely with NCLC and other consumer groups such as TURN to develop the testimony and arguments in opposition to SDG&E's proposal. CforAT in particular focused on the issue of vulnerable consumers who should not participate in prepayment as well as the issue of what would happen when a customer already enrolled in a prepayment program became ineligible (due to age, disability or some other reason), as well as concerns regarding effective notice for customers who cannot use standard forms of communication and risks of prepayment for the most vulnerable customer groups. CforAT also joined the other consumer groups on a joint brief concerning prepayment rather than address this issue separately. Overall, CforAT worked with the other consumers to refine and prepare the prepayment materials, to address issues unique to California and to our constituency, and to coordinate efforts to avoid duplication of effort.

With regard to other issues of residential rate design, CforAT focused on the impacts such proposals would have on the affordability of essential supplies of electricity. Except for Greenlining, with which CforAT worked closely and filed joint pleadings and argument, no other party focused on affordability. Throughout the coordinated effort, CforAT and Greenlining divided responsibilities and worked closely to create joint material in support of common goals. In keeping with our focus on affordability,

<p>CforAT supported the legal arguments of other consumer parties regarding rate design proposals such as the Basic Service Fee, but did not separately develop legal theories. Rather, CforAT addressed affordability impacts that such a fee would have on its constituency.</p> <p>With regard to issues impacting CARE, CforAT argued, in conjunction with Greenlining, that SDG&E’s proposal to remove the CARE Tier 3 rate cap was not justified and would allow CARE Tier 3 rates to rise rapidly without limit going forward. Of the other consumer groups, only ORA addressed this issue, arguing for an increased cap. CforAT also joined all other consumers to address SDG&E’s proposed changes to the CARE cost allocation.</p> <p>Overall, CforAT worked collaboratively with other consumer representatives where appropriate, and maintained its focus on our unique constituency and our unique presentation of affordability concerns. Our time records demonstrate that this work was managed efficiently and supplemented the work of other parties with appropriate levels of collaboration.</p>	
---	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness</p> <p>As advocated by CforAT, the final decision rejected SDG&E’s proposals regarding prepayment and changes to the CARE allocation on the merits, and rejected all other proposals regarding changes to residential rate design and CARE that would impact CforAT’s constituency without prejudice for consideration in the residential rate design rulemaking. At minimum, rate design changes that would lead to higher rates for low-income and low-usage customers have been deferred (and CforAT is an active party in the rulemaking advocating against changes in rate design that will impede the ability of residential customers to access essential levels of electricity at</p>	<p><u>CPUC Verified</u> Verified.</p>
--	--

<p>affordable rates). Additionally, a proposed prepayment pilot program that would weaken consumer protections will not be permitted, and a change in the CARE allocation that would increase the burden on residential customers was rejected.</p> <p>The bill impacts (avoiding or at least deferring changes to rate design that would increase the bills of low-income and low-usage customers) of these results for any individual customer is meaningful for those with low incomes, though modest relative to the cost of participating in Commission proceedings. Cumulatively, however, the financial benefit for CforAT’s constituency is substantial. In addition, the intangible benefits of maintaining strong consumer protections and maintaining the equal-cents-per-kWh formula for CARE also provide substantial benefit to vulnerable customers.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>In our NOI, CforAT estimated that it would expend 200 hours of time by counsel and 100 hours of time by experts. While this complex proceeding included motion practice, preparation of testimony, evidentiary hearings and briefing, substantial efforts at settlement, and coordination among numerous parties, CforAT spent less time than anticipated while obtaining favorable results for our constituency. CforAT worked efficiently and reasonable, coordinating with other consumer organizations and all other parties as appropriate, to ensure effective participation.</p>	<p>Verified, <i>but see</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p>
<p>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</p> <p>As set forth in CforAT’s NOI and above, CforAT focused on issues impacting residential rates and CARE, with a focus on how SDG&E’s proposals would impact affordability of electricity for its constituency, and on SDG&E’s prepayment proposal. Records of time spent on these issues are identified as “Affordability” and “Prepayment,” respectively. Efforts to settle the prepayment issues are included under the issue of “Prepayment.”</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

Time that cannot easily be classified by these substantive issues is sorted into the categories identified below:

Settlement: Because multiple parties explored settlement of residential rate design issues, time spent on this effort is separately classified as "Settlement." CforAT did not participate in the settlement addressing commercial and industrial customers, except to review filings as part of general participation in the proceeding. All "Settlement" entries concern efforts to reach a settlement on residential rate issues.

Hearing: Time spent generally preparing for hearing and at hearing is identified separately. While CforAT's examination of witnesses focused on our substantive concerns regarding affordability, it is not possible to break all hearing time into other classifications.

General Participation: As in all proceedings, sometime is allocated to procedural matters and other items (such as reviewing parties' filings) that cannot be otherwise classified. Here, time spent supporting and coordinating with other consumers regarding the CARE allocation, particularly upon issuance of the proposed decision, is included in the "general participation" category despite CforAT's focus on this issue with regard to affordability because other parties did not share the same focus (while having the same position on the merits).

Solar/NEM: A substantial amount of early activity in this proceeding involved the utility's initial proposal to implement a Network Use Charge targeted to net energy metering (NEM) customers. UCAN filed a motion that led to this proposal being removed from the proceeding, with instructions to the utility to refile its application. Subsequent activity followed to develop a study regarding NEM. While CforAT did not take the lead in any of this activity, we filed a reply in support of the motion (in conjunction with TURN) and monitored activity with regard to NEM issues as they developed. While this time could also be classified as "general participation," (and

<p>portions concerned rate design and other issues CforAT generally classified as “affordability”), CforAT identified it as a separate issue. It was necessary for CforAT to track this issue in order to participate meaningfully in the proceeding overall.</p> <p>Overall, time spent by counsel was allocated as follows:</p> <p>Affordability: 27% (31.1 of 117.2 hours)</p> <p>Prepayment: 29% (34.0 of 117.2 hours)</p> <p>Settlement: 7% (8.4 of 117.2 hours)</p> <p>Hearing: 13% (15.6 of 117.2 hours)</p> <p>General Participation: 19% (22.7 of 117.2 hours)</p> <p>Solar/NEM: 5% (5.4 of 117.2 hours)</p> <p>In addition to time spent by counsel, this compensation request includes time by the two experts whose testimony was presented at hearing by CforAT, Dmitri Belser and Nicolie Bolster. 100% of the time expended by each expert concerned affordability.</p>	
--	--

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2011	10.8	\$420	D.11-10-012	\$4,536	10.8	420.00	4,536.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2012	96.3	\$430	D.13-04-008	\$41,409	92.5 [1]	430.00	39,775.00

Melissa W. Kasnitz	2013	9.9 (<i>see comment 5, below</i>)	\$440	D.13-11-001	\$4,356	9.90	440.00	4356.00
Dmitri Belser	2012	2.5	\$225	D.13-02-014	\$562.50	2.5	225.00	562.50
Nicolie Bolster	2012	32.85	\$140	<i>See below.</i>	\$4,599	32.85	140.00 <i>See D.14-02-066</i>	4,599.00
Subtotal:								
\$55,462.50						Subtotal: \$ 53,828.50		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2012	1.8	\$215	½ standard rate	\$387	1.8	215.00	387.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2014*	14.9	\$220	D.13-11-001 Because virtually all merits work was completed in 2013, CforAT is requesting compensation for time spent on this request at ½ 2013 rates, though preparation took place in 2014.	\$3,278	14.9	220.00	3,278.00

PROPOSED DECISION

Nicolie Bolster	2014*	2.2	\$70	½ requested rate for 2013	\$154	1.2 [2]	70.00	84.00
<i>Subtotal: \$3,819.00</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$3,749.00</i>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount				
	Printing/Copying	DREDF in-house expenses	\$53.50	\$33.10 [3]				
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 59,335						TOTAL AWARD: \$57,610.60		

*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.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate.

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ²	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Melissa W. Kasnitz	December 24, 1992	162679	No, but Kasnitz maintained an inactive status from January 01, 1993 until January 25, 1995 and from January 01, 1996 until February 19, 1997.

² This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

C. Intervenor's Comments on Part III:

Comment #	Intervenor's Comments
4	<p>Time Records: Melissa Kasnitz, Merits Work 2012, September-December.</p> <p>Due to a change in timekeeping systems in the fall of 2012, CforAT's time records for 2012 are split. We have been unable to merge the system records while maintaining the integrity of the data. We apologize for any inconvenience.</p>
5	<p>Time Records: Melissa Kasnitz, Merits Work 2013</p> <p>The time records for 2013 include several entries for January of 2014, when the final decision was issued. CforAT is seeking compensation for these few entries at 2013 rates. CforAT reserves the right to seek any appropriate adjustment in rates for 2014 in other proceedings.</p>
9	<p>Justification for Rate for Nicolie Bolster (DREDF): No rate has previously been set for Ms. Bolster, but the rate requested here, \$140 per hour, is the same as that set forth in CforAT's pending compensation request in A.11-06-007, the Phase 2 proceeding for Southern California Edison, in which Ms. Bolster conducted similar work to that performed in this proceeding. In the compensation request in that proceeding, which was filed on June 3, 2013, CforAT submitted the following description of her experience and skills:</p> <p>"CforAT engaged Nicolie Bolster of the Disability Rights Education and Defense Fund (DREDF) to conduct outreach to the disability community for inclusion in the record of this proceeding. As set forth in detail in the Statement of Qualifications that accompanied her testimony in this proceeding, Ms. Bolster has extensive experience conducting investigations and outreach, including work as a legal investigator and paralegal. She is experienced at interviewing witnesses, preparing reports and organizing records.</p> <p>Ms. Bolster has never had a rate set before the Commission. Her requested rate of \$140 is the rate that DREDF routinely requests and is awarded for comparable work in disability access matters in state and federal court. Under the expert scale set forth in Resolution ALJ-281 setting rates for 2012, the minimum rate for an expert with over thirteen years of experience would be \$160. Ms. Bolster's requested rate is below the minimum on this scale, but represents the appropriate rate of compensation for the work performed."</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1]	<p>On June 12, 2012 Kasnitz's timesheet lists 3.8 hours of work related to finalizing Belser's testimony, reviewing revisions and corrections, preparing attachments, and checking citations. Such work is clerical in nature and is not compensable by the Commission, as compensation for</p>

	such work is factored into the established rate.
[2]	Bolster spent 2.2 hours conferring with Kasnitz and obtaining reports from a bookkeeper. Such time is excessive in light of the work performed and the Commission removed 1 hour from the award.
[3]	The Commission notes that bulk printing rates are available for significantly less cost than quoted by CforAT. As such, CforAT's printing and photocopying costs on June 29, 2012 have been reduced to 10 cents per page to reflect current pricing.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

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. Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to D. 14-01-002.
2. The requested hourly rates for Center for Accessible Technology'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 \$57,610.60.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Center for Accessible Technology is awarded \$57,610.60.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay Center for Accessible Technology 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 June 7, 2014, the 75th 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.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D1401002		
Proceeding(s):	A1110002		
Author:	ALJs Amy Yip-Kikugawa & Stephen C. Roscow		
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas & Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	3/24/14	\$59,335	\$57,610.60	N/A	See CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Dmitri	Belser	Expert	Center for Accessible Technology	\$225	2012	\$225.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Center for Accessible Technology	\$420	2011	\$420.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Center for Accessible Technology	\$430	2012	\$430.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Center for Accessible Technology	\$440	2013	\$440.00
Nicolie	Bolster	Expert	Center for Accessible Technology	\$140	2012	\$140.00

(END OF APPENDIX)