

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Oversee the Resource Adequacy Program, Consider Program Refinements, and Establish Annual Local Procurement Obligations.

Rulemaking 11-10-023  
(Filed October 20, 2011)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-06-050**

<b>Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)</b>	<b>For contribution to: Decision (D.) 14-06-050</b>
<b>Claimed: \$48,336.07</b>	<b>Awarded: \$42,777.32 (reduced 11.5%)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michel Peter Florio</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: David M. Gamson</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	Decision 14-06-050 adopts, among other things: an interim “flexible capacity” framework for 2015 through 2017 as an additional component of Resource Adequacy (RA) requirements; flexible capacity obligations for 2015; and minor refinements to the RA program for 2015.
--	--

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

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	N/A	N/A
2. Other specified date for NOI:	Nov. 28, 2011	Verified
3. Date NOI filed:	May 11, 2012 (see comment below)	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes; late filing accepted.

<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.11-11-008	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 3, 2012	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	N/A
8. Has the Intervenor 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:	R.11-11-008	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 3, 2012	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	Verified
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-06-050	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	July 1, 2014	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	September 2, 2014	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

<b>#</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comments(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
3	On August 31, 2012, ALJ Gamson issued a ruling accepting TURN’s late-filed NOI and determining that TURN’s eligibility for intervenor compensation would start on May 11, 2012, the date on which TURN filed its NOI. All of the hours claimed in this request were incurred after May 11, 2012.	The Commission accepts this assertion.
15	The 60 <sup>th</sup> day after the issuance of D.14-06-050 fell on Saturday, August 30, 2014 and the following Monday was the Labor Day holiday when the Commission was closed. Pursuant to Rule 1.15 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Request for Compensation is timely filed on the first business day thereafter.	The Commission accepts this assertion.

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION****A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a), and D.98-04-059).**

<b>Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
1. The Decision (p. 13) encouraged CAISO to consider the following TURN recommendations for the 2015 Flexible Capacity Needs Assessment: (1) the CAISO should develop a Flexible Capacity Needs Assessment computation manual; and (2) the CAISO should compute flexible requirements based on summer and non-summer seasons	TURN 5/8/14 Comments, pp. 2-3	Accepted.
2. Consistent with TURN's recommendations, the Decision (p. 16) attempted to minimize differences between the flexible capacity requirements adopted by the CPUC and the CAISO's FRAC-MOO proposal and stated the Commission's expectation that the CAISO will align its FRAC-MOO proposal as closely as possible the Commission's adopted framework.	TURN 2/24/14 Comments, p. 3 TURN 3/6/14 Comments, p. 2 TURN 4/18/14 Comments, pp. 4-5.	Accepted.
3. Consistent with TURN's recommendation, the Decision (p. 20) determines that, for the 2015 RA year, the Commission will use load-ratio share to allocate flexibility requirements among Load Serving Entities (LSEs), as a practical interim solution.	TURN 2/24/14 Comments, pp. 1-2.	Accepted.
4. Consistent with TURN's recommendation, with respect to the issue of CAM and CHP resources procured outside the	TURN 2/18/14 Comments, pp. 2-4 TURN 3/3/14 Comments, pp. 3-4 TURN 4/18/14 Comments, p. 2	Accepted.

<p>procuring IOU service areas, the Decision (p. 41) agrees with the concerns raised by TURN and other parties regarding the initial Energy Division (ED) proposal, further agrees with TURN that adopting ED’s separate proposed Scheduled Outage Replacement Rule for CAM and CHP resources obviates the need for certain elements of the initial ED proposal, and adopts the revised ED proposal supported by TURN and other parties.</p>	<p>TURN 4/25/14 Comments, pp. 1-2</p>	
<p>5. Consistent with TURN’s recommendation, the Decision (p. 60) declines to adopt an ELCC model and ELCC-based QC values for wind and solar resources because there was not sufficient time for vetting and iteration of ED’s proposed methodology.</p>	<p>TURN 2/18/14 Comments, pp. 1-2 TURN 3/3/14 Comments, pp. 1-3 TURN 4/18/14 Comments, p. 1</p>	<p>Accepted.</p>

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<p><b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?<sup>1</sup></b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> With respect to the first substantial contribution listed above, TURN believes that it was the only party to make that recommendation. For the other substantial contributions, depending on the issue, one or more of the following other parties may have had a position similar to TURN: ORA, NRG, PG&amp;E, SCE, CAISO and/or AReM.</p>		<p>Verified</p>
<p><b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b> TURN and ORA represented similar interests in this proceeding. (While both represented ratepayer interests, TURN alone focuses its representation on the</p>		<p>Verified</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>interests of residential and small commercial customers.) TURN accordingly took steps to coordinate with ORA, as appropriate. For example, TURN took the lead in analyzing CAISO’s flexible capacity needs assessment for 2015 and making recommendations for improving CAISO’s process for the 2016 assessment. In addition, TURN devoted relatively more resources than ORA to explaining the issues with the ELCC model that necessitating postponing its use for estimating QC values for wind and solar resources.</p> <p>The fact that other parties shared TURN’s perspective on various other issues did not result in TURN’s undue duplication with those parties. A rulemaking proceeding of this nature attracts a range of parties, and some degree of overlap in positions is inevitable. In the specific case of the issues here, the range of interests represented by parties with positions overlapping with TURN’s varied widely, from generators to marketers to utilities to consumer representatives. TURN’s positions were based on the independent analysis of its highly experienced and respected expert, Kevin Woodruff, and complementary to the offerings of others. TURN’s independent perspective contributed to a full record upon which the Commission could base its determinations.</p> <p>For all of these reasons, TURN submits that the Commission should find no undue duplication between TURN’s participation and that of DRA or other parties.</p>	
--	--

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<p><b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b></p> <p>TURN’s advocacy reflected in D.14-06-050 addressed policy and implementation matters rather than specific rates or disputes over particular dollar amounts. As a result, TURN cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from our work related to D.14-06-050, given the nature of the issues presented. While it is difficult to place a dollar value on Resource Adequacy (RA) issues, TURN submits that our participation should result in reduced customer costs by promoting accurate flexible capacity needs assessments and minimizing implementation costs. In this case as in prior RA proceedings, these benefits far exceed the modest cost of TURN’s participation. (<i>See, i.e.</i> D.12-06-014, issued in, R.09-10-032, as well as D.09-11-029, issued in R.08-01-025, and D.07-03-011, issued in R.05-12-013 (two earlier RA proceedings), which found that the benefits from TURN’s participation on RA policy issues outweighed the costs of TURN’s participation.)</p> <p>For all of these reasons, the Commission should find that TURN's efforts here have been productive.</p>	<p><b><u>CPUC Discussion</u></b></p> <p>TURN’s participation was productive. However, certain hours are disallowed, as discussed in Part III (A) below.</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes approximately 160 total substantive</p>	<p>TURN’s participation was generally efficient. However,</p>

hours for TURN’s attorney and consultant, or the equivalent of four weeks of full-time work by a single person (40 hours/week). TURN submits that this is a reasonable amount of time, given that this phase of the proceeding, resulting in D.14-06-050, spanned ten months, required careful analysis of two highly detailed flexible capacity proposals by the Joint Parties and by Energy Division, required careful scrutiny of several new and complex proposals, involved several days of workshops and ISO stakeholder meetings, and involved eight formal pleadings filed by TURN (excluding compensation-related pleadings) and three sets of stakeholder comments to the CAISO.

TURN was efficient in staffing this proceeding and pursuing our objectives. As reflected in the attached timesheets, Mr. Long was TURN’s sole attorney in this phase of the case. Throughout this phase, Mr. Long was assisted by outside consultant Kevin Woodruff, of Woodruff Expert Services, the same expert TURN has extensively relied on in previous Resource Adequacy rulemaking proceedings. Once again, Mr. Long relied heavily on Mr. Woodruff, resulting in Mr. Woodruff’s incurring more than 80% of TURN’s total hours (excluding intervenor compensation-related time). This reliance on Mr. Woodruff’s extensive expertise significantly reduced TURN’s attorney hours and thereby resulted in efficiencies in TURN’s participation in this proceeding.

TURN’s work on the flexible capacity issues in this phase of the docket included a significant number of hours reviewing and commenting upon CAISO FRAC-MOO proposals. This work reflects the intertwined nature of the Commission’s and CAISO’s flexible capacity policies. Accordingly, TURN participated in the CAISO stakeholder process that developed the FRAC-MOO, including participating in meeting and filing written comments on issues related to the computation of total and “category specific” flexible needs. This participation in the CAISO process was integral to TURN’s substantial contributions on flexible capacity issues enumerated in Section II.A and should be fully compensated.

TURN claims 4.0 hours (approximately 2% of TURN’s total substantive hours, mostly incurred by Kevin Woodruff) for its work analyzing the ISO’s Local Capacity Requirements (LCR) study. As D.14-06-050 reflects, LCR was one of the issues resolved in the Decision. The time incurred related to the LCR issue was devoted to understanding and analyzing the ISO study and its results. TURN presented a concern about the CAISO analysis in stakeholder comments to the CAISO. TURN was sufficiently satisfied with the CAISO’s response to TURN’s comments that TURN did not see a reason to file any comments with the CPUC. Nevertheless, the fact that TURN undertook to scrutinize the CAISO study and found no problems worth commenting upon could give the Commission confidence that the ISO study and results were reliable. In this respect, TURN’s analysis made a substantial contribution to the final decision adopting the ISO study results, and TURN did so efficiently by incurring a small number of hours and avoiding the filing of an unnecessary pleading with the Commission. Accordingly, TURN submits that these hours are reasonable and should be compensated.

TURN submits that all of the hours claimed in this request were reasonably necessary to the achievement of TURN’s substantial contributions, and no

parts of the work related to TURN’s participation at the CAISO are disallowed, as discussed in Part III (A) below.

<p>unnecessary duplication of effort is reflected in the attached timesheets.</p> <p>TURN’s request also includes 7.5 hours devoted to the preparation of this request for compensation by Mr. Long. This is a reasonable figure consistent with the scale of the proceeding and TURN’s level of involvement in it. Mr. Long has prepared this request because of his involvement in all stages of this phase of the proceeding and his detailed knowledge of TURN’s work effort.</p>															
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>TURN has allocated its daily time entries by activity codes to better reflect the nature of the work reflected in each entry. TURN has used the following activity codes for its substantive (non-compensation-related) work:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="240 674 1057 1314"> <thead> <tr> <th>Code</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Flex Cap (or FC)</td> <td>Work specifically related to Flexible Capacity requirements and implementation issues</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ELCC</td> <td>Work specifically related to the proposed ELCC methodology for calculating QC for wind and solar resources</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CAM</td> <td>Work specifically related to the initial and revised Energy Division proposals regarding CAM and CHP resources procured outside the serving IOUs service areas</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LCR</td> <td>Work specifically related to Local Capacity Requirements for 2014</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GP</td> <td>Work related to general participation in this proceeding, such as reviewing the scoping memo and other rulings, review of workshop notices, and other procedural matters</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comp</td> <td>Work related to intervenor compensation.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p># - Time entries that cover substantive issue work that cannot easily be identified with a specific activity code. In this proceeding, in recognition of the fact that the workshops and comments often addressed several discrete issues in a relatively short time frame, the time entries coded # represent approximately 20% of the total hours. TURN requests compensation for all of the time included in this request for compensation, and therefore does not believe allocation of the time associated with these entries is necessary. However, if such allocation needs to occur, TURN proposes that the Commission allocate these entries as follows, based on the following percentages derived from the time TURN devoted to the major issues in the docket:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Flexible Capacity– 92.75 hours - 77.1%          ELCC – 12.50 hours – 10.4%          CAM –10.75 hours – 8.9%          LCR – 4.25 hours – 3.5%</p>	Code	Description	Flex Cap (or FC)	Work specifically related to Flexible Capacity requirements and implementation issues	ELCC	Work specifically related to the proposed ELCC methodology for calculating QC for wind and solar resources	CAM	Work specifically related to the initial and revised Energy Division proposals regarding CAM and CHP resources procured outside the serving IOUs service areas	LCR	Work specifically related to Local Capacity Requirements for 2014	GP	Work related to general participation in this proceeding, such as reviewing the scoping memo and other rulings, review of workshop notices, and other procedural matters	Comp	Work related to intervenor compensation.	
Code	Description														
Flex Cap (or FC)	Work specifically related to Flexible Capacity requirements and implementation issues														
ELCC	Work specifically related to the proposed ELCC methodology for calculating QC for wind and solar resources														
CAM	Work specifically related to the initial and revised Energy Division proposals regarding CAM and CHP resources procured outside the serving IOUs service areas														
LCR	Work specifically related to Local Capacity Requirements for 2014														
GP	Work related to general participation in this proceeding, such as reviewing the scoping memo and other rulings, review of workshop notices, and other procedural matters														
Comp	Work related to intervenor compensation.														

<p>TURN submits that under the circumstances this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission’s rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.</p>	
--	--

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Thomas J. Long	2013	6.75	\$555.00	D.14-04-015, p. 28	\$3,746.25	6.50	\$555	\$3,607.50
T. Long	2014	18.25	\$555.00	See comment #1	\$10,128.75	16.75	\$570	\$9,547.50
Kevin Woodruff	2013	20.75	\$240.00	D.12-11-050, p. 17	\$4,980.00	11.75	\$240	\$2,820.00
K. Woodruff	2014	114.00	\$240.00		\$27,360.00	98.50	\$250	\$24,625.00
<b>Subtotal: \$46,215.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$40,600.00</b>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
T. Long	2014	7.5	\$555.00	½ of approved rate (see comments #1 below)	\$2,081.25	7.5	\$285	2,137.50
<b>Subtotal: \$2,081.25</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$2,137.50</b>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	Phone	Telephone expense related to R.11-10-023, current phase			\$11.99	\$11.99		
	Photocopying	Expenses associated with copying pleadings related to R.11-01-023, current phase			\$9.00	\$9.00		
	Postage	Expense associated with mailing pleadings related to R.11-10-023, current phase			\$18.83	\$18.83		
<b>Subtotal: \$39.82</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$39.82</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$48,336.07</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$42,777.32</b>		

\*\*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.

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

<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation</b>
Thomas J. Long	December 11, 1986	124776	No

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

<b>Attachment or Comment #</b>	<b>Description/Comment</b>
Comment #1	At the time of preparing this request, the Commission had not determined the amount by which intervenor attorney hourly rates will be raised for 2014. Accordingly, for 2014, TURN’s request uses the approved 2013 rate for Mr. Long. TURN respectfully requests that the Commission adjust Mr. Long’s hourly rate by the amount of any general increase it may determine is appropriate for 2014 intervenor hourly rates.
1	<b>Certificate of Service</b>
2	<b>Daily Time Record for Attorney and Consultant with Coded Time Entries</b>
3	<b>Cost Detail</b>

**D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>
III. A	<p>Today’s decision disallows 26.25 hours [1.75 hours for Long and 24.5 hours for Woodruff] for which TURN seek compensation. The disallowed hours consist of time that TURN devoted to its participation at the CAISO.</p> <p>Under the Intervenor Compensation statute, the Commission may compensate an intervenor’s reasonable expenditures that make a substantial contribution in a proceeding before the Commission (See generally, Pub. Util. Code Sections 1801, 1801.3(a) and (d), 1802(c) and (f), and 1803.) “Proceeding” may include alternate dispute resolution in lieu of formal proceedings (See Section 1802(f)), and compensable fees and costs include those incurred in preparing for a proceeding and in obtaining judicial review of a Commission order or decision (See Sections 1802(a) and (c)).</p> <p>However, aside from work obtaining judicial review, the statute does not authorize the Commission to compensate work by an intervenor in another forum (e.g. the Legislature or another regulatory agency). The fact that the other forum may be dealing with an issue integrally related to an issue in a Commission proceeding is, for purposes of the statute, irrelevant. Except in a few instances where the Commission has formally coordinated its “proceeding” with the proceeding of another agency, the intervenor may not obtain compensation for its participation at the other agency.</p>

<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> .

	<p>The instant Commission proceeding is a rulemaking on issues relating to the Resource Adequacy Program. As summarized in Decision (D.) 14-06-050, the Commission there adopted local capacity procurement and flexible capacity obligations for 2015 applicable to Commission-jurisdictional electric load serving entities. These procurement obligations are based on an annual study of local capacity and flexible capacity requirements performed by the [CAISO] for 2015 which seeks to ensure that each part of the California grid, including those parts with transmission constraints, has access to sufficient generating capacity to meet the local need. (See D. 14-06-050 at 2) The total “local capacity requirements” that the Commission adopted are those recommended by the CAISO (<i>Id.</i>). Throughout D.14-06-050, the Commission makes clear that it is giving great weight to the proposals and determinations of the CAISO. TURN’s analysis of those proposals and determinations is part of TURN’s preparation for participation in the Commission’s rulemaking. TURN’s hours reasonably devoted to such analysis are therefore fully compensable under the statute.</p> <p>TURN did more than such analysis, however. As described in its timesheets, TURN participated in the CAISO “stakeholder process,” including participating in meetings and filing written comments. Such participation goes beyond preparation for the Commission’s rulemaking; it appears, rather, to constitute advocacy of TURN’s views at the CAISO. Even assuming that such advocacy might benefit the ratepayer interests represented by TURN, the advocacy exceeds the scope of activities for which the Commission may award compensation under the statute.</p> <p>From review of TURN’s timesheets (Attachment 2 of its compensation claim), about 24.50 hours of Woodruff’s time (recorded for 10/9/2013, 12/5/2013, 2/6/2013, 1/23/2014, 1/25/2014, 2/20/2014, 2/21/2014, 3/17/2014, 3/18/2014, 3/19/2014, and 4/10/2014) see primarily related to CAISO advocacy. About 1.75 hours of Long’s time (recorded for 2/6/2013, 1/31/2014, 2/20/2014, 2/25/2014, and 3/18/2014) seem primarily related to CAISO advocacy. The award of compensation in today’s decision reflects disallowance of these hours.</p>
<p>III.B</p>	<p>Pursuant to the Cost-of-Living–Adjustment (COLA) adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-303, the hourly rates for work performed by Long and Woodruff in 2014 have been increased to \$570 and \$250 respectively.</p>

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. TURN has made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) 14-06-050.
2. The requested hourly rates for Intervenor's representatives 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, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation, after disallowance of non-compensable work, is \$42,777.32.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with the adjustments set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.
2. The comment period for today's decision should be waived so as to ensure prompt payment of the award.

**ORDER**

1. The Utility Reform Network is awarded \$42,777.32.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network (TURN) their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2014 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. 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 July 1, 2014, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of TURN'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>	N/A
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1406050		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R1110023		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Gamson		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, 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>
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	9/2/2014	\$48,336.07	\$42,777.32	N/A	Non-compensable hours; Resolution ALJ-303.

**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>
Thomas	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$555	2013	\$555
Thomas	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$555	2014	\$570/\$285
Kevin	Woodruff	Expert	TURN	\$240	2013	\$240
Kevin	Woodruff	Expert	TURN	\$240	2014	\$250

**(END OF APPENDIX)**