Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Revisions to the California High Cost Fund B Program.	Rulemaking 09-06-019 (Filed June 18, 2009)

DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-06-008

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	**For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-06-008**
Claimed: $258,608.30	**Awarded: $236,685.38** (reduced 8.48 %)
Assigned Commissioner: Liane M. Randolph	**Assigned Administrative Law Judge:** ALJ Division[1]

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief Description of Decision:	This compensation request covers the final decision in a docket that spanned multiple years and included multiple decisions. Taken together, these decisions constitute the Commission's work to revise the Commission's California High Cost Fund-B and to devise different market mechanisms to encourage competition in high cost areas. This latest Final Decision adopts a mechanism to update methodologies to calculate cost support amounts for the California High Cost Fund-B. Further, the decision renders final decisions on outstanding issues in the docket, including a final rejection of a proposed reverse auction mechanism, and closes the docket.

[1] ALJ Thomas Pulsifer was the originally assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	N/A	
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	March 19, 2010[2]
3. Date NOI Filed:	November 29, 2006 April 19, 2010	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.06-06-028 R.09-06-019	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 15, 2008 October 10, 2011	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.05-02-027, A.08-05-023	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 4, 2005 April 22, 2009	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D. 14-06-008	Verified
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	June 17, 2014	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	August 18, 2014	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

[2] The Assigned Commissioner did not solicit comments until February 11, 2010, with a due date of March 19, 2010.

#	Intervenor's Comments	CPUC Discussion
B.3	The Commission closed R.06-06-028 and opened R.09-06-019 as a "successor proceeding." TURN properly filed its NOI for work performed in R.06-06-028 and was granted an award of substantial contribution for its work toward the Phase 1 decision, D.07-09-020. Upon the commencement of R.09-06-019, TURN filed a revised NOI and, on October 10, 2011, ALJ Pulsifer found TURN eligible to request compensation for its work in both R.09-06-019 and R.06-06-028 upon Commission adoption of a Final Decision in this docket. TURN filed a compensation request covering multiple decisions spanning both dockets after the Commission adopted D.12-12-038 (Basic Service Definition) and received compensation for its work (D.13-12-051).	
B.13	This compensation request covers work spanning multiple years within both R.06-06-028 and R.09-06-019. The Final Decision closes the docket and addresses multiple issues that, at first, may not seem related but as discussed below constitute a package of issues that the Commission reviewed to determine competition policy in high cost areas.	

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

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

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. *Background & Summary* TURN was an active participant in this docket, representing consumer interests, for over 8 years. TURN previously requested and received intervenor compensation for its work in this docket covering multiple	D. 08-04-037, Granting Compensation to the Utility Reform Network for Substantial Contribution to D.07-09-020 (R.06-06-028) and D. 13-12-051 Granting Compensation to the Utility Reform Network for Substantial Contribution to D.12-12-038, D.09-07-020, D.08-09-042, D.07-12-054, and Resolution T-17143. (R.09-06-019)	Yes.

Final Decisions and Resolutions representing the Commission's policy on competition in high cost areas of the state, as well as related issues on the rate for and definition of basic service. This compensation request covers the remaining hours for TURN's work in this docket. However, as with the other requests, TURN's work spans from 2007 to 2014 and during that time addressed a wide variety of issues. For the purpose of this request, TURN's work begins with a comprehensive and ambitious Scoping Memo issued for Phase II of R.06-06-028. That Scoping Memo prioritized issues relating to the adoption and implementation of a reverse auction and updating cost proxy values to adjust B-Fund subsidies to carriers. As discussed below, the Commission acknowledged the complex issues and groundbreaking work involved in creating a reverse auction process in California. TURN was an integral part of the multi-party, multi-year collaborative effort created by the Commission. TURN was skeptical of the value of a reverse auction, concerned about the impact of a reverse auction on customers in high cost areas, and the impact on those paying the surcharge to support the B-Fund. Therefore, TURN was	October 5, 2007 Phase 2 Scoping Ruling December 13, 2007 ACR on Working Groups December 31, 2010 ACR on Competition Analysis January 29, 2013 ACR on Cost Proxy Modeling April 23, 2013 ACR on Affordability Study [*See discussion below for further citations to Commission rulings and parties' comments*] Final Decision D.14-06-008	

compelled to be involved in almost every aspect of the discussion. Indeed, due to the process created by the Commission, and the interrelated nature of the issues, parties had to commit to the entire process in order to ensure they were making a substantial contribution. As the compensation request demonstrates, TURN dedicated significant resources and made a clear and substantial contribution to the process. A high-level timeline of events covered by this compensation request may be helpful to understand where TURN made a substantial contribution on reverse auction and other issues: **October 2007** – Phase II Scoping **November 2007**- Comments on detailed Commission questions **December 2007**- ACR on Working Group Process **January – May 2008**- Working Group Process **June 2008**- Party comments on reverse auction **February 2010**- ACR on reverse auctions in R.09-06-019 **February/March 2010**- Party comments on reverse auctions **December 2010-February 2011**- work on possible competition analysis		

April –June 2013- ACR and comments on affordability study **January 2013-January 2014**- workshops and comments on cost proxy updating [End timeline] TURN was actively involved in each of the events listed above, employing its staff and experts as needed. TURN's work on reverse auctions, competition, affordability, and cost proxy updates was substantial and comprehensive. The Commission continued its work and serious consideration of a reverse auction mechanism for several years until its definitive rejection of the plan in the Final Decision at issue here. As discussed below and in the Section II.A.b., Reasonableness of Hours, TURN also dedicated resources to addressing Commission inquiries on the level of competition in California and the impact of a 2010 Staff Report on affordability of basic service. These are critical issues to TURN for its work to ensure that residential customers have access to affordable, high quality and reliable telecommunications services. Below, TURN breaks out numerous examples of its substantial contribution to the multiple interrelated issues		

covered by the Commission Decision at issue in this compensation request. However, as discussed in the compensation request filed in February 2013, because of the length and complexity of the proceedings, it is difficult to encapsulate hundreds of pages of filed comments and hours of participation in working groups and workshops into direct examples of where the Commission may have agreed with TURN's position and included it in one of the Decisions discussed here. TURN did not attempt to comprehensively cite to all the Rulings in this docket or its own sets of comments. For example, TURN filed hundreds of pages of material on the design and impact of reverse auction mechanisms in comments filed independently and as part of the Working Group process. Overall, TURN, along with other intervenors, was an active and critical part of the consumer voice in this docket. TURN's knowledge, experience, and resources contributed to expand the record and strengthen the level of discourse on these issues. While no single party can demonstrate substantial contribution on all of the issues, TURN's participation undeniably contributed to the overall value and effectiveness of the proceeding and resulting Decisions.		

2. Reverse Auction- General The Commission characterized the implementation of a reverse auction as a priority issue for Phase II of this docket in October 2007. As discussed below, the Commission pursued the possibility of implementing a reverse auction for several years issuing no fewer than four ACRs with requests for detailed comments each on a broad range of issues relating to the implementation of reverse auctions. TURN was not supportive of the Commission's attempt to implement a reverse auction mechanism as part of its high cost subsidy program. TURN expressed concern over several issues including rates, service offerings, level of participation and overall complexity of implementation time and time again. While other parties were also cautious to pursue a reverse auction, they were supportive only if the Commission was willing to adopt their proposals. TURN's work on reverse auction issues, all coded as either AUC or WG in this compensation request, covers multiple interrelated issues including COLR obligations, transition to winning bidders, auction design, and mapping geographic areas for auction pilot programs. Other issues related to auction design were also discussed during this time,	ACR on Phase II Scope, October 7, 2007. TURN Opening November 9, 2007 TURN Reply, November 28, 2007 at. 5, 15 ACR Soliciting Further Comments, May 28, 2008. TURN June 24, 2008 Comments. TURN July 15, 2008 Reply Comments Order Instituting Rulemaking, at3-6. TURN Reply Comments on Cost Proxy Updating, August 23, 2014, at 6-7. ACR Requesting Further Comment, August 29, 2013. Final Decision at 17.	Yes.

but TURN has claimed compensation for its work on those issues in previous compensation requests. The last set of substantive comments TURN filed on reverse auction issues was in March 2010. But as late as August 2013, TURN requested that the Commission make a final and definitive statement rejecting the possibility of a reverse auction. In its 2013 comments, TURN points out that the B-Fund no longer provides sufficient subsidy money to serve as an incentive for carriers to participate in an auction and may sunset in 2015. An ACR dated August 29, 2013 acknowledges TURN's August comments and confirms that, "Given these considerations, it would not be effective to pursue reverse auction." The Final Decision contains the definitive statement that the Commission will no longer consider the implementation of a reverse auction. It cites, in part, to the fact that there is no longer an incentive for carriers to participate in light of the small amounts of B-Fund subsidy money.		
3. Reverse Auction-Prioritization of Issues The Commission proposed a reverse auction process as a basis for setting high cost	ACR on Phase II Scope, October 9, 2007. TURN Opening November 9, 2007. TURN Reply, November 28, 2007 at 5, 15.	Yes.

support levels for basic service. Parties provided detailed responses to the Commission's initial questions and each party urged caution and thoughtfulness in the pursuit of a reverse auction. TURN urged the Commission to address certain key issues first including rate caps and the definition of basic service. TURN's position was that these issues must be given priority and the reverse auction can only be designed once these issues are addressed. This position was in contrast to arguments from parties like Sprint that suggested basic service rates did not need to be addressed prior to setting up a reverse auction. Other carriers, such as AT&T, Verizon and T-Mobile also urged the Commission to provide more flexibility to carriers regarding the services offered as part of their auction bidding and not spend time setting a single service. The Commission agreed with TURN and separated out issues related to rates and the definition of basic service. At first, the Commission asked for substantive comments on the definition of basic service while still actively considering reverse auction issues. After the working group process, the Commission put work on the auction and cost proxy issues on hold until both rates and basic service issues were	AT&T Opening November 9, 2007. ACR Soliciting Further Comments, May 28, 2008. TURN June 24, 2008 Comments, at 4, Roycroft Affidavit. TURN July 15, 2008 Reply Comments, at 4-5. TURN March 19, 2010 Opening Comments, Roycroft Affidavit. ACR Amending Scoping Memo, May 10, 2010. Final Decision at 5.	

addressed. The Commission issued final decisions on basic rates in 2008 and the definition of basic service in 2012. The Final Decision at issue here notes that, "the assigned Commissioner ultimately determined to first address updating basic telephone service requirements before considering the merits of a reverse auction."		
4. Reverse Auction- Pilot Program The Commission asked for comment regarding the need to engage in a pilot project for a reverse auction. Along with other parties in the docket, TURN emphasized the unknown ramifications of reverse auctions and the fact that California would be the first Commission in the country to implement a reverse auction. At first, TURN strongly urged the Commission to create a pilot project for a reverse auction and Dr. Roycroft conducted detailed mapping as part of the Working Group process and subsequent sets of comments to support recommendations regarding the locations and design of a pilot project. In subsequent comments, TURN expressed concern about the resources for a pilot and the overall use of a reverse auction.	TURN Opening November 9, 2007 at 39. Working Group ACR December 13, 2007. ACR Soliciting Further Comments, May 28, 2008. TURN June 24, 2008 Comments, Roycroft Appendix	Yes.

The Commission agreed that there was a need for a pilot project and set up a Working Group process that would design and implement the pilot project. The Commission continued to request input on the design of a pilot program in subsequent rulings. No pilot program was ever created.		
5. Reverse Auction- Limited Carrier Participation In discussions regarding the design and implementation of the reverse auction, TURN raised a fundamental issue regarding the level of participation in an auction and the impact it will have on the outcome of the auction and the level of competition in rural California areas. Despite reductions in the B-Fund subsidy money as a result of changes to the program in 2006 and 2007, the Commission continued to consider a reverse auction for several years. TURN *consistently* stated that the Commission "cannot reasonably expect that auctions will lead to a flood of new entry in high cost areas" and this lack of bidders will impact the efficacy of reverse auctions. After years of consideration, other parties also urged the Commission to reject the idea of a reverse auction, but TURN raised the concern about level of participation in the auction	TURN Opening Comments November 9, 2007 at 20. TURN June 24, 2008 Comments, at 3, Roycroft Appendix. TURN July 15, 2008 Comments, at 2. TURN March 19, 2010, at 3-4, Roycroft Affidavit. ACR soliciting additional comments, August 29, 2013 at 4-5. Final Decision at 17.	Yes.

early on in the proceeding. Ultimately, the Commission rejected the concept of a reverse auction to address competition policy in rural parts of the California stating that, "Given the limited amount of B-Fund support at issue, we do not believe there would be sufficient carrier participation to justify further proceedings or to enable a reverse auction to work."		
6. Reverse Auction- Working Group The Commission created a detailed Working Group process wherein parties were urged to "secure the most experienced and qualified experts on this issue." The goal was to develop areas of consensus or narrow disputed issues. TURN dedicated significant resources to each of the Working Groups and played a leading consumer advocacy role and an active participant in all work efforts. Thus, work product coming from the Working Group process and its impact on the Commission's work toward a reverse auction including acknowledging the complexities and taking additional time to consider certain issues, represents TURN's substantial contribution. As the written reports from both Working Groups indicate, there was limited consensus	ACR setting Working Groups, December 13, 2007. Working Group 1 Status Reports February 21, 2008 & May 1, 2008. Working Group 2 Status Reports, February 21, 2008 & May 1, 2008. ACR Soliciting Further Comments, May 28, 2008. TURN June 24, 2008 Comments post-Working Group process. Order Instituting Rulemaking, R.09-06-019 at 3-5.	Yes.

among the participants. Yet the parties provided clarity on the description and understand of several key issues regarding design and implementation and the need to prioritize certain issues above other issues. At the request of the Working Group participants, the Commission requested comments from each party as to the prioritization of issues and next steps for the Working Groups. TURN urged the Commission to address fundamental issues on basic service and auction design before moving forward with more detailed analysis in a Working Group environment. In its OIR opening the related docket, R.09-06-019, the Commission still raised the possibility of resuming the Working Group Process. However, after comments were filed in March 2010, the Commission did not resume the Working Group process.		
7. Affordability In April 2013, the Commission amended the scope of the docket to request comments "on the findings regarding the affordability of basic telephone service published in the CD report…particularly in view of the current environment in which basic telephone service rates …are no longer subject to rate caps." (4/23/2013 ACR) The Scoping Memo was not only requesting	Affordability ACR, April 23, 2013. TURN Opening Comments on Affordability, June 10, 2013. TURN Reply Comments on Affordability, June 24, 2010. Final Decision at 17-18.	Will be addressed in separate intervenor compensation decision in R. 11-03-013.

comment on the Report itself, but urging parties to provide further analysis of the issues of affordability "in view of the current environment." TURN had repeatedly and consistently requested that the Commission review affordability issues in this docket. In 2008, the Commission ordered the Commission to review affordability as part of LifeLine. In 2010 the Commission staff issued an affordability Report in the LifeLine docket. TURN filed an Application for Rehearing on the Commission's use of that Report to support the Final Decision in the LifeLine docket. The Commission granted TURN's Application, in part, and ordered the Commission to provide further opportunity to comment on the 2010 Report. The Commission provided parties two opportunities to provide further comments on the 2010 Report. In response to the April 2013 ACR in this docket, TURN filed opening and reply comments, including an affidavit by Dr. Roycroft, providing a detailed analysis of the 2010 Report discussing useful findings from the Report, flaws in the Report's methodologies, and the need for further investigation and review into both affordability and competitive alternatives. At the same time, the		

Commission also asked for comments regarding the use of the 2010 Staff Report in the LifeLine proceeding. (*R.11-03-013 Scoping Memo 4/10/2013*) In January 2014, the Commission adopted its final decision in the LifeLine proceeding wherein it found the 2010 Staff Report to be "stale," contradicted by comments at 8 PPHs, incomplete due to subsequent rate increases in basic service and "no longer useful." (*D.14-10-036, p. 126-127, FOF 14*). It addressed affordability in the LifeLine final decision by continuing to cap LifeLine rates. The Final Decision at issue in this compensation request cursorily addresses the Affordability Study by stating that, "In view of subsequent proceedings in the Lifeline docket (R.11-03-013) where we have taken steps to provide for the affordability of Lifeline telephone service, we will not pursue further study of the affordability issue in this docket." So, the Commission's actions on affordability must be viewed from the perspective of both dockets. While the Commission did not ultimately take on the additional analysis recommended in TURN's June 2013 comments in this docket, it did acknowledge the need to address affordability issues and concluded it has been adequately addressed in the separate but related		

LifeLine docket.		
8. Cost Proxy- Cost Modeling The Commission initially asked for comments on the possibility of using a specific cost model- the HM 5.3- to update cost proxy rates. TURN urged the Commission not to reopen a cost modeling process at all, especially one using HM 5.3. It provided detailed analysis of why HM5.3 would not produce accurate or useful results for the purpose of updating high cost support and the resources involved in engaging in a full cost analysis. While ORA agreed that there would be little benefit to developing entirely new cost studies, it did advocate for additional analysis and updating of cost proxy values beyond just using census data. The Commission did not pursue the use of HM 5.3 as a means to update or revise the high cost subsidy calculations, and explicitly rejected ORA's call for further data analysis stating that such an effort may then require a detailed costing analysis. The Commission noted that the smaller size of the B-Fund and limited expected growth made additional costing analysis unnecessary and potential waste of Commission resources.	ACR on Phase II Scope, October 9, 2007. TURN Opening Nov 9, 2007 comments at 3, 42. Final Decision at 16, FOF. 5	Yes.

9. Cost Proxy- Consensus Proposal After completing its review of the definition of basic service, the Commission issued an ACR outlining the final phase of this docket. The ACR set the next priority for the proceeding as "updating of cost proxy data used to calculate B-Fund Support." The Commission put this issue on the table early in Phase 2 of the docket, in 2007, but set it aside along with the related issue of reverse auctions to work on other priorities. The January 2013 Ruling, and a subsequent March 2013 Ruling, set forth a workshop process wherein parties were directed to focus on producing updated census data to calculate B-Fund Support. TURN prepared a detailed presentation at the first workshop on the most effective and efficient ways to use updated census data. Following the workshop, parties conducted a series of meetings and discussions on the possibility of presenting a joint proposal to update cost proxy data using census data. TURN's expert, Trevor Roycroft was an active participant in these discussions and allowed TURN to critically review the carriers' proposals. The parties presented a Consensus Proposal in comments. While not termed a	January 29, 2013 ACR on Cost Proxy Updates. March 4, 2013 ACR on Cost Proxy Workshop. Joint Comments on CBG Mapping Data Update, May 23, 2013. TURN Reply Comments, May 31, 2013. TURN Reply Comments on Cost Proxy Issues, August 23, 2013 at 5-6. Final Decision at 14-16, OP 1-2.	Yes.

"settlement" pursuant to the Commission's Rules, the parties negotiated and compromised to come to this joint proposal. ORA did not fully support the consensus proposal because, as discussed above, ORA believed the Commission should further update the cost proxy numbers using data beyond census figures. The Final Decision adopts the Consensus Proposal and "declines to undertake further steps to adjust existing cost proxies as proposed by Verizon and ORA." (at 16) The Final Decision cites to TURN's comments that suggest any attempt to update the cost proxy data as ORA proposes would further complicate the process and start the analysis down the "slippery slope" of a detailed costing analysis. (at 16)		
10. Cost Proxy-Implementation Although TURN supported the consensus proposal to updating cost proxy values using census data, it raised concerns that the carriers' efforts to implement the updated data were incomplete at the time of filing comments. TURN urged the Commission to require the carriers to file Tier 1 Advice Letters to provide further information on the fully	TURN Reply Comments on Cost Proxy Issues, August 23, 2013. Final Decision at 18, OP 4.	Yes.

updated cost proxy numbers once each carrier completed the analysis. The Final Decision requires the affected COLRs to file Tier 1 Advice Letters (AL)to implement the changes to their B-Fund subsidy amounts by solely reflecting the changes in census data. The Final Decision states, "We agree with TURN that all B-Fund carriers should be required to file a Tier 1 AL to finalize the list of 2010 CBGs eligible for B-Fund support."		
11. Cost Proxy- Unmapped CBGs Certain small local exchange carriers, including Frontier, urged the Commission to adopt the SURF proposal. This proposal would theoretically allow certain carriers to move to an alternative regulatory framework and receive B-Fund support for qualifying service territories. As a fall back, it urged the Commission to take an initial step and in this docket adopt updated cost proxy numbers for all of the census block groups in the state that do not currently have cost proxy values because those areas are currently not eligible for B-Fund subsidy. TURN opposed the recommendation that the Commission assign cost proxy values for every CBG in the state as unnecessary and	TDS Telecom Comments, May 17, 2013. Joint Comments on CBG Mapping Data Update, May 23, 2013 at 2. TURN Reply Comments on TDS and Frontier Proposals, May 31, 2013. June 7, 2013 ALJ Ruling setting next Workshop. TURN Reply Comments on Cost Proxy Issues, August 23, 2013 at 4. 6. Final Decision at 15.	Yes.

therefore a waste of resources. Further, TURN warned the Commission that an attempt to generically assign cost proxy values to those areas where no such analysis has been done could result in highly speculative subsidy calculations. The Joint Comments supporting the consensus proposal also urged the Commission to adopt a different methodology for assigning cost proxy values to new census block groups only if and when it becomes necessary. The June 7, 2013 ALJ Ruling rejects the proposal to update all CBGs as an option for carriers "moving out of rate of return regulation" as "premature." The Final Decision rejects the proposal to assign cost proxy values to every census block group in the state suggesting that the Commission could develop a process to assign cost proxy figures and determine B-Fund subsidy amounts if and when it is necessary.		
12. Cost Proxy- Frontier CBGs Frontier requested that the Commission directly address the need to assign cost proxy values to those territories recently added to its serving territory. These areas of the state were not previously eligible for B-Fund subsidy.	Frontier Opening Comments, May 17, 2013. TURN Reply Comments on TDS and Frontier Proposal, May 31, 2013. TURN Reply Comments on Cost Proxy Issues, August 23, 2013 at 4.	Yes.

Between workshops, TURN and Frontier discussed different methodologies to apply updated cost proxy data to its new CBGs. After some changes by Frontier, TURN supported the methodology presented by Frontier as a reasonable methodology under the limited circumstances. ORA opposed Frontier's proposal stating that Frontier should not be able to receive B-Fund support for these new areas. The Final Decision adopts Frontier's proposal noting TURN's agreement with the proposal as "reasonable." However, the Final Decision also notes that TURN specifically does not support the Frontier proposal being applied to other serving areas and must be limited only to the circumstances surrounding Frontier's new serving areas. The Final Decision states that any additional B-Fund areas that subsequently become served by companies but do not have currently assigned cost proxy numbers will need to be developed. (at 15)	Final Decision at 11-12, 15 OP 3.	

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?[3]	**Yes.**	Verified.
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	**Yes.**	Verified.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Other intervenors were parties to the case, such as the National Consumer Law Center, the Disability Rights Advocates/Center for Accessible Technology, and the Greenlining Institute. However, on the issues that are the subject of this compensation request including the reverse auction mechanisms and cost proxy updating, TURN was the only active intervenor. On comments regarding affordability, other intervenors filed limited comments. In addition, there were also numerous parties representing various categories of industry participants including incumbent GRC LECs , URF carriers, and competitive local exchange carriers.		Verified.
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: TURN worked extremely closely with DRA and other intervenor parties to ensure limited duplication of effort. Throughout this docket, TURN collaborated both formally and informally with various combinations of parties through strategy conference calls, joint filings, and preparation for key events such as working groups, workshops, and ex parte meetings. When appropriate, the consumer parties coordinated and shared work effort to conserve resources and increase efficiencies such as comments on affordability and strategy discussions regarding the competition review phase. TURN helped move the consumer voice forward while still coordinating with each of the intervenors to ensure consistent consumer representation on these technical issues. This was especially critical in light of the significant number of parties representing various industry perspectives. In sum, the Commission should find that TURN's participation was efficiently coordinated with the participation of other intervenors wherever possible, so as to avoid undue duplication and to ensure that any such duplication served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showing of the other intervenor.		Verified.

[3] 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 the Governor on September 26, 2013.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	**CPUC Discussion**
TURN's work and substantial contributions to the decision covered by this compensation request created tangible and intangible benefits to California consumers. This is a large compensation request covering significant resources expended by TURN on this docket. The main task of Phase 2 of this long-running docket was the consideration of a reverse auction mechanism as part of the Commission's competition policy. TURN's detailed and technical work on reverse auction mechanisms avoided rural customers suffering from uncertainty and variability in their communications services, especially as offered by the lowest bidder. TURN work also prevented an increase in surcharge payments by California ratepayers to support an inefficient program. While the avoided costs are impossible to calculate in light of the scope and scale of the proposed reverse auction, the discussion did not provide detailed cost estimates for program implementation, the record is clear that implementing a reverse auction mechanism would have been complicated and potentially costly with only limited potential benefits to a small subset of customers. This risk of misuse of Commission and ratepayer resources was particularly clear as the B-Fund subsidy shrank, making additional surcharge collection just to support the reverse auction a glaring and disproportionate misuse of funds. The Commission eventually echoed TURN's concerns that the size of the Fund did not warrant such a complicated solution. While the possibility of a reverse auction loomed, TURN looked for alternative mechanisms to address rural competition policy issues. As part of this process, TURN invested resources to ensure that a consensus proposal updating the B-Fund subsidy mechanism, covering hundreds of census block groups with costs exceeding $36 per customer, served the best interests of both rural customers and those that pay the B-Fund surcharge. TURN researched, reviewed, and participated in several meetings and workshops with industry members to design a rational mechanism that was efficient and effective. By avoiding a reverse auction and an expensive costing exercise, potentially millions of dollars have been saved. Even in the face of ORA opposition suggesting that further work should be done, the Commission eventually agreed that a smaller scale solution was appropriate. Consumers benefit when the Fund is correctly sized, thereby limiting surcharges and yet ensuring carriers will have an incentive to maintain high quality service in rural areas. More generally, TURN has a limited number of hours in this compensation	Verified.

request to address issues raised by the Commission on affordability and competition. These hours were important investments in state-wide competition policy. It was critical that consumers had early, detailed and clear input into these inquiries. Issues of affordability and competition have direct impact on the communication alternatives available to consumers- in particular vulnerable consumers with limited choices. The Commission has acknowledged numerous times that affordability is a significant priority and criteria for its competition policies. Had the Commission decided to pursue these inquiries in this docket, consumers would need strong representation to ensure the process was fair and effective this keeping rates in rural areas reasonable. Therefore, although much of the ratepayer benefit in this case comes from difficult to identify "avoided costs," stability in the marketplace and consumer representation on key policy issues, the Commission should therefore conclude that TURN's overall request is reasonable in light of the substantial benefits to California ratepayers that were directly attributable to TURN's participation in the case.	
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed <u>TURN Hours</u> This compensation request represents a significant amount of TURN's staff time and resources. The Commission has focused on the issues in this docket and related issues for the development of its telecommunications policy and, as a result, TURN made its work in this docket a priority. Due to the long duration of the docket, plus the multiple interrelated but distinct issues covered by the docket, all of TURN's telecommunications advocates recorded a significant amount of time for the organization's efforts. Christine Mailloux primarily served as lead attorney on the issues covered by the compensation request; however, due to the scope and scale of this proceeding, Bill Nusbaum was an active participant in strategy development and focused issues. This was particularly true with work on auction mechanism issues where each TURN representative had a specific role to play. Regina Costa and Trevor Roycroft were consistent contributors on each of the issues covered by the compensation request, occasionally taking the lead on certain issues. TURN relied on Dr. Roycroft's economics policy and data analysis expertise to work on each of the issues, but most critically he took a major role in reverse auctions and cost proxy updating. <u>Auction Mechanism Hours</u> TURN dedicated significant resources to participate in the Commission's	Verified.

work on reverse auctions. In previous compensation requests, TURN diligently extracted hour entries that represented work on reverse auction design and implementation issues pending a final decision on those issues. The definition of basic service and some pricing issues initially were discussed in the context of reverse auctions, but those issues were separated out by the Commission and included in separate final decisions in 2008 and 2012. In its last compensation request in this docket, filed in February 2013 (see, D.13-12-051), TURN requested and received compensation for its work on those decisions. The Commission accepted TURN's apportionment of its hours separating out auction issues in that compensation request. This compensation request includes all remaining hours for TURN's work on reverse auctions and cost proxy mechanisms, including the Working Group effort discussed below. TURN once again urges the Commission to accept its apportionment of its time for this complicated issue. If the Commission needs additional document on this effort, TURN will work with the Commission to provide that information. The possibility of adopting a reverse auction mechanism to support competition in rural areas remained a consideration from November 2007, when the Commission requested initial comments on the issue, until the Final Decision when the Commission rejected reverse auctions. During these 6 years, the Commission kept the issue alive through several sets of comments and a detailed Working Group process. The Commission acknowledged the complexity of the issues and the need to "proceed in a careful and thoughtful manner." (*12/13/07 ACR*) As discussed below, the WG process during the first six months of 2008 was a multi-stakeholder processes that required significant dedication of resources. Beyond that work, however, the Commission requested several rounds of additional comments. These comments were generally detailed and included responses to either specific questions posed by the Commission or a draft set of rules for auction design. As discussed above, TURN consistently opposed the use of a reverse auction mechanism. However, in light of the continued interest in this issue by the Commission, TURN also worked diligently to shape the design and implementation of a reverse auction to mitigate what it saw as the dangers to consumers. Given the complexity and importance of the issues in this rulemaking, the Commission should find that TURN's use of attorney and expert witness time was reasonable. <u>Working Group Effort</u> As TURN explained in its February 2013 compensation request, all stakeholders dedicated significant resources to the Working Group process created by the Commission in this docket. Parties were directed to consider a broad range of issues related to the development of reverse auctions and, more generally, updating the cost proxies for the B-Fund	

subsidy calculation. TURN dedicated significant staff time to both working groups and relied on Dr. Roycroft's expertise to address all issues. TURN conducted extensive data analysis, and was a key member of the drafting process for the resulting reports. The Working Groups took a broad and all-inclusive approach to the multiple interrelated issues. TURN has identified entries relating to Working Group efforts as "WG." For its February 2013 compensation request TURN conducted a detailed analysis of its hours to determine how much of its time was spent on issues related to those final decisions and how much needed to be reserved for a future compensation request. At the time, it determined that one-third of its time spent on Working Group 1 issues and all of the time spent on Working Group 2 issues were not appropriate to include in that compensation request. TURN now includes those hours here as time spent directly addressing the design and implementation of a reverse auction. <u>Competition Analysis</u> TURN has included a moderate amount of hours, approximately 70, for its work on a competition analysis as set forth in a December 2010 ACR. These hours are coded as "COM." The detailed ACR issued by Commissioner Bohn provided clear direction to the parties regarding the expected work effort to "assess the level of competition in the telecommunications marketplace" and to determine the impact of competition on prices for basic service. The ACR set a schedule for comments within two months and noted, "We are particularly interested in hearing comments from the [sic] DRA and TURN." (*ACR Adopting Amended Scoping Memo and Schedule, December 31, 2010 at 24*) Issues regarding the level of competition and the impact of competition on rates for basic service have been a high priority for the Commission and for TURN because of the direct impact on consumer interests. The ACR acknowledges this, calling this review "critical" for the Commission to discharge its duties under the Public Utilities Code and cites to a report presented by TURN in March 2009 as one of the justifications for initiating this competition review. TURN began to diligently prepare its comments in response to the detailed questions in the ACR, including the specific requests for "data analysis" to support the comments and arguments therein. On January 20, 2011, Commissioner Peevey issued a ruling "temporarily deferring" the schedule. However, the Peevey ACR also expressed continued support for the Bohn Ruling and gave no indication that his ACR would be anything but a short delay in the schedule. TURN continued to work on these issues, including preparing an update to the TURN study cited in the original Bohn ACR through detailed data analysis by Dr. Roycroft and conducting	

discovery to gather data from the carriers on competition in the marketplace. The parties received no further direction on this issue. In light of the uncertainty in the schedule, TURN limited its work effort and eventually stopped work on these issues soon after realizing that the Commission may not move forward. In light of this history, TURN urges the Commission to compensate TURN for its work effort in direct response to the detailed Bohn ACR. While there was no final decision on this effort, TURN's hours represent a reasonable and necessary work effort on behalf of consumers on this critical issue. <u>Meeting Attendance</u> There are some hourly entries that reflect meetings attended by two or more of TURN's attorneys and expert witnesses. In past compensation decisions, the Commission has on occasion deemed such entries as reflecting internal duplication that is not eligible for an award of intervenor compensation. This is not the case here. As explained in its February 2013 compensation request and further discussed above, for the meetings that were among TURN's attorneys and expert witnesses, such meetings are essential to the effective development and implementation of TURN's strategy for this proceeding. None of the attendees are there in a duplicative role because each advocate and consultant has his or her own expertise and knowledge of certain issues and procedures to bring to the discussion. In addition, due to limited resources and out of town workers, each staff person had to be familiar enough with the issues to attend meetings and conference calls as a lone TURN representative. As a result of this collaborative process, TURN is able to identify new and unique issues and angles that would almost certainly never come to mind individually. There were also meetings with other parties (particularly intervenors) and meetings or workshops at the Commission at which more than one attorney or advocate represented TURN on occasion. TURN's requested hours do not include any for any TURN attorney or expert witness where his or her presence at a meeting was not necessary in order to achieve the meeting's purpose. As discussed above, TURN also has the unique situation where the case manager could not attend many of the meetings in person, leaving those in San Francisco to participate more fully while Ms. Mailloux monitored by phone. TURN submits that such meetings can be part of an intervenor's effective advocacy before the Commission, and that intervenor compensation can and should be awarded for the time of all participants in such meetings where, as here, each participant needed to be in the meeting to advance the intervenor's advocacy efforts.	

TURN submits that the recorded hours are reasonable, both for each TURN staff member and expert witness, and in the aggregate. Given some of the different circumstances present here including the long duration of the docket, multiple interrelated by distinct issue areas and collaboration with several intervenors, TURN's hours are reasonable. Therefore, TURN seeks compensation for all of the hours recorded by our staff members and outside consultants as included in this request. <u>Compensation Request Preparation Time</u>: TURN is requesting compensation for approximately 11 hours devoted to preparation of this request for compensation. This is a reasonable figure in light of the size and complexity of the case and, therefore, request for compensation itself. Ms. Mailloux took the lead in drafting the request. TURN took it upon itself to delete some hours worked by Ms. Mailloux that it felt excessive and represented the fact that the attorneys had to piece together a larger than normal record, a wide range of time entries, and coordinate multiple advocates' work efforts. As a result, the Commission should find this amount reasonable under the circumstances. **Hourly Rates of TURN Staff and Consultants** TURN's request for compensation covers work performed in 2007 through 2014. In D.13-12-051, in this docket, the Commission approved the hourly rate for each of the TURN advocates for work performed in 2007 through 2012, except for Dr. Roycroft whose hourly rate was only approved through 2011. TURN relies on those approved hourly rates in this compensation request. Therefore, below TURN only addresses the hourly rates for Dr. Roycroft for 2012 and 2013 and for other TURN advocates from 2013 and 2014. For Christine Mailloux, her approved hourly rate for work performed in 2013 is $430. (D.14-04-021). Consistent with Resolution ALJ-267, TURN seeks compensation for her 2014 work at the same previously-approved hourly rate. If the Commission determines that a Cost of Living Increase is appropriate for work performed in 2014, TURN requests that the Commission apply the COLA to her currently approved rate. Mr. Nusbaum has an approved hourly rate for his work in 2013 of $455 (D.13-10-065). Mr. Nusbaum has no hours for 2014 in this case. For Regina Costa, TURN is using her approved hourly rate of $290 for 2013 (D.14-04-021). Ms. Costa has a limited number of hours for 2014. Without waiving its ability to request an updated rate for Ms. Costa in	

future compensation requests, TURN seeks compensation for her 2014 work at the same previously-approved hourly rate for 2013. For Trevor Roycroft, the Commission approved an hourly rate of $230 for 2012. (D.13-05-031) For work in 2013, TURN requests reimbursement at his approved rate of $230. Dr. Roycroft has no hours in 2014 for this case. TURN submits that this information is more than sufficient for the Commission to grant the requested hourly rates for these advocates. However, should the Commission disagree and believe that it needs more information to support the request, TURN asks that we be informed of the additional information that is necessary and given an opportunity to provide that information before a draft decision issues on this compensation request. **Reasonableness of Expenses** TURN requests that the Commission approve its expenses associated with its participation in this case. These limited amount of expenses are directly attributable to TURN's work on the issues covered in this compensation request. Some expenses such as photocopies and phone related to these issues have already been claimed in previous requests because it would have been impossible to break them out. But as with its hour entries, TURN diligently parsed through expense records to separate out those expenses related to this docket but not claimed until there was a Final Decision on the issue. The expenses consist of photocopying expenses, postage, phone and travel expenses. The phone costs include conference call charges and personal phone expenses due to the coordination efforts with its consultant and among the intervenors and other parties to the case. The travel expenses cover attendance at a 2013 cost proxy workshop by TURN's lead attorney Ms. Mailloux whose presence was required because of the possibility that the scope of the docket would be discussed and Dr. Roycroft who presented a detailed proposal on cost proxy and census data updates. Dr. Roycroft also attended a follow up workshop on the cost proxy consensus proposal, but Ms. Mailloux's presence was not required and she participated partially by phone. TURN is extremely cautious and conservative in its staffing of workshops and the resulting travel expenses it may incur. The Commission should find TURN's direct expenses reasonable.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: TURN has allocated its time entries asset for in the attachments by the	Verified.

following codes:		
GP	**General Preparation**- work that generally does not vary with the number of issues that TURN addresses in the case.	
AUC	**Auction**- The AUC code encompasses TURN's work in response to the Commission's repeated inquiries on the viability of a reverse auction process. This code includes work on sub-issues such as auction design, eligibility criteria, proposed geographic locations for auctions and pilot programs, COLR obligations, and the issues arising from the transition of service from a loosing bidder to a winning bidder. Due to the interrelated nature of the issues regarding the design and implementation of a reverse auction, TURN cannot accurately apportion relative levels of effort to each sub-issue and requests that the Commission find its substantial contribution on the reverse auction issues must be viewed as a whole.	
COM	**Competition-** The hours coded as "COM" are directly related to TURN's response to the Assigned Commissioner's Scoping Memo in December 2010 amending the Scope to expand the docket and include a detailed, data-driven competition analysis and updated methodologies to determine whether competition is restraining the market. This work included discovery preparation and negotiation by one of TURN's attorneys and mapping analysis by TURN's expert.	
AFF	**Affordability-** This work effort is limited to TURN's comments in response to a request for parties to address the relevance and applicability of the 2010 Affordability Report in light of current circumstances.	
WG	**Working Group-** Participation in the Working Group Process set up by the Commission in the first five months of 2008. TURN has only included those hours relating to WG issues that are part of this compensation request, mainly the auction design issues from Working Group 2 and some COLR issues discussed in Working Group 1 that were not included in a previous compensation request.	
CP	**Cost Proxy-** This time, coded as "CP" represents TURN's final work efforts in this docket to address methodologies to update cost proxy values for high cost serving areas of the state possibly eligible for B-Fund subsidy. This includes work on comments, negotiations with carriers, and workshops.	

COMP **Compensation**- work on TURN's compensation request and compensation related activities such as the NOI. 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.	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
William Nusbaum	2008	17.25	$435	D.09-02-024	$7,503.75	17.25	$435.00[4]	$7,503.75
William Nusbaum	2011	18.75	$435	D.10-07-012	$8,156.25	18.75	$435.00[5]	$8,156.25
William Nusbaum	2013	1.75	$455	D.13-12-051	$796.25	0.25[D]	$455.00[6]	$113.75
Christine Mailloux	2007	8.50	$360	D. 08-04-037	$3,060.00	8.5	$360.00[7]	$3,060.00
Christine Mailloux	2008	63.75	$390	D.09-04-029	$ 24,862.50	63.75	$390.00[8]	$24,862.50
Christine Mailloux	2011	4.50	$390	D12-03-053	$1,755.00	4.5	$390.00[9]	$1,755.00
Christine Mailloux	2013	33.25	$420	D.13-12-051	$13,965.00	22[D]	$430.00[10]	$9,460.00
Christine Mailloux	2014	3.75	$420	ALJ-287	$1,575.00	3.75	$440.00[11]	$1650.00
Regina Costa	2007	66.50	$255	D.09-08-020	$16,957.50	66.5	$255.00[12]	$16,957.50

[4] Approved in D.09-02-024.
[5] Approved in D.14-12-018.
[6] Approved in D.13-10-065.
[7] Approved in D.08-04-037.
[8] Approved in D.10-06-016.
[9] Approved in D 14-07-021.
[10] Approved in D.15-01-048.
[11] Application of 2.58% Cost of Living Adjustment.
[12] Approved in D.08-04-037.

Regina Costa	2008	155.25	$275	D.09-04-029	$42,693.75	155.25	$275.00[13]	$42,693.75
Regina Costa	2010	74.75	$275	D.10-07-012	$20,556.25	74.25	$275.00[14]	$20,418.75
Regina Costa	2011	3.25	$275	D.12-09-016	$893.75	3.25	$275.00[15]	$893.75
Regina Costa	2013	94.25	$275	D.14-04-012	$25,918.75	62.5[D]	$290.00[16]	$18,125.00
Regina Costa	2014	1.50	$275	ALJ-287	$412.50	1.50	$295.00[17]	$442.50
Trevor Roycroft	2007	46.00	$175	D.08-04-037	$8,050.00	41.75[A]	$175.00[18]	$7,306.25
Trevor Roycroft	2008	175.00	$190	D.09-07-049	$33,250.00	166.75[A]	$190.00[19]	$31,673.00
Trevor Roycroft	2010	84.25	$210	D.11-07-023	$17,692.50	84.25	$210.00[20]	$17,692.50
Trevor Roycroft	2011	34.00	$230	D.13-12-051	$7,820.00	34.00	$230.00[21]	$7,820.00
Trevor Roycroft	2013	72.00	$230	D.13-12-051	$16,560.00	50.75[D]	$235.00[22]	$11,926.25
					***Subtotal:* $252,478.75**			***Subtotal:* $232,510.50**

OTHER FEES

Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):

Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total $	Hours	Rate	Total $
Christine Mailloux	2013	6.0	$210	Half approved hourly rate	$ 1260.00	0[B]	$0.00	$0.00
					***Subtotal:* $1,260.00**			***Subtotal:* $0.00**

[13] Approved in D.09-04-029.
[14] Approved in D.14-07-021.
[15] Approved in D 11-10-013.
[16] Approved in D.14-04-021.
[17] Application of 2.58% Cost of Living Adjustment.
[18] Approved in D.08-04-037.
[19] Approved in D.09-07-049.
[20] Approved in D.11-07-023.
[21] Approved in D.13-12-051.
[22] Application of 2.0% Cost of Living Adjustment.

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total $**
Christine Mailloux	2014	11.50	$210	Half approved hourly rate	$ 2,415.00	11.5	$220.00	$2,530.00
					***Subtotal:* $2,415.00**			***Subtotal:* $2,530.00**

COSTS				
#	**Item**	**Detail**	**Amount**	**Amount**
	Photocopies	Copies of Misc. filings and TURN Office Scans/Copies	$ 27.80	$27.80
	Phone/ Conference call	Phone expenses associated with R.09-06-019/R.06-06-028	$ 13.49	$13.49
	Postage/FedEx	Postage to mail Misc. filings and FedEx Expenses	$119.17	$0.00[C]
	Consultant Travel/Attorney Travel	Airfare, Travel by Public Transportation, Parking, and Lodging Expenses	$2,294.09	$1,603.59[B]
			***Subtotal:* $ 2,454.55**	***Subtotal:* $1,644.88**
			TOTAL REQUEST: $258,608.30	**TOTAL AWARD: $236,685.38**

**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

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	**Date Admitted to CA BAR[23]**	**Member Number**	**Action Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation**
Christine Mailloux	December 10, 1993	167918	No
William Nusbaum	June 7, 1983	108835	No, was inactive from January 1, 1997 until October 4, 2002

[23] This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch.

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	**Certificate of Service**
2	**Time Sheets for Attorneys, Advocates and Experts**
3	**TURN Expenses**
4	**Issue Allocation by Percentage**

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
A	Reduction to Trevor Roycroft's hours for excessive time spent revising comments and reviewing e-mails. Reduction of 12.5 hours across 2007 and 2008.
B	As stated in D.07-05-050, "[t]he Commission reimburses the reasonable costs of necessary travel. It does not reimburse the costs of an employee's commute to and from the Bay Area, which is TURN's place of business and the location of the Commission's main offices. Law firms and consulting firms do not bill their clients for such routine commuting costs. We will continue to reimburse travel costs associated with witnesses and advocates who have special expertise and live out of the area. We will also continue to reimburse the costs of travel to and from our hearings and workshops which are conducted outside of the Bay Area. However, we disallow all expenses for Mailloux's travel from her home in San Diego to San Francisco." D.07-05-050 at 13. *See also* D.09-05-015 at 12 (*stating* "[d]isallowance of [] travel time [for Mailloux]. Travel deemed to be related to routine commuting and non-compensable, despite TURN's rationale. . . . Disallow costs for attorney airfare, parking, BART, hotel and meals, also deemed to be related to routine commuting and non-compensable, despite TURN's rationale."); D.09-04-029 at 13.
C	Unnecessary overnight mailing of documents with no urgency. TURN shipped documents overnight despite the fact that urgency was not required to mail any of these documents.
D	Reduction for hours related to affordability issue. This issue was not addressed in D. 14-08-008 or in any other decision in R. 09-06-019. D. 14-06-008 stated that "In view of subsequent proceedings in the Lifeline docket (R.11-03-013) where we have taken steps to provide for the affordability of Lifeline telephone service, we will not pursue further study of the affordability issue in this docket." We will therefore address TURN's contribution on this matter in an intervenor compensation claim filed by TURN in R. 11-03-013.

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 (*see* Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	Yes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.14-06-008.

2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network'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 $236,685.38.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network is awarded $236,685.38.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, The California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Fiscal Office shall disburse the awarded compensation from the Commission's Intervenor Compensation Fund. 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 November 01, 2014, the 75th day after the filing of The Utility Reform Network'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

Compensation Decision:		**Modifies Decision?**	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1406008		
Proceeding(s):	R0906019		
Author:	ALJ Division		
Payer(s):	Commission's Intervenor Compensation Fund		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	08/18/14	$258,608.30	$236,685.38	No	Reductions for excessive hours claimed and non-compensable expenses; increases for higher rates awarded

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Regina	Costa	Expert	TURN	$255	2007	$255
Regina	Costa	Expert	TURN	$275	2008	$275
Regina	Costa	Expert	TURN	$275	2010	$275
Regina	Costa	Expert	TURN	$275	2011	$275
Regina	Costa	Expert	TURN	$275	2013	$290
Regina	Costa	Expert	TURN	$275	2014	$295
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	$360	2007	$360
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	$390	2008	$390
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	$390	2011	$390
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	$420	2013	$430
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	TURN	$420	2014	$440
William	Nusbaum	Attorney	TURN	$435	2008	$435
William	Nusbaum	Attorney	TURN	$435	2011	$435
William	Nusbaum	Attorney	TURN	$455	2013	$455
Trevor	Roycroft	Expert	TURN	$175	2007	$175
Trevor	Roycroft	Expert	TURN	$190	2008	$190
Trevor	Roycroft	Expert	TURN	$210	2010	$210
Trevor	Roycroft	Expert	TURN	$230	2011	$230
Trevor	Roycroft	Expert	TURN	$230	2013	$235

(END OF APPENDIX)