

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Develop a Risk-Based Decision-Making Framework to Evaluate Safety and Reliability Improvements and Revise the General Rate Case Plan for Energy Utilities.	Rulemaking 13-11-006 (November 14, 2013)
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

DECISION AWARDING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE FOR CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-12-025

Intervenor: Mussey Grade Road Alliance (MGRA)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-12-025
Claimed: \$19,954	Awarded: \$17,877.80 (~10.40% reduction)
Assigned Commissioner: Michel Peter Florio	Assigned ALJ: John Wong

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Incorporates a risk-based decision-making framework into the Rate Case plan and modifies Appendix A of D.07-07-004.
------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 (PHC):	April 29, 2014	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:	January 30, 2014	Because the Commission held a prehearing conference, the end-date specified for filing an NOI became May 29, 2014. <i>See</i> Scoping Memo at p. 10 (<i>published</i> May 15, 2014).
3. Date NOI filed:	March 3, 2014	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?	Yes, MGRA timely filed the notice of	

		intent to claim intervenor compensation.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.13-11-006	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	7/21/2014	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, MGRA demonstrated appropriate status as a customer.
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.13-11-006	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	7/21/2014	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, MGRA demonstrated significant financial hardship.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-12-025	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	12/9/2014	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	2/9/2015	Verified.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, because the sixtieth day following the issuance of the Decision fell on a Saturday, MGRA’s filing on the following Monday is timely.

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(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. For definition of issue, see Comment 1 in Section C. For reference abbreviations, see		Verified.

<p>Comment 2 in Section C.</p>		
<p>2. Importance of risk quantification and cost/benefit analysis. RT</p>	<p>OIR Comments, p. 8 – “All risks are specifically quantified and to the degree possible tied to the magnitude of potential losses. - “Scores” or “Levels” defined to designate risks or benefits should be translatable into dollar values, if not by the utility then by the Commission. - The benefits of proposed improvements to infrastructure are adequately quantified and linked as tied as far as possible to reliability and avoided risk. - Proposed projects in a GRC have some degree of cost/benefit analysis applied.”</p> <p>FD [Final Decision], p. 44 – “The Risk Mitigation Accountability Report ‘would consist of a program-by-program comparison of the utility’s GRC predictions of risk mitigation programs – quantified as much as possible using the models examined in the S-MAPs and used to prepare the RAMP assessments – with measured results of actual risk mitigation programs, including a comparison of projected and actual Risk Mitigation to Cost Ratios.’ (Refined Straw Proposal, at 9.)”</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p>3. Common risk assessment process under guidance of the Commission. SMAP</p>	<p>OIR Comment, p 3 – “Establish a minimum standard for the evaluation of wildfire risks by utilities and methods for quantitative risk assessment for wildland fire that can be factored into rate cases.”</p> <p>OIR Reply, p. 4 – “Within the regulatory context, the comparison of risk assessment methodologies currently practiced by utilities may allow the identification of best practices and processes that can be then applied more broadly with Commission sponsorship.”</p> <p>RSP Comments, p. 5 – “While each of these risks may affect one utility more than another due to geographic considerations it is the duty of the Commission to ensure that all utilities address these common risks in an appropriate way, and in a manner that the</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

	<p>Commission can evaluate and judge.”</p> <p>FD, p. 21 – “The purpose of the S-MAP is to allow the Commission and parties to examine, understand, and comment on the models that the energy utilities plan to use to prioritize risks and to mitigate risks. The other purpose of the S-MAP is to allow the Commission to establish the guidelines and standards for these models.”</p> <p>FD, p. 23 – “The Refined Straw Proposal states that the “Uniformity of models would have the obvious benefit of reducing burdens on Commission staff and parties to learn multiple models and would also increase the comparability of risk priority and mitigation analyses among the utilities.” (Refined Straw Proposal at 4.)”</p>	
<p>4. S-MAP as a repeating process, common to all utilities and not per GRC</p> <p>SMAP</p>	<p>Redline Straw Proposal, p. 1 – “The purpose of the Guidelines would be 1) to help guarantee that all California utility customers are provided a standard level of risk protection, 2) To ensure that emerging risks and new information about currently managed risks are incorporated into all relevant GRC proceedings, and 3) to help reduce duplication between GRCs and thereby simplify the GRC process and reduce costs.”</p> <p>RSP Reply, pp. 2-6 Section: “A Periodic S-MAP is Key to Maximizing Safety and Minimizing Costs”</p> <p>RSP Reply, p. 5 – “To the extent that the work done by each utility is duplicative, there is a potential for cost savings if that duplication can be eliminated. Furthermore, there is the potential to improve safety by selecting best practices.”</p>	<p>Verified, but we note MGRA put forth arguments that were duplicative of TURN, UCAN, and CBE on this issue. This demonstrates that the parties failed to adequately coordinate on this issue, which resulted in a duplicative effort.¹</p>

¹ See Pub. Util. Code § 1801.3(f) (stating that intervenor compensation program articles “shall be administered in a manner that avoids unproductive or unnecessary participation that duplicates the participation of similar interests otherwise adequately represented or participation that is not necessary for a fair determination of the proceeding.”); See also D.15-05-016.

	<p>FD, p. 24 – “If the utility’s model that is used in the RAMP phase differs from the model that the utility presented in the last S-MAP, the utility would be required to explain the differences between the models in the RAMP phase.”</p> <p>FD, pp. 9-10 – “Beginning either as part of this proceeding or as an immediate spin-off from this proceeding (i.e., separate from GRCs), the Commission should initiate a periodic (perhaps triennial), generic (i.e., all energy utility) [footnote omitted] Safety Model Assessment Proceeding (S-MAP), the twin purposes of which would be to: (1) allow parties to understand the models the utilities propose to use to prioritize the programs/projects intended to mitigate risks and (2) allow the Commission to establish standards and requirements for those models.”</p> <p>FD, p. 27 – “On the topic of whether there should be future S-MAP proceedings, we conclude that such proceedings should be held at least two times, at an interval of three years. A recurring proceeding is needed initially to analyze and understand each energy utility’s approach to assessing, managing, and mitigating their risks, to refine such models as we work through a utility’s GRC cycle, and to develop and refine uniform and common standards. In the second S-MAP proceeding, the Commission can decide whether the S-MAP proceedings should continue in the future or be terminated.”</p>	
<p>5. Risks not limited to a “top-ten” list but rather all relevant risks should be analyzed.</p> <p>RT</p>	<p>RSP Comments, p. 3 – “The Straw Proposal suggests that utilities start with a “top ten” list of risks that they will address in each GRC. This is an incorrect approach for two reasons.”</p> <p>RSP Reply, p. 5 – “using ‘ten’ risks as the safety baseline is arbitrary”</p> <p>FD, pp, 39-40 – “Limiting the utility’s RAMP submission to just 10 asset categories may prevent the Commission</p>	<p>Verified, but we note MGRA put forth arguments that were duplicative of UCAN and CBE on this issue. This demonstrates that the parties failed to adequately coordinate on this issue, which</p>

	and interested parties from having a comprehensive view of the utilities potential safety risks, and its plans for addressing those risks.”	resulted in a duplicative effort.
6. Reliability should not be included in the scope of the proceeding. RT	<p>Workshop – Ms. Conklin made several interventions in the workshop arguing for the pre-eminence of safety rather than reliability as the fundamental goal of this proceeding.</p> <p>RSP Reply, p. 9 – “We urge the Commission to emphasize safety as it formulates the S-MAP and RAMP processes. To the extent that reliability affects public safety and has financial impacts on the public, risks to reliability may be included in analyses and rankings. However, safety should be the primary consideration.”</p> <p>FD, p. 19 – “We do not believe that we need to expand the methods and methodologies being developed in this proceeding to include an assessment of making reliability a top priority.”</p>	Verified.
7. Wildfire risk inclusion in the proceeding RM	<p>OIR Comments, p. 2 – “The Alliance therefore welcomes OIR 13-11-006, which will hopefully provide a productive forum for producing and optimizing methods for quantifying power line wildfire risks and costs.”</p> <p>The Final Decision defers all specific risk issues to the S-MAP proceeding.</p> <p>All major electric utilities have included wildfire as one of their top safety risks.</p>	Verified.
8. Inclusion of data from R.08-11-005 in risk assessments. RM	<p>OIR Comments, p.3 – “Integration of GRC efforts with future outputs from R.08-11-005 fire data collection and fire hazard mapping efforts.”</p> <p>No determination by the Commission.</p>	Verified.

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?²	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: TURN (The Utility Reform Network), UCAN (Utility Consumers' Action Network), CBE (Communities for a Better Environment), UWUA (Utility Workers Union of America), CCUE (Coalition of California Utility Employees).		Verified.
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: The Alliance proposed, organized and hosted three multi-party conference calls, on 4/1/2014, 4/25/2014, and 6/5/2014, with attendees including TURN, UCAN, ORA, UWUA, and CCUE. The primary purpose of these calls was to discuss party positions and as far as practical to align them. Speaking for our own organization these discussions helped to reduce the number of areas we felt the need to comment on and unified slightly discordant positions. To our knowledge these were the primary multi-party meetings occurring outside the framework of the workshops. In this way MGRA helped to reduce duplication not only for its own submissions but also more broadly for the proceeding as a whole. The Alliance's set of positions on issues varied from that of other intervenors, and no other party held exactly the same set of positions as MGRA. Additionally, MGRA made unique arguments regarding positions that other parties shared. For example, the emphasis on safety being the focus of GRC risk analysis rather than reliability is a position stated early in the proceeding by the Alliance, a position that was upheld in the Final Decision. Finally, the Alliance's primary and unique position has been to ensure that residents of our rural fire-prone area and other such areas in California are adequately protected from utility-caused wildfires. This was a theme we continued to raise in both filings and discussions with other parties. While the Final Decision made no specific determination regarding wildfire or any other specific utility risk, deferring this instead to upcoming S-MAP proceedings, we still consider our efforts fruitful in this regard for two reasons. First, all major electric utilities highlighted wildfire as one their primary risks, if not their top risk. Secondly, the final S-MAP/RAMP framework is sufficiently broad and flexible that it should allow evaluation of not only wildfire risk but also other low-probability/high-impact risks that may be identified.		Verified, but further coordination would have reduced duplication. <i>See</i> Part II.A, above (noting issues where duplicative views were presented). The Commission has removed 15% of the intervenor's claimed hours for each issue where duplication occurred.

² 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.

C. Additional Comments on Part II (use line reference # or letter as appropriate):

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
1	<p>There were three general issues that MGRA intervened in during the course of this proceeding. Abbreviations and definitions of these are:</p> <p>SMAP - Whether there should be a risk determination process outside of the GRC process; whether such a process should be recurrent; whether a common methodology for risk should be developed.</p> <p>RM – Risk Models - Specific risks that should be addressed, including wildfire, newly identified risks, low-probability high impact risks, and the incorporation of fire and outage data from other proceedings.</p> <p>RT – Risk Topics - Reliability versus risk, asset risks versus other risks, risk quantification and cost/benefit analysis, “top-ten” list of risks, and risk lexicon.</p>	Verified.
2	<p>References and abbreviations:</p> <p>OIR Comments: MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON INCORPORATING RISK-BASED DECISION MAKING INTO GENERAL RATE CASES January 14, 2014</p> <p>OIR Reply: MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE REPLY REGARDING RISK-BASED DECISION MAKING January 30, 2014</p> <p>Redline Straw Proposal (email to M.Zafar)</p> <p>RSP Comments: MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON STRAW PROPOSAL FOR RISK-BASED DECISION MAKING IN GRCS May 23, 2014</p> <p>RSP Reply: MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE REPLY COMMENTS ON STRAW PROPOSAL FOR RISK-BASED DECISION MAKING IN GRCS June 13, 2014</p> <p>PD Comments: MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE COMMENTS ON PROPOSED DECISION FOR RISK-BASED DECISION MAKING IN GRCS November 24, 2014</p> <p>PD Reply: MUSSEY GRADE ROAD ALLIANCE REPLY TO PARTY COMMENTS ON PROPOSED DECISION FOR RISK-BASED DECISION MAKING IN GRCS December 1, 2014</p>	Verified.

	FD: Final Decision D.14-12-025	
3	<p>PD, p. 15 – “Most often, instead of separately identifying the party from where each comment came from, we generically address the issues raised by the various parties’ recommendations in the sub-sections below...”</p> <p>MGRA has therefore traced the development of its arguments through the proceeding and related these to the FD in Section IIA.</p>	Verified.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>The primary interest that the Alliance has in this proceeding and the others we have participated in is the safety of the residents of our area and similar areas in California, specifically the reduction of wildfire risks from utilities. As we’ve claimed in other proceedings, while it is difficult to quantify such benefits the best way to do it is to compare it to past losses.</p> <p>In addition to loss of life, the 2007 utility wildfires ended up costing over \$2 billion in losses. Reducing the probability of such events is a key outcome of this safety program. For example, if such an event were to occur every 40 years, and the additional measures put in place as a result of this proceeding were to reduce wildfire risk by 20%, that would represent a savings of \$10 million per year. Even if the contribution of the Alliance represented only 5% of this avoided cost, that would still be equivalent to \$500,000/year in avoided losses to California residents, which is far larger than the compensation requested.</p> <p>Another potential area of cost savings for ratepayers is the unification of some utility risk management processes, a point that the Alliance made throughout the proceeding and acknowledged in the Final Decision. In its recent GRC application, SDG&E announced its plans to build up a risk management team that may consist ultimately of approximately ten professionals. SCE and PG&E are also actively managing risks and have devoted staff time to this effort. Assuming that there were, say 50 professionals with some connection to utility risk management working in California’s utilities, and taking for an example a \$150 thousand per year per person cost to the companies, ratepayers would be paying \$7.5 million per year for risk management activities. If common practices could be identified, this number could be significantly reduced through the elimination of replication. Even if this resulted in an improvement of only 10%, this would still represent a cost savings of \$750 thousand per year, again much larger than the cost of Alliance compensation.</p> <p>Dr. Mitchell requests a COLA adjustment of 2% as per ALJ-287 from his base rate last established as \$275/hr in D.13-10-008 and 2.58% as per ALJ-303. This would raise the rate to \$287.73, which we round up to \$290/hr.</p> <p>Ms. Conklin requests an increase in compensation rate for 2014 from the current \$110/hr to \$125/hr. The bases for this request are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ms. Conklin requested a 2.2% increase for 2012 which was rejected in D.13-10-008 on the grounds that the requested increase would be less than the purported minimum increment of \$5/hr. This request is now resubmitted 	<p>CPUC Discussion</p> <hr/> <p>Verified.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------

<p>in conjunction with other incremental increases which will exceed the purported \$5/hr threshold for COLA adjustments.</p> <p>2) The COLA for 2013 allowed by ALJ-287 is 2%.</p> <p>3) The COLA for 2014 allowed by ALJ-303 is 2.58%.</p> <p>4) Ms. Conklin is eligible for a step-increase of 5% in her compensation rate.</p> <p>Combined, these adjustments allow for an increase of 12.3%. This would correspond to an hourly rate of \$123.50, which we round up to \$125/hr.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>As stated in II B (d), the Alliance organized and hosted multi-party conference calls to reduce replication and unify positions. This allowed us to focus our contributions on specific areas where we believed we would be able to make unique contributions. Furthermore, Dr. Mitchell attended these calls and intervened in substantive issues, but requests no compensation for his attendance.</p> <p>Due to coordination between parties and due to the deferral of specific risk issues to a later S-MAP phase, our compensation request is less than ¼ of the original estimate in our NOI.</p> <p>Ms. Conklin alone, and not our expert Dr. Mitchell, attended the workshops, resulting in significant cost savings.</p> <p>Dr. Mitchell donated 11.2 hours of unpaid time. Additionally he did not charge for 3 hours of preparation time for the Notice of Intent preparation. Ms. Conklin did not charge for 2 hours to review and revise this compensation claim.</p>	<p>Verified. <i>But see</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p>

c. Allocation of hours by issue:		Verified.
D. Conklin hours		
SMAP	13.6	
RM	7.7	
RT	5.5	
TOTAL	26.8	
SMAP Travel	9.6	
RM Travel	3.2	
RT Travel	3.2	
TOTAL	16.0	
J. Mitchell hours		
SMAP	28.2	
RM	4.4	
RT	6.6	
TOTAL	39.2	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
D. Conklin (Advocate)	2014	26.8	125	D.13-10-008; ALJ-287 ALJ-303	3,350	23.93	\$125.00 [1]	2,991.25
J. Mitchell (Expert)	2014	39.2	290	D.13-10-008; ALJ-287 ALJ-303	11,368	33.98	\$285.00 [2]	9,684.30
Subtotal: \$14,718						Subtotal: \$12,675.55		
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 \$
D. Conklin	2014	16	62.50	D.13-10-008; ALJ-287 ALJ-303	1,000	16	\$62.50	1,000.00
Subtotal: \$1,000						Subtotal: \$1,000.00		

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
D. Conklin	2014	2.2	62.50	D.13-10-008; ALJ-287 ALJ-303	138	2.2	\$62.50	137.50
J. Mitchell	2014	13.1	145	D.13-10-008; ALJ-287 ALJ-303	1,900	13.1	\$142.50	1,866.75
Subtotal: \$2,038						Subtotal: \$2,004.25		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1	Expenses	See itemized expenses, attachment #4 and supporting receipts, attachment #5			2,198	2,198.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 19,954						TOTAL AWARD: \$17,877.80		
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								

C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[1]	<p>The Commission approves Conklin’s 2014 rate of \$125, which includes a requested 5% step increase.</p> <p>For the duplication discussed above, the Commission removed 15% of Conklin’s 2014 hours for SMAP and RT issues, which resulted in a disallowance of 2.87 hours.</p>
[2]	<p>The Commission incorrectly set a rate of \$280 dollars for Mitchell in 2014. The Commission corrects its error in this Decision.</p> <p>In 2012, Mitchell’s rate was \$275. When the cost-of-living adjustment for 2013 of 2% is applied to the 2012 rate, and the result rounded to the nearest five dollar increment, a rate of \$280 is the result. When the 2014 cost-of-living adjustment (2.58%) is applied to this rate, and rounded to the nearest five dollar increment, a rate of \$285 is the result. As such, the Commission sets Mitchell’s 2014 rate at \$285.</p>

	For the duplication discussed above, the Commission removed 15% of Mitchell’s 2014 hours for SMAP and RT issues, which resulted in a disallowance of 5.22 hours.
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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(c)(6))?	Yes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Mussey Grade Road Alliance has made a substantial contribution to D.14-12-025.
2. The requested hourly rates for Mussey Grade Road Alliance’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 \$17,877.80.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Mussey Grade Road Alliance shall be awarded \$17,877.80.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision PacifiCorp, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities LLC, Southern California Edison Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Southwest Gas Company shall pay Mussey Grade Road Alliance their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional gas and 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 April 25, 2015, the 75th day after the filing of Mussey Grade Road Alliance’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX A
Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1412025		
Proceeding(s):	R1311006		
Author:	ALJ Wong		
Payer(s):	PacifiCorp, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC, Southern California Edison Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Southwest Gas Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Mussey Grade Road Alliance (MGRA)	02/09/2015	\$19,954.00	\$17,877.80	No.	See Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Diane	Conklin	Advocate	MGRA	\$125.00	2014	\$125.00
Joseph	Mitchell	Expert	MGRA	\$290.00	2014	\$285.00