

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  
(Filed November 14, 2013)

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-12-025**

<b>Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-12-025</b>
<b>Claimed: \$128,419.43</b>	<b>Awarded: \$125,053.28 (reduced 2.6%)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michel Peter Florio</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: John S. Wong</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	Decision (D.) 14-12-025 adopted changes to incorporate a risk-based decision-making framework into the Rate Case Plan for energy utilities' General Rate Cases (GRCs). The framework and parameters adopted in the decision are intended to assist the utilities, interested parties, and the Commission in evaluating the various proposals that the energy utilities use for assessing their safety risks, and to manage, mitigate and minimize such risks. To this end, the decision adopted two new GRC-related procedures – the Safety Model Assessment Proceeding (S-MAP) and the Risk Assessment Mitigation Phase (RAMP).
--	--

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

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	4/29/14	Verified.

2. Other specified date for NOI:	Within 30 days of reply cmmts	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:	2/26/14	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, TURN timely filed the notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation.
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.12-11-009 (PG&E 2014 GRC)	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	9/6/13	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, TURN demonstrated appropriate status as a customer.
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.12-11-009 (PG&E 2014 GRC)	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	9/6/13	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, TURN demonstrated significant financial hardship.

<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-12-025	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	12/9/14	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	2/5/15	02/04/2015
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, TURN timely filed the request for intervenor compensation.

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**

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

<b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p><b>1. The Refined Straw Proposal Embraced In D.14-12-025:</b> TURN’s substantial contribution is best captured by comparing the revised “straw proposal” TURN submitted (in conjunction with ORA) in response to the request from Policy &amp; Planning Division (PPD), and the “Refined Straw Proposal” issued shortly thereafter. The two documents are largely identical, and the Commission relied very heavily on the Refined Straw Proposal for the outcomes adopted in D.14-12-025.</p> <p>The PPD request for proposed revisions to the original staff-developed straw proposal came in an e-mail of March 21, 2014, just after the conclusion of the three days of workshops devoted to the original straw proposal and related issues. The e-mail requested parties to submit either a red-lined version of the original straw proposal or come up with a new one that would get the Commission to the “goal of developing fundamental regulatory processes for</p>	<p>E-mail of March 21, 2014, from PPD to the parties of R.13-11-006.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>TURN and ORA Recommendations for a</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<sup>1</sup> TURN has attached to this request for compensation the March 21, 2014 e-mail, since to our knowledge it is not part of the formal record in this proceeding.

<p>defining, acquiring, and disseminating risk-based information that supports rate-setting and project prioritizing decisions.” TURN worked with ORA to submit a joint recommendation for a revised straw proposal. This revised joint recommendation became the basis for very large portions of the Refined Straw Proposal issued by ALJ Ruling of April 17, 2014.</p> <p>As TURN discusses further below, many of the issue-specific outcomes adopted in D.14-12-025 reflect TURN’s position on the issue, usually as set forth in the revised straw proposal but also as presented in the comments filed thereafter. But the Commission could easily and appropriately determine that TURN made a very substantial contribution to the proceeding and to the ultimate decision if it simply compared the TURN/ORR revised straw proposal with the Refined Straw Proposal, and then considered how often the Commission favorably cited and relied upon the Refined Straw Proposal in D.14-12-025.</p>	<p>Revised Staff Straw Proposal (April 7, 2014).<sup>2</sup></p> <p>ALJ Ruling of April 17, 2014, Appendix A.</p> <p>D.14-12-025, Findings of Fact: 10, 11, 13, 24, 25 and 27; Conclusions of Law 5, 10, 11 and 15.</p>	
<p><b>2. The S-MAP Proceeding :</b> TURN’s revised Straw Proposal called for a periodic generic 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 and mitigate risks and (2) allow the Commission to establish standards and requirements for those models. Each successive S-MAP would have the ability to respond to changing</p>	<p>TURN and ORR Recommendations for a Revised Staff Straw-Proposal (April 7, 2014), pp. 3-4.</p>	<p>Verified, but we note TURN put forth arguments that were duplicative of MGRA, CBE, and UCAN on this issue. This demonstrates that the parties failed to adequately coordinate on this issue, which resulted</p>

<sup>2</sup> TURN has attached to this request for compensation the April 7, 2014 TURN and ORR Recommendations, since to our knowledge it is not part of the formal record in this proceeding.

<p>circumstances and could build on its predecessor S-MAPs and tackle increasingly sophisticated and challenging issues.</p> <p>The Commission adopted use of the S-MAP as set forth in the Refined Straw Proposal, which itself relied almost entirely on the S-MAP as described in the TURN/ORA revised Straw Proposal.</p>	<p>D.14-12-035, pp. 29-30; Conclusion of Law 5.</p>	<p>in a duplicative effort.<sup>3</sup></p>
<p><b>3. The RAMP Phase Of Future GRCs:</b></p> <p>TURN’s revised Straw Proposal called for a Risk Assessment and Mitigation Phase (RAMP) as an initial phase of a GRC in which the utility presents its assessment of its key risks and its proposed programs for mitigating those risks. This assessment would be based on the model that was vetted in the S-MAP and that complies with all CPUC requirements for the model determined in the most recent S-MAP. As proposed, there would be no Commission decision in this phase.</p> <p>The Commission adopted use of the RAMP largely as set forth in the Refined Straw Proposal, which itself relied almost entirely on the RAMP as described in the TURN/ORA revised Straw Proposal.</p> <p>The Proposed Decision (PD) would have required a separate RAMP application leading to a separate final decision, rather than having it within the GRC application. TURN’s comments on the PD called for incorporating the new process in the GRC framework, and not requiring a RAMP-specific decision. The final decision modified the PD in these regards.</p> <p>The Refined Straw Proposal would have</p>	<p>TURN and ORA Recommendations for a Revised Staff Straw Proposal (April 7, 2014), pp. 4-5.</p> <p>D.14-12-035, pp. 37-41; Conclusion of Law 6 and 10.</p> <p>TURN Comments on Proposed Decision (November 24, 2014), pp. 2-5.</p> <p>D.14-12-025, pp. 37, 39.</p> <p>TURN Opening Comments on the Refined Staff Proposal (May 23, 2014), pp. 6-8; TURN</p>	<p>Verified, but we note TURN put forth arguments that were duplicative of MGRA and CBE on this issue. This demonstrates that the parties failed to adequately coordinate on this issue, which resulted in a duplicative effort.</p>

<sup>3</sup> 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 Decision (D.) 15-05-016.

<p>had the RAMP effort focus on risk assessment and mitigation for the top ten assets or family of assets, rather than the full range of risk assessment and mitigation plans. TURN called for a more comprehensive approach. The Commission adopted the more comprehensive approach rather than focusing only on the “top ten.”</p>	<p>Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision (December 1, 2014), p. 2.</p> <p>D.14-12-025, pp. 39-40</p>	
<p><b>4. Timing and Procedure for Incorporating RAMP Into GRCs:</b></p> <p>TURN’s revised Straw Proposal included an illustrative schedule to show how a RAMP could be incorporated into a GRC. The GRC Application Filing schedule set out in Table 4 of the decision is largely consistent with a number of key elements of the illustrative schedule TURN had put forward. In some areas, the Refined Straw Proposal or Proposed Decision had included different dates and periods, such as the GRC application date (November 1 in the PD, September 1 in the decision), and the expected length of evidentiary hearings (2.5 weeks in the Revised Straw Proposal, 4 weeks in the decision). Perhaps most importantly, the Proposed Decision appeared to have intervenors serving testimony concurrently with ORA, contrary to longstanding practice and TURN’s recommendations. In all three cases, the final decision adopted outcomes consistent with TURN’s recommendations.</p>	<p>TURN and ORA<sup>4</sup> Recommendations for a Revised Staff Straw-Proposal (April 7, 2014), p. 6.</p> <p>D.14-12-025, Table 4, p. 42.</p> <p>Proposed Decision, Table 4, p. 39; TURN Opening Comments on PD, pp. 8-9, and 9-11.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p><b>5. Verification – New Accountability Tools:</b> TURN’s revised Straw Proposal included two new verification documents that each utility would submit annually. In the Risk Mitigation Accountability Report, each utility would compare its GRC projections of the benefits and costs of the risk mitigation programs adopted in the</p>	<p>TURN and ORA Recommendations for a Revised Staff Straw-Proposal (April 7, 2014), pp. 7-8.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<sup>4</sup> The scheduling issues were the one area where the recommendations were sponsored by TURN, rather than jointly with ORA.

<p>GRC with the actual benefits and costs, and explains any discrepancies. In the Risk Spending Accountability Report, the utility would compare its GRC projected spending for approved risk mitigation projects with the actual spending on those projects, and explains any discrepancies. The Commission adopted these recommendations, over the objections of the utilities (particularly with regard to the Risk Mitigation Accountability Report).</p>	<p>TURN Reply Comments on the Refined Straw Proposal, pp. 8-9.</p> <p>D.14-12-025, pp. 43-44; Finding of Fact 27, Conclusion of Law 15.</p>	
<p><b>6. Workshops:</b> The Commission conducted workshops over a three-day period to explore the ideas raised in the original staff Straw Proposal in order to refine or create new solutions to integrate a risk-based approach for utility funding requests in the GRCs. The workshop was conducted via seven panels, each of which addressed separate topics related to the original Straw Proposal’s framework. TURN was one of the co-presenters for four of the seven panels. The discussion at the workshop was one of the inputs that led to the Refined Straw Proposal.</p> <p>TURN understands that mere attendance of a workshop may not be a sufficient basis to demonstrate a substantial contribution to a Commission proceeding or the resulting decision. However, here TURN was a very active presenter for the majority of the panels that took place over a three-day period, and the discussions at the workshops strongly influenced the Refined Straw Proposal that became the basis for further consideration and, ultimately, Commission adoption. Under the circumstances, the Commission should find that TURN’s participation in the workshops constitutes an additional element of TURN’s substantial contribution.</p>	<p>Workshop Agenda, Panels 3 (How to Define Risk), 5 (Creation of a Verification Form), 6 (RAMP as Separate Proceeding or Part of GRC) and 7 (Modification of GRC Cycle).</p> <p>ALJ’s Ruling Regarding Refined Straw Proposal (4/17/14), p. 2</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

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

	<b>Intervenor’s Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<b>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?</b>	Yes	Verified.
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	Yes	Verified.
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> Virtually every active party in the proceeding had a position that was similar to a TURN position on at least some of the proposals under consideration in this phase of the proceeding. As TURN’s time records reveal, TURN consulted and coordinated with parties as diverse as the unions, UCAN, SDCAN, Mussey Grade Road Alliance, Southern California Generation Coalition, and Energy Producers and Users Coalition.		Verified.
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b> This was an unusual proceeding, in that the consumer advocates that typically share much in common at times took very different approaches to the policy and procedural issues under discussion here, and at times TURN found its position closely aligned with that of parties with whom we typically disagree. Furthermore, in a proceeding seeking to address such key policy issues as improving the integration of safety and risk issues into the GRC process, parties are likely to feel more strongly about getting their policy positions presented without compromise, thus making it more challenging to develop or present a common position on issues where there is not already near agreement. Therefore, TURN submits the Commission should find that it is more difficult than usual to achieve non-duplication in proceedings such as this rulemaking and, therefore, apply a more relaxed standard for intervenor compensation purposes.  That said, the Commission should also conclude that TURN was very successful in achieving non-duplication where it could, with the best example being the revised version of the Straw Proposal that TURN and ORA developed and presented together. As TURN’s time records reveal, the development of the proposed revisions were labor intensive and involved a good deal of back and forth with ORA. With the Commission’s embrace in D.14-12-025 of nearly all aspects of the Refined Straw Proposal, the joint effort achieved very positive results.  In sum, the Commission should find that under the circumstances, it is more difficult than usual to avoid duplication with other parties, and that TURN was successful in structuring its participation in a manner that avoided such duplication to a relatively high degree despite those circumstances. The award of intervenor compensation should not be reduced due to duplication concerns.		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.

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p>TURN’s request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$128,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in the proceeding to date.<sup>5</sup> In light of the quality of TURN’s work, the importance of the issues addressed in this phase of the proceeding, and the magnitude of TURN’s substantial contribution to the proceeding and the resulting decision, the Commission should have little trouble concluding that the amount requested is reasonable.</p> <p>TURN’s advocacy reflected in D.14-12-025 addressed policy and process matters rather than specific rates or disputes over particular dollar amounts. As a result, TURN cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from our work related to D.14-12-025, given the nature of the issues presented. While it is difficult to place a dollar value on such issues, TURN submits that our participation should result in substantial benefits in the form of a more consistent and more transparent presentation and analysis of safety- and risk-related issues in GRCs going forward. And given the Commission’s very substantial reliance in the final decision on the Straw Proposal revisions TURN developed and proposed (in conjunction with ORA), there should be no dispute that the benefits of TURN’s participation far exceed the cost of that participation.</p> <p>In sum, the Commission should conclude that TURN’s overall request is reasonable given the issues at stake in the rulemaking and the adopted outcomes.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>This rulemaking was intended to encourage all interested parties and, ultimately, the Commission to reassess and reconsider very fundamental issues regarding the structure and approach to general rate cases in order to better emphasize the focus and analysis of safety and risk reduction in that context. In order to develop constructive positions for such an undertaking, TURN relied on the collective experience of its energy staff, particularly attorneys with extensive experience in GRCs and the regulatory process more generally. This request for compensation includes hours for the three</p>	<p>Verified. But <i>see</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p>

<sup>5</sup> TURN has removed from this request hours that are appropriately assigned to the second phase covering issues related to more efficient and effective management of the overall rate case process. TURN’s expectation is that those hours will likely be included in a request for compensation associated with a Commission decision on the second phase issues, should TURN file such a request.

TURN attorneys who performed the majority of the work, but excludes the efforts of other TURN attorneys and staff members who contributed to the process of developing TURN's positions for purposes of this rulemaking.

TURN seeks compensation for a total of approximately 260 hours devoted to this phase of the proceeding, the vast majority of which are TURN attorney hours. This is the equivalent of 6-7 weeks of full-time work.

Given the range and magnitude of TURN's substantial contribution to the proceeding, the Commission should find the number of hours reasonable in total. If the Commission looks to the time devoted to particular tasks, such as preparing and participating in workshops or reviewing the comments of a multitude of other parties in order to prepare reply comments and such, it should reach the same conclusion on a task-specific basis. The work was performed very efficiently, and the number of hours for each TURN representative was reasonable under the circumstances present here.

TURN Attorneys and Consultants:

Thomas Long, Hayley Goodson, and Robert Finkelstein served as TURN's lead representatives throughout this rulemaking. TURN's attorneys were always attentive to avoiding overlap or duplication where possible, and strove to achieve clear assignments of responsibility, both by task and by issue area. For example, Ms. Goodson took the lead in preparing TURN's opening and reply comments in response to the questions raised in the OIR (1/15/14 and 1/30/14), with substantial input from both Mr. Long and Mr. Finkelstein on the range of issues identified in the OIR. Mr. Long and Mr. Finkelstein each served as TURN's representative on various panels from the workshops conducted in March 2014. Mr. Long played the instrumental role in developing (with ORA) the revised version of the Straw Proposal that the Commission embraced nearly in whole, again with substantial and important input from his colleagues, and was primarily responsible for handling the preparation of opening and reply comments when the Refined Straw Proposal was issued (5/14 and 6/14). Mr. Long also took the lead in reviewing the Proposed Decision, coordinating and preparing TURN's opening and reply comments thereon, again with input from Ms. Goodson on certain issues.

TURN also relied on a relatively limited amount of input from members of JBS Energy, the consulting firm that has worked with TURN in nearly every energy-related GRC over the past quarter century. William Marcus of JBS Energy, Inc., provided key input at specific times based on his extensive experience serving as TURN's expert witness in numerous past GRCs. John Sugar of the firm assisted with the initial review of the OIR when issued and related materials, and helped accelerate TURN's work at the initial stages of the proceeding.

TURN submits that the Commission should find reasonable the number of hours for Mr. Long, Ms. Goodson, Mr. Finkelstein, Mr. Marcus and Mr. Sugar that are included in the request.

Meetings or discussions involving more than one TURN attorney or expert witness: Due to the nature of this rulemaking, TURN's compensation request includes a greater-than-usual amount of hours and hourly entries that reflect internal meetings involving two or more of TURN's attorneys. In past compensation decisions, the Commission has deemed such entries as reflecting internal duplication that is not eligible for an award of intervenor compensation. This is not the case here. In order to constructively participate in this rulemaking, parties needed to develop a position on how to better incorporate safety- and risk-related elements into the GRC process. In order to develop such a position, parties needed to engage in internal discussions to that end. The meetings and discussions among TURN's attorneys (and expert witnesses) were essential to the effective development and implementation of TURN's position and strategy for this rulemaking. As a result, TURN was able to identify issues and angles that would almost certainly never have come to mind but for the "group-think" achievable in such settings. Furthermore, where, as here, the proceeding arrives during a period when TURN's staff resources were already fully engaged in other Commission matters, some amount of internal communication is essential to achieve full coverage of the material issues with the limited resources available. Again, such meetings or discussions are not in any way a sign of undue duplication, but rather an essential element of TURN's work in the proceeding.

Compensation Request Preparation Time: TURN is requesting compensation for 9.0 hours devoted to compensation-related matters, primarily preparation of this request for compensation (8.0 hours). This is a very small number of hours for preparing a compensation request, particularly for a proceeding with time records that extend over nearly four years. The Commission should find it a reasonable figure.

Mr. Finkelstein prepared this request for compensation because his knowledge of all aspects of this proceeding, combined with his experience with the Commission's intervenor compensation program, enable him to prepare the request in a more efficient manner than if it were prepared by one of the other attorneys. In addition, the request for compensation is due during a period when the workload for TURN's attorneys who specialize on energy-related matters is particularly high, rendering Mr. Long and Ms. Goodson unavailable for the task.

In sum, the Commission should find that the number of hours claimed is fully reasonable in light of the complexity of the issues and TURN's relative success on the merits.

<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>TURN has allocated all of our attorney and consultant time by issue area or activity, as evident on our attached timesheets. The following codes relate to general activities that are part of nearly all CPUC proceedings, such as tasks associated with general participation, procedural matters, and coordination with other parties, as well as the specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN in this proceeding.</p>		<p>Verified.</p>
<b>Code</b>	<b>Stands for:</b>	
GP	General Participation -- work that would not vary with the number of issues that TURN addresses, for the most part. This code appears most regularly during early stages of broad reviews, such as the initial review of the application and testimony, rebuttal testimony, and opening briefs, and other tasks that are of a more general nature, such as preparing for and participating in prehearing conferences.	
Coord	Coordination with other parties, largely ORA but also other intervenors active in the proceeding.	
Rd1Cmmts	For the first round of comments (responding to the questions posed in the OIR), work that was of a more general nature or overlapped between the areas of safety/risk and specific Rate Case Plan (RCP) modifications.	
Rd1Safety	For the first round of comments (responding to the questions posed in the OIR), work that was related to the development and incorporation of safety/risk analysis into the RCP process.	
Rd1RCP	For the first round of comments (responding to the questions posed in the OIR), work that was related to specific modifications to the RCP that were less directly related to development and incorporation of safety/risk analysis.	
StrawProp	Review and analysis of the original staff-developed Straw Proposal.	
WS	Preparation for and participation in the three-days of workshops conducted on the staff-developed Straw Proposal and related issues.	
RevSP	Development of proposed revised Straw Proposal that was subsequently largely embraced and issued as the staff's Refined Straw Proposal.	
Rd2Cmmts	For the second round of comments (responding to the Refined Straw Proposal issued by ALJ Ruling), work that was of a more general nature or overlapped between the areas of safety/risk and specific Rate Case Plan (RCP) modifications.	

Rd2Safety	For the second round of comments (responding to the Refined Straw Proposal issued by ALJ Ruling), work that was related to the development and incorporation of safety/risk analysis into the RCP process.
Rd2RCP	For the second round of comments (responding to the Refined Straw Proposal issued by ALJ Ruling), work that was related to specific modifications to the RCP that were less directly related to development and incorporation of safety/risk analysis.
PD	Proposed Decision -- work on reviewing, analyzing, commenting on, lobbying on, strategizing on the Proposed Decision and revisions thereto.
Comp	Time devoted to compensation-related pleadings
<p>TURN submits that under the circumstances, this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission’s rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.</p>	

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours [1]	Rate \$	Total \$
Thomas Long	2013	0.5	\$555	D.14-05-015	\$277.50	0.5	\$555.00	\$277.50
T. Long	2014	125.75	\$570	Res. ALJ-303 (See Cmmt 1)	\$71,677.50	120.537	\$570.00 <i>See Res. ALJ-303</i>	\$68,706.09
Hayley Goodson	2013	2.75	\$345	D.14-04-021	\$948.75	2.75	\$345 <sup>6</sup>	\$948.75
H. Goodson	2014	70.5	\$355	Res. ALJ-303 (See Cmmt 1)	\$25,027.50	69.787	\$355 <sup>7</sup>	\$24,774.38
Robert Finkelstein	2013	2.5	\$490	D.14-05-015	\$1,225.00	2.5	\$490.00	\$1,225.00
R. Finkelstein	2014	46.5	\$500	Res. ALJ-303 (See Cmmt 1)	\$23,250.00	45.675	\$505.00	\$23,065.88

<sup>6</sup> Adopted in Decision (D.) 15-05-019.

<sup>7</sup> Application of 2.58% COLA per Resolution ALJ-303.

William Marcus	2013	5.75	\$265	D.14-05-015	\$1,523.75	1.25	\$265.00	\$331.25
William Marcus	2014					4.50	\$270.00	\$1,215.00
John Sugar	2013	10.57	\$210	D.14-05-015	\$2,219.70	10.57	\$210.00	\$2,219.70
<b>Subtotal: \$126,149.70</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$122,763.55</b>		
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
H. Goodson	2014	1.0	\$195	½ of requested 2014 rate	\$177.50	1.0	\$177.50	\$177.50
R. Finkelstein	2015	8.0	\$250	½ of requested 2014 rate (See Comment 2)	\$2,000.00	8.0	\$252.50 <i>See Res. ALJ-308</i>	\$2,020.00
<b>Subtotal: \$2,177.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$2,197.50</b>		
<b>COSTS</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Detail</b>			<b>Amount</b>	<b>Amount</b>		
	Photocopying	Copies made of TURN pleadings for service			\$25.10	\$25.10		
	Postage	Expenses for postage for this proceeding			\$14.76	\$14.76		
	Lexis/Nexis	Computerized research costs associated with preparation of TURN's strategy and pleadings for this proceeding			\$46.56	\$46.56		
	Telephone	Long-distance calls associated with work on this proceeding			\$5.81	\$5.81		
<b>Subtotal: \$ 92.23</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$92.23</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 128,419.43</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$125,053.28</b>		
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.</p>								

<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation</b>
Thomas Long	December 1986	124776	No
Hayley Goodson	December 2003	228535	No
Robert Finkelstein	June 1990	146391	No

**C. Intervenor’s Comments on Part III:**

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comments</b>
Comment 1	For 2014 hourly rates, TURN is using the recently authorized cost-of-living adjustment of 2.56% adopted in Resolution ALJ-303 applied to the previously authorized rate for each attorney’s work in 2013.
Comment 2	TURN is not requesting here that the Commission establish an hourly rate at the stated levels for 2015 for any of its attorneys or expert witnesses. At the time this request for compensation was submitted, the Commission had not yet determined the general “cost-of-living” adjustment for 2015. Therefore, TURN is using the \$500 hourly rate as a placeholder for whatever rate results from application of any general adjustment the Commission may adopt for 2015 to the previously authorized rate for work each attorney or expert witness performed in 2014.

**D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>
[1]	For the duplication discussed above, the Commission removed 15% of TURN’s hours for RevSP and PD issues, which resulted in the following disallowances: 0.825 hours from Finkelstein’s 2014 claim; 0.713 hours from Goodson’s 2014 claim; and 5.213 hours from Long’s 2014 claim.

<sup>8</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch> .

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. TURN has made a substantial contribution to D.14-12-025.
2. The requested hourly rates for TURN'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 \$125,053.28.

**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 shall be awarded \$125,053.28.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision PacifiCorp, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric, Liberty Utilities LLC, Southern California Edison Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Southwest Gas Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network 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 20, 2015, the 75<sup>th</sup> 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

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1412025		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R1311006		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Wong		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	PacifiCorp, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric, 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
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	02/06/2015	\$128,419.43	\$125,053.28	No.	See Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

## Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Thomas	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$555	2013	\$555
Thomas	Long	Attorney	TURN	\$570	2014	\$570
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	TURN	\$345	2013	\$345
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	TURN	\$355	2014	\$355
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$490	2013	\$490
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$500	2014	\$505
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$500	2015	\$505
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$265	2013	\$265
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$265	2014	\$270
John	Sugar	Expert	TURN	\$210	2013	\$210

(END OF APPENDIX)