

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company in its 2012 Nuclear Decommissioning Cost Triennial Proceeding (U39E).

Application 12-12-012
(Filed December 21, 2012)

And Related Matters.

Application 12-12-013

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS
TO DECISIONS 14-02-024 AND D. 14-12-082**

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	For contribution to Decisions (D.) 14-02-024 and D.14-12-082
Claimed: \$354,057.00	Awarded: \$346,757.25 (approximately 2.1 % reduction)
Assigned Commissioner: Michel P. Florio	Assigned: ALJ: Melanie Darling

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	<p><u>Decision 14-02-024 (Phase 1)</u> The decision adopts a cost estimate of \$679 million to complete the decommissioning of Pacific Gas & Electric Company's Humboldt Bay Power Plant Unit 3. The decision also makes findings relating to 2011-2013 costs for maintaining minimal plant systems during decommissioning and reviews the reasonableness of \$25.923 million in expenditures for completed decommissioning projects. The decision improves the Commission's monitoring of decommissioning activities and costs occurring between triennial proceedings and establishes clear expectations of recordkeeping and other evidentiary support for final approval of future expenditures.</p> <p><u>Decision 14-12-082 (Phase 2)</u> This decision approves decommissioning cost estimates for San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) Units 1, 2</p>
--	--

PROPOSED DECISION

	and 3, for the Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station (PVNGS) and for the Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP). The decision also finds that SCE did not meet its burden of proof as to \$13.9 million it claims to have spent on SONGS 1 decommissioning activities in 2011 and 2012. The decision also addresses trust fund return assumptions and approves revenue requirements for DCPP, HBPP3, SONGS and PVNGS.
--	---

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):	March 27, 2013	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	April 25, 2013	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:	A.12-11-009	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	September 6, 2013	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
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.12-11-009	Rulemaking (R.) 11-11-008
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	September 6, 2013	January 3, 2012
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.14-12-082	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 22, 2014	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 20, 2015	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1		Regarding lines 5-7. The Commission did not issue a formal ruling on TURN's customer status in Application (A.)12-12-012 or A.12-12-013 in response to TURN's Notice of Intent to claim compensation.
2		Regarding lines 5-7. TURN cites to a proceeding in which a formal ruling issued on customer status.
3		Section 1804(b) (1) provides that a finding of significant financial hardship shall create a rebuttable presumption of eligibility for compensation in other Commission proceedings commencing within one year <u>of the date of the finding.</u> (<i>emphasis added.</i>) Here, TURN inappropriately cites to a ruling which issued <u>after</u> these consolidated proceedings were filed to create this rebuttable presumption. Because these consolidated proceedings were filed December 21, 2012, a ruling in R.11-11-008 issued on January 3, 2012 finding TURN has established significant financial hardship creates a rebuttable presumption of significant financial hardship in this proceeding.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Claimant's description of its substantial contribution 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. PHASE 1 / ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY TURN expressed serious concern about the process for reviewing both disbursements from the trust funds and reviewing completed decommissioning projects including over \$867 million in costs for projects not yet complete	<u>Phase 1 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy on behalf of TURN, pages 9-10</u> <u>Phase 1 TURN opening brief, September 13, 2013, pages 22-27</u> <u>TURN opening comments on Phase 1 PD, February 18, 2014, pages 8-10</u> <u>D.14-02-024, pages 4, 50-52</u>	Accepted

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>at HBPP 3. TURN urged the Commission to take prompt action to “enforce some measure of accountability”, improve oversight and allow for appropriate future determinations with respect to the reasonableness and prudence of costs incurred since 2009. Specifically, TURN proposed that the total decommissioning scope should be divided into 10-15 major work packages and that any reasonableness review should compare final work and cost to the relevant approved cost estimate (2009 or 2012).</p> <p>The Decision states that “The Commission shares TURN’s interest in cost containment and accountability when a utility seeks after-the-fact review of its decommissioning decisions, activities, and expenditures.” The Decision agreed with TURN that “there is value to the Commission and public in having a reasonably detailed cost breakdown of future decommissioning projects and a correlation to the previously approved cost estimate of activities, costs and schedule.”</p> <p>In response to TURN’s observations and recommendations for greater tracking of project costs, the Decision directed PG&E to meet with Energy Division staff to develop more detailed requests for disbursements that identify how any requested funds apply to the 11 major cost categories identified by PG&E and the four civil works projects.</p> <p>The Decision further notes that TURN’s concerns should be</p>		

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>addressed via “more detailed reporting, combined with higher expectations of sufficient evidence to support expenditure” and that an independent audit could be ordered in a future NDCTP after “most major work is completed.”</p>		
<p>2. PHASE 1 / REASONABLENESS REVIEW</p> <p>TURN expressed concern that PG&E’s request for a finding of reasonableness of \$25.9 million in expenditures on projects completed by the end of 2011 did not include any basis for comparing actual expenditures with the estimates contained in the 2009 approved cost estimate. The Decision notes “TURN is correct that PG&E did not provide an explanation of how it arrived at the previously “authorized” amounts” from the 2009 cost study to benchmark actual expenditures for projects completed by the end of 2011.</p> <p>TURN pointed out that the Advice Letters filed by PG&E requesting disbursements from the trusts provided no information on the “authorized” costs for any of these projects. The Decision agreed with TURN that PG&E had not “fully complied” with the requirements of D.11-07-003 with respect to the information included in advice letters seeking trust fund disbursements for specific decommissioning projects.</p> <p>Finally, TURN urged the Commission to compare the remaining \$139.1 million spent</p>	<p><u>Phase 1 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy on behalf of TURN, pages 2, 21</u></p> <p><u>Phase 1 TURN opening brief, September 13, 2013, pages 16-20.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 1 TURN reply brief, September 27, 2013, pages 7-11.</u></p> <p><u>TURN opening comments on Phase 1 PD, February 18, 2014, pages 4-5</u></p> <p><u>D.14-02-024, pages 46-47, 49</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>between 2009 and 2011 to the original estimates in the 2009 cost study as part of a reasonableness review when the relevant projects are completed. The Decision requires that, for any 2009-2011 expenditures presented for review in the 2015 NDCTP, PG&E shall “at a minimum, provide references to the 2009 study to the extent available, and shall provide a description of the cost factors, identify the correlative cost category from an approved Advice Letter, and link it to the remaining costs to complete identified and approved in this proceeding.”</p>		
<p>3. PHASE 1 / COST ESTIMATE</p> <p>TURN urged the Commission to reject PG&E’s \$449 million increase to its decommissioning cost estimate for HBPP 3. Specifically, TURN compared PG&E’s 2009 cost estimate with the specific increases explained and identified in its 2012 application, identified the portion of increases due to changes in scope and quantified those tied to basic decommissioning cost increases. TURN’s analysis revealed serious discrepancies that fail to explain, at a minimum, \$54.2 million of the overall increase.</p> <p>The Decision identifies “some concerns about the inability to trace specific cost estimates back to the 2009 study, or even within the 2012 study as to these increases”. The Decision further agrees with TURN that PG&E failed to properly document</p>	<p><u>Phase 1 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy on behalf of TURN, pages 6-10, 19.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 1 TURN opening brief, September 13, 2013, pages 1-11</u></p> <p><u>D.14-02-024, pages 28-29, Finding of Fact 7.</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>“basic decommissioning increases” provided insufficient evidence to support \$48.2 million of its overall cost increase. As a result, the Decision finds that the cost estimate should be reduced by \$48.2 million to reflect this failure.</p>		
<p>4. PHASE 2 / DIABLO CANYON COST ESTIMATE</p> <p>TURN urged the Commission to approve a decommissioning cost estimate for Diablo Canyon of \$1.8 billion rather than the \$2.8 billion requested by PG&E. TURN further criticized a series of poorly documented assumptions that PG&E relies upon to seek an increase of nearly \$1 billion relative to its 2009 approved cost estimate.</p> <p>Based on the specific critiques raised by TURN, the Decision reduces PG&E’s request by \$497.89 million “on the grounds the request lacked adequate support to demonstrate the requests were reasonable in nature and amount.” The Decision agrees with TURN that PG&E failed to justify large increases in security costs relating to wet fuel storage, a switch to a “rip and ship” approach, and the new assumption that low-level waste should be directly disposed without first going to an off-site waste processor. The Decision also agrees with TURN that PG&E failed to justify additional utility staff and contractor costs.</p> <p>The Decision explains that “we share much of TURN’s frustration with PG&E’s attitude about how</p>	<p><u>Phase 2 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy, September 20, 2013 (October 21, 2013 errata), pages 17-20.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 5-17.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN reply brief, January 24, 2014, pages 1-6.</u></p> <p><u>TURN reply comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 15, 2014, pages 3-4.</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 95-107</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>little it needs to say in order to establish a higher cost estimate and obtain almost \$1 billion from ratepayer to increase the DCP trust funds." The Decision also "shares TURN's concern that the Commission and intervenors cannot see the changes which ratepayers are asked to fund."</p>		
<p>5. PHASE 2 / SONGS 1</p> <p>TURN opposed SCE's request that the Commission find \$13.9 million in SONGS 1 decommissioning expenditures occurring between 2009 and 2012 were reasonably incurred. TURN asserted that SCE failed to provide sufficient evidence to allow the Commission to make such a determination. The Decision finds that SCE did not meet its burden of proof to establish that \$13.9 million in costs on SONGS 1 decommissioning were reasonably incurred. Specifically, the Decision notes that SCE's presentation of cost data consisted of insufficient evidence, data omissions and an inability to reconcile actual expenditures to previously forecasted costs.</p> <p>TURN urged the Commission to reject SCE's argument that D.10-07-047 eliminated the requirement for a utility to compare actual recorded decommissioning expenditures to the most recently approved cost estimate. TURN urged the Commission to clarify that such comparisons are essential to any reasonableness review. The Decision agrees with TURN and finds that "SCE mistakenly argues</p>	<p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 17-19</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN reply brief, January 24, 2014, pages 17-19</u></p> <p><u>TURN reply comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 15, 2014, pages 4-5</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 43-49</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>that, as a result of the 2009 GRC decision, the standard for reasonableness review of decommissioning costs was relaxed.” The Decision agrees with TURN that the scope of review for completed decommissioning projects requires a more robust showing including a comparison of actual costs to those estimated in a previous NDCTP.</p>		
<p>6. PHASE 2 / SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL</p> <p>TURN expressed concern about the 12 year wet cooling period for spent fuel assumed at both SONGS and Diablo Canyon. Due to the much higher costs of wet storage (compared to dry storage), TURN urged the Commission to direct SCE and PG&E to pursue all practical strategies to reduce the duration of wet cooling in order to minimize overall decommissioning costs.</p> <p>Although finding the 12-year wet cooling period for spent fuel assumed by the utilities to be reasonable for purposes of “high level cost estimation”, the Decision notes that “actual future operating decisions” with respect to wet fuel storage will be reviewed for reasonableness and that “the utilities should be considering the regulatory and economic impacts of taking steps to transfer SNF to dry cask storage as soon as practicable.” The Decision also requires that “in the 2015 NDCTP, the utilities shall address the disparate costs of wet versus dry storage in their applications.” The Decision also encourages SCE to continue its</p>	<p><u>Phase 2 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy, September 20, 2013 (October 21, 2013 errata), pages 9-10, 19-20.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 27-29.</u></p> <p><u>TURN opening comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 8, 2014, pages 3-5</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 29-30, 68</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
efforts to minimize the wet storage cooling periods "within the confines of NRC regulations."		
<p>7. PHASE 2 / REVENUE REQUIREMENTS</p> <p>TURN urged the Commission to modify the Proposed Decision to significantly reduce the level of trust fund contributions authorized for SONGS Units 2 and 3. Specifically, TURN argued that SCE should end its collections after the first quarter of 2014 and SDG&E should be authorized to continue its previously approved contribution level of \$8.07 million for 2014 and 2015 with no contributions authorized for 2016. TURN argued that this reduction is warranted based on the revised site-specific decommissioning cost estimate for SONGS and would save ratepayers over \$95 million in excess contributions to the Unit 2 & 3 trust funds between 2014-2016.</p> <p>The Decision acknowledges the fact that changed conditions, including healthy trust fund growth and lower than expected decommissioning costs, justify no additional funding for SCE after the first quarter of 2014 and only \$8.07 million for SDG&E in 2014 and 2015. Any additional changes to revenue requirements were deferred, if necessary, to a future decision on the Joint Application to approve a site-specific decommissioning cost estimate.</p>	<p><u>TURN opening comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 8, 2014, pages 3-5</u></p> <p><u>TURN reply comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 15, 2014, pages 1-3</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 4, 6, 59, 111, Findings of Fact 35, 36, Conclusions of Law 36, 37</u></p>	<p>Accepted, except that the correct page citation to TURN's opening comments on the Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 8, 2014 is to pages 2-3.</p>
<p>8. PHASE 2 / DOE SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL LITIGATION PROCEEDS</p> <p>TURN urged the Commission to</p>	<p><u>Phase 2 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy,</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>remove certain spent nuclear fuel storage costs (post-shutdown dry fuel storage) from the decommissioning cost estimates to reflect the fact that damage payments will be made by the United States Government to cover these costs. TURN pointed to a pattern of successful litigation recoveries related to these costs and expressed concern that failure to make these adjustments could lead to intergenerational inequity.</p> <p>While the Decision does not adopt TURN's primary recommendation, it does agree that "TURN raises a serious point regarding potential overcollections" and requires the utilities to "disclose, in their next NDCTP application, all settlements, awards, or other resolution of damage claims completed in the triennial period, based on DOE failure to accept SNF." The Decision also requires each utility to "establish how the recoveries were allocated to ensure that NDTFs received the appropriate share of net proceeds commensurate with payment of the underlying costs supporting the resolved claims."</p>	<p><u>September 20, 2013 (October 21, 2013 errata), pages 12-17</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 30-34.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN reply brief, January 24, 2014, pages 6-17</u></p> <p><u>TURN opening comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 8, 2014, pages 6-7</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 35-36</u></p>	
<p>9. PHASE 2 / ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY</p> <p>TURN made three specific recommendations relating to the presentation of data in future NDCTPs that will allow comparisons within and between utility submissions. These recommendations including refinements to the cost estimate summary, a variance analysis, and improvements to the common</p>	<p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 34-37.</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 40-43</u></p>	Accepted

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>summary format.</p> <p>The Decision states “we appreciate TURN’s attention to improving the transparency and utility of the decommissioning cost estimates” and agrees that TURN’s recommendations should be incorporated into a revised Common Summary Format. The Decision directs SCE and SDG&E to meet with the Energy Division and other interested parties to develop a revised Common Summary Format to incorporate these recommendations.</p>		
<p>10. PHASE 2/ ACCOUNTABILITY & TRANSPARENCY</p> <p>TURN expressed concern that it may be difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile ongoing spending on SONGS 2 and 3 decommissioning with previously submitted or approved cost estimates. TURN recommended that disbursements be subjected to better tracking and offered a series of recommendations to “improve oversight, increase transparency, and provide meaningful accountability as decommissioning activities commence.”</p> <p>The Decision states “we agree with TURN that the Commission should generally be able, based on the Utilities’ submissions, to compare estimated and recorded costs back to the most recently approved estimate with supporting evidence to explain significant differences.” The Decision applies the process set forth in D.14-02-024 to SONGS 2</p>	<p><u>Phase 2 Direct Testimony of Bruce Lacy, September 20, 2013 (October 21, 2013 errata), pages 21-22</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 19-27</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN reply brief, January 24, 2014, pages 19-23</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, pages 41, 71-76</u></p>	<p>Accepted</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>and 3 relating to the comparison of decommissioning expenditures with previously approved estimates, the development of a spreadsheet for requesting disbursements, a comparison of actual and estimated cash flows, and records of key decisions regarding cost, scope, or timing of a major project or activity. The Decision notes that these elements “may be blended into the common summary and data presentation recommendations by TURN”. The Decision states that these changes “should be sufficient to allay TURN’s discomfort with the incompatibility of decommissioning cost studies when a power plant first transitions to active decommissioning.” Furthermore, the Decision adopts TURN’s recommendation to categorize costs in a manner “similar to TURN’s proposal to break the decommissioning plan into 10-15 major subprojects, each with an expected budget, schedule, and completion milestones suitable for tracking performance.”</p>		
<p>11. PHASE 2 / TRUST FUND ASSUMPTIONS</p> <p>TURN argued that PG&E’s fixed income return projections were significantly lower than those of SCE and SDG&E without any basis given the comparable investment strategies employed by the trust fund investment managers for all three utilities. TURN urged the Commission to adopt a similar fixed-income return for all three utilities.</p> <p>Although not adopting any</p>	<p><u>Direct Testimony of Garrick Jones, September 20, 2013 (errata October 21, 2013), pages 1, 3, 7-9, 14.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN opening brief, December 16, 2013, pages 44-48.</u></p> <p><u>Phase 2 TURN reply brief, January 24, 2014, pages 31-33.</u></p> <p><u>TURN opening comments on Phase 2 Proposed Decision, December 8, 2014, pages 8-10.</u></p> <p><u>D.14-12-082, page 126.</u></p>	<p>Accepted in part as to TURN’s representation. However, <i>see</i> the discussion at Part III.D below.</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>changes to PG&E’s assumed fixed-income returns in this case, the Decision states “we are concerned that PG&E’s estimated returns are significantly lower than the other utilities.” The Decision directs PG&E to “work with its Trust Fund Committee to endeavor to increase fixed income returns before the 2015 NDCTP.”</p> <p>Additional information TURN’s claim for substantial contribution on this issue is described in Comment #2.</p>		

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?¹</p>	Yes	Correct
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	Yes	Correct
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility, Coalition to Decommission San Onofre</p>		Correct
<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</p> <p>TURN made a unique showing in both phases of the proceeding and did not duplicate work by other intervenors. In Phase 1, the only intervenors were TURN and the Office of Ratepayer Advocates. Since TURN addressed unique issues that were not included in ORA’s showing, there was no duplication of work in that phase. TURN coordinated with ORA on several occasions to ensure that no duplication occurred.</p> <p>In Phase 2, TURN performed unique analysis that was not duplicated by any other party and sought relief that was not requested by other parties. To the extent that TURN and ORA aligned on any position, it involved joint advocacy against SCE’s proposals regarding the reasonableness of SONGS 1 decommissioning expenditures.</p>		

¹ The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

<p>TURN and ORA did focus on different types of deficiencies in SCE’s showing relating to SONGS 1 with TURN emphasizing problems with the legal arguments made by SCE.</p> <p>TURN largely argued for entirely unique positions on other contested issues in the proceeding. The Commission should not, therefore, conclude that any reductions in compensation are warranted based on duplication of effort.</p>	
---	--

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion
1	<p>TURN responded to SCE’s Application for Rehearing of D.14-12-082 and opposed the changes sought in this decision. At the time this request for compensation was submitted, the Commission had not issued a decision on the rehearing application. For purposes of efficiency, TURN includes these hours in this request.</p>	<p><i>See discussion at Part III.D below.</i></p>
2	<p>PHASE 2 / TRUST FUND ASSUMPTIONS</p> <p>In Phase 2 of the proceeding, TURN presented a number of recommendations relating to the equity and debt returns to be assumed for nuclear decommissioning trust funds along with the appropriate allocation of investments amongst various types of assets. Although the Commission did not adopt any specific adjustments to the trust fund return assumptions, TURN’s critical assessment of PG&E’s very low return assumption for fixed-income assets led the Commission to conclude that PG&E should reconsider its fixed-income assumptions for the next NDCTP.</p> <p>The standard for an award of intervenor compensation is whether TURN made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s decision, not whether TURN prevailed on a particular issue. For example, the Commission recognized that it “may benefit from an intervenor’s participation even where the Commission did not adopt any of the intervenor’s positions or recommendations.” (D.08-04-004, SCE’s contract with Long Beach Generation / A.06-11-007, pages 5-6). In that case TURN’s opposition focused on the need for the generation resource and its cost-effectiveness. The Commission stated, “The opposition presented by TURN and other intervenors gave us important information regarding all issues that needed to be considered in deciding whether to approve SCE’s application. As a result, we were able to fully consider the consequences of adopting or rejecting the LBG PPA.</p>	<p><i>See discussion at Part III.D below.</i></p>

<p>Our ability to thoroughly analyze and consider all aspects of the proposed PPA would not have been possible without TURN's participation." <i>Id.</i>, at 6. On this basis the Commission found that TURN had made a substantial contribution even though its positions had not been adopted, and awarded TURN intervenor compensation for all of the reasonable hours devoted to the proceeding.</p> <p>In D.09-10-051, the Commission determined that TURN had made a substantial contribution through its work on depreciation-related issues in the SCE 2009 test year GRC even though it had not adopted TURN's recommendations. The decision on TURN's request for compensation in that proceeding indicates that the Commission accepted TURN's argument that such an effort constituted a substantial contribution despite the fact that the Commission did not accept or agree with TURN's recommended outcome. (D.09-10-051, pages 8-9). The Commission reached a similar determination in D.14-05-015 (in A.10-12-005, SDG&E/SoCal Gas GRC) where full compensation was awarded despite the fact that none of TURN's recommended depreciation parameters were adopted.</p> <p>TURN submits that a similar outcome is warranted here. The showing of TURN on trust fund issues gave the Commission an opportunity to conduct a more thorough review of the asset return and allocation issues than would have otherwise been the case. Consistent with comparable prior decisions, the Commission should still find that TURN made a substantial contribution warranting an award of intervenor compensation for its work in this proceeding.</p>	
--	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
<p>As demonstrated in the substantial contribution section, TURN’s participation had an extraordinarily significant impact on the outcome of the core issues litigated in this proceeding. Specifically, TURN’s participation yielded the following benefits for ratepayers of PG&E, SCE and SDG&E:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A \$497.89 million reduction in PG&E’s decommissioning cost estimate for Diablo Canyon that was a key factor in the elimination of any revenue requirements for 2014-2016 Diablo Canyon trust fund contributions collected in rates. • A \$48.2 million reduction in the PG&E’s decommissioning cost estimate for HBPP 3 that reduced 2014-2016 trust fund contributions collected in rates. • A finding that \$13.9 million in expenditures on SONGS 1 decommissioning activities between 2009-2012 were not reasonable. • Clarification of the standards that will govern the reasonableness review for over \$867 million in costs for projects not yet completed at HBPP 3. • Reductions to the SONGS Units 2 and 3 trust fund contributions authorized in the revised Phase 2 Proposed Decision that saved ratepayers over \$95 million between 2014-2016. <p>Taken together, the benefits associated with TURN’s participation far exceed (by orders of magnitude) the cost of TURN’s participation in this proceeding. TURN’s claim should be found to be reasonable.</p>	<p>Accepted</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>Given the breadth and depth of TURN’s contributions to the final resolution of contested issues in this proceeding, the amount of time devoted by its staff and consultants is fully reasonable. In considering the reasonableness of the request, the Commission should be mindful of the fact that parties fully litigated two specific phases of the proceeding and were required to address decommissioning issues for three utilities owning at least 7 units at four separate nuclear sites. The proceeding involved two sets of evidentiary hearings, two rounds of testimony and briefing, and two final decisions. In order to effectively participate, TURN was obligated to devote substantial resources to the proceeding. The time devoted to each task was reasonable in light of the complexity of the issues presented.</p> <p><u>Reasonableness of Staffing</u></p> <p>TURN devoted one attorney and three consultants to this proceeding. Each individual focused on unique issues and engaged in a minimum of duplication. Matthew Freedman was the lead attorney handling the bulk of the work in the proceeding including case strategy, evidentiary hearings, briefing and other</p>	<p>Accepted</p>

pleadings.

TURN's consultants each addressed unique issues. Bruce Lacy was TURN's primary expert on nuclear decommissioning cost, regulatory and process issues. Mr. Lacy devoted substantial amounts of time to reviewing the voluminous testimony and cost estimates submitted by the three utilities. Mr. Lacy prepared two pieces of direct testimony and assisted Mr. Freedman with a variety of technical issues along with support for hearings and briefing. His work is largely responsible for the large reductions in the approved decommissioning cost estimates for Diablo Canyon and Humboldt Bay along with a variety of new accountability requirements that apply to billions of dollars in decommissioning expenditures.

Garrick Jones was TURN's primary expert on trust fund investment issues. With some assistance from Bill Marcus, Mr. Jones devoted time to reviewing the investment assumptions provided by the utilities and offering recommendations to ensure consistent estimated returns between comparable investment strategies and prudent allocations of investment funds between debt and equity.

Given the wide range of issues, and the sheer number of activities required to effectively participate over the course of this multi-year proceeding, the hours devoted to their work by Mr. Lacy, Mr. Jones and Mr. Marcus were fully reasonable. Moreover, the efforts of these experts significantly reduced the number of hours required by TURN's attorney (who has a higher approved hourly rate) and thereby minimized the overall compensation requested by TURN. 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.

Compensation Request

TURN's request also includes 20.75 hours devoted to the preparation of compensation-related filings. Given the duration of this proceeding, the large number of hours involved (1054 total), the significant volume of testimony and pleadings, the number of issues addressed in two final decisions, and the increasingly cumbersome requirements established by the Commission for documenting intervenor compensation claims, the time devoted to this compensation request is appropriate and should be found to be reasonable.

Travel expenses

TURN seeks to recover costs associated with travel by Bruce Lacy and Matthew Freedman. Mr. Lacy lives in Cedar Rapids, Iowa and was required to travel to San Francisco twice to appear at evidentiary hearings in Phase 1 and 2. Mr. Lacy and Mr. Freedman also traveled to Eureka, CA for a site visit at the Humboldt Bay Power Plant organized by PG&E and attended by representatives from the Commission (including ALJ Darling) along with the Office of Ratepayer Advocates and other utility personnel. Since the Eureka site visit commenced early in the morning, it was reasonable for TURN personnel to incur lodging costs at the same hotel used by other participants in the site visit. Since Eureka is over 270 miles from San Francisco, the costs of travel for Mr. Freedman are appropriate under Commission rules and should not be considered "routine commuting."

<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</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 specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN. TURN also provides an approximate breakdown of the number of hours spent on each task and the percentage of total hours devoted to each category.</p> <p>GP – 88.6 hours – 9% of total</p> <p>General Participation work essential to participation that typically spans multiple issues and/or would not vary with the number of issues that TURN addresses. This includes reviewing the initial applications and Commission rulings, initial review of utility filings and motions, review of Non Disclosure Agreements, reviewing responses to data requests submitted by other parties, reviewing pleadings submitted by other parties and review of proposed decisions.</p> <p>EH – 217.5 hours – 21% of total</p> <p>All tasks related to participation in Evidentiary Hearings, Prehearing Conferences and Oral Arguments, including attending hearings, preparing cross-examination and hearing materials and reviewing transcripts. The bulk of these hours are devoted to evidentiary hearings in Phase 1 and 2 of the proceeding.</p> <p>PHASE 1/A&T – 65.15 hours – 6% of total</p> <p>Work on Accountability and Transparency issues in Phase 1 including the process for reviewing both disbursements from the trust funds and tracking expenditures on decommissioning projects. Also includes work reviewing PG&E Advice Letters seeking trust disbursements for Humboldt Bay 3.</p> <p>PHASE 1/REASON – 36.6 hours – 4% of total</p> <p>Work on Phase 1 issues relating to the reasonableness of expenditures on decommissioning projects at Humboldt Bay Unit 3 and the process for reconciling completed project expenditures to original cost estimates.</p> <p>PHASE 1/COST – 109.5 hours – 11% of total</p> <p>Work on Phase 1 issues relating to the reasonableness of the Humboldt Bay Unit 3 decommissioning cost estimate.</p> <p>PHASE 2/COST – 134.7 hours – 13% of total</p> <p>Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the review of decommissioning cost estimates for Diablo Canyon, SONGS Units 2 and 3, and Palo Verde.</p> <p>PHASE 2/SONGS1 – 33 hours – 3% of total</p> <p>Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the reasonableness of decommissioning expenditures at SONGS Unit 1 and the legal standard for assessing reasonableness.</p> <p>PHASE 2/SNF – 21.6 hours – 2% of total</p> <p>Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the reasonableness of the forecasted wet cooling period for spent nuclear fuel at Diablo Canyon and SONGS Units 2 and 3 along with identifying opportunities to reduce costs by moving fuel into dry storage at an earlier date.</p>	Accepted
--	----------

PHASE 2/REVREQ – 9.6 hours – 1% of total

Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the appropriateness of revenue requirements collected from ratepayers to finance trust fund contributions for SONGS Units 2 and 3 from 2014-2016.

PHASE 2/DOESNF – 71.3 hours – 7% of total

Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the appropriate treatment of anticipated damage payments by the United States Government to compensate nuclear plant owners for the extended storage of nuclear fuel at facility sites.

PHASE 2/A&T – 60 hours – 6% of total

Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the presentation of cost and expenditure data that will promote accountability, transparency and consistency between utility submissions. Also includes recommendations relating to the tracking of trust fund disbursements and the review of Advice Letter filings by SCE and SDG&E seeking disbursements from the SONGS 2 and 3 Trust Funds.

PHASE 2/TRUST – 177.8 hours – 17% of total

Work on Phase 2 issues relating to the assumptions governing trust fund investment portfolios and anticipated investment returns on trust fund balances over time.

SCEAFR – 8.5 hours – 1% of total

Work responding to SCE’s application for rehearing of D.14-12-082.

COMP – 20.75 hours

Work preparing TURN’s notice of intent to claim compensation and the final request for compensation.

Multi-issue allocators

For hours coded “PH1”, TURN allocates 30% to PHASE 1/A&T, 20% to PHASE 1/REASON, and 50% to PHASE 1/COST.

For hours coded “PH2”, TURN allocates 40% to PHASE 2/COST, 15% to PHASE 2/SONGS1, 5% to PHASE 2/SNF, 15% to PHASE 2/DOESNF, 10% to PHASE 2/A&T, 10% to PHASE 2/TRUST, and 5% to PHASE 2/REVREQ.

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 \$
Matthew Freedman	2013	231	\$400	D.14-11-019	\$92,400.00	228.6	\$400	\$91,440.00
Matthew Freedman	2014	75	\$410	D.14-11-019; Resolution ALJ-303	\$30,750.00	75	\$410	\$30,750.00
Matthew Freedman	2015	8.5	\$410	See Comment #3	\$3,485.00	8.5	\$410	\$3,485.00
Bruce Lacy	2013	452.25	\$365	See Comment #1	\$165,071.25	451.95	\$365	\$164,961.75
Bruce Lacy	2014	49.75	\$365	See Comment #1	\$18,158.75	48.25	\$365	\$17,611.25
Garrick Jones	2013	191.51	\$155	D.14-05-015	\$29,684.05	161.47	\$155	\$25,027.85
Garrick Jones	2014	19.49	\$155	D.14-05-015, See Comment #2	\$3,020.95	14.61	\$155	\$2,264.55
Garrick Jones	2014	5.92	\$180	See Comment #2	\$1,065.60	4.42	\$180	\$795.60
William Marcus	2013	0.25	\$265	D.14-06-027; D.14-08-022	\$66.25	0.25	\$265	\$66.25
Subtotal: \$343,701.85						Subtotal: \$336,402.25		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Matthew Freedman	2013	0.75	\$200	D.14-11-019 (@ 50% of \$400)	\$150.00	0.75	\$200	\$150.00
Matthew Freedman	2015	20	\$205	See Comment #3	\$4,100.00	20	\$205	\$4,100.00
Subtotal: \$4,250.00						Subtotal: \$4,250.00		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail				Amount	Amount	
1	Copies	Copies for evidentiary hearings and pleadings				\$714.78	\$714.78	
2	LEXIS fees	Costs of legal research regarding historical precedents				\$61.44	\$61.44	

CLAIMED					CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
		relevant to the litigation of issues in this proceeding						
3	Phone	Costs of phone calls relating to this proceeding					\$1.51	\$1.51
4	Postage	Costs of mailing copies of pleadings and testimony					\$21.44	\$21.44
5	Travel/lodging	Costs of consultant travel to/from San Francisco (from Iowa) for Phase 1 and 2 evidentiary hearings and travel/lodging by both consultant and attorney to Eureka, CA for a site visit to HBPP 3 with Commission staff.					\$5,305.83	\$5,305.83
Subtotal: \$6,105.00							Subtotal: \$6,105.00	
TOTAL REQUEST: \$354,056.85							TOTAL AWARD: \$346,757.25	
<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. Intervenors' 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>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ²		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation		
Matthew Freedman		March 29, 2001		214812		No		

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Daily Time Records for Attorneys and Experts
Attachment 3	Cost/expense details

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

<p>Comment 1</p>	<p>Hourly Rates for Bruce Lacy</p> <p>TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$365 for work performed by Mr. Lacy in 2013 and 2014. The Commission has previously approved an hourly rate of \$345 for Mr. Lacy’s work in 2009 (in D.11-03-022). During 2009 and 2010, Mr. Lacy’s regular billing rate was \$345. He subsequently raised his regular billing rate to \$365 for work performed in 2013 and 2014.</p> <p>The Commission should find the requested rate reasonable. Mr. Lacy is a consultant with a nationwide practice who has set and receives a market rate for his services. While he has appeared on behalf of TURN in several CPUC proceedings, those appearances have been relatively sporadic over the years and represent only a relatively small portion of Mr. Lacy’s work. The Commission should recognize that the requested increase to the previously-authorized rate is reasonable for both 2013 and 2014, even though it does not comport precisely with the cost of living adjustments adopted during that period for intervenor compensation purposes.</p> <p>The \$365 rate should also be found reasonable because it is substantially below the rate that would result were the Commission to strictly apply the authorized “cost-of-living” adjustment (COLA) increases and the opportunity for “step” increases to the previously adopted rate of \$345 for Mr. Lacy. In Resolution ALJ-287, the Commission adopted a 2.2% COLA increase and continued to provide the opportunity for an additional 5% “step” increase. The cumulative impact of the 7.2% increase to the \$345 rate would produce an hourly rate of \$370 for 2013. The 2.58% COLA increase adopted for 2014 would result in a 2014 rate of \$380.</p> <p>Therefore, TURN requests that the Commission approve the requested hourly rate of \$365 for work performed in 2013 and 2014.</p>
<p>Comment 2</p>	<p>2014 Hourly Rate for Garrick Jones</p> <p>For work performed beginning in late 2014 by Garrick Jones of JBS Energy, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$180. JBS Energy began charging this rate for Mr. Jones’s work as of October 1, 2014. The Commission previously adopted a \$155 rate for his work since March 1, 2013, the last time JBS Energy revised the rate charged for his work. TURN seeks the increase because it reflects the market rate that JBS Energy charges all of its clients for work Mr. Jones performs as of October 1, 2014.</p> <p>Mr. Jones received his B.S. in Environmental and Resource Science from the University of California, Davis, in 1998. He also holds an M.S. degree in Agriculture & Resource Economics, from UC Davis (2006). Mr. Jones joined JBS Energy in June 2007. In recent years he has emerged as a key witness on behalf of TURN and been responsible for preparation and sponsorship of testimony as an expert witness in numerous general rate cases (GRCs) on revenue requirement issues (the 2015 SCE GRC (A.13-11-003) and the 2014 PG&E GRC (A.12-11-009), most recently) and Marginal Cost issues (Phase II of Southern California Edison’s 2012 GRC (A.11-06-007)) and on a variety of issues related to electric distribution in recent GRCs and served as a lead witness for TURN in the PG&E Smart Grid Pilot Project proceeding (A.11-11-017). Mr. Jones also provided TURN with extensive analysis and research in the PG&E SVTC Solar Manufacturing proceeding (A.10-11-002). Additionally, Mr. Jones has provided major and substantive analytical and testimony drafting support on numerous utility regulatory cases across a diverse array of jurisdictions, including Arkansas, California, Nevada, Texas, and Washington.</p> <p>Before coming to JBS Energy in 2007, Mr. Jones analyzed the effects of electrified transit</p>

	<p>projects on statewide and regional electricity infrastructure as well as on the overall transportation energy budgets in the relevant service areas. Mr. Jones performed similar analyses for residential housing projects. Representative clients for these studies include the California High-Speed Rail Authority, the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the Orange County Transportation Authority, and the City of Orange, California, among others. As well, Mr. Jones performed project-level analyses of air quality impacts and prepared text for a variety of project-related issues, including public utilities and services, hydrology and water quality, and noise pollution.</p> <p>By the last quarter of 2014, he had accumulated over ten years of relevant experience including seven years of experience with JBS and three years' prior experience of analysis with a focus on environmental impact assessment and reporting. This prior experience, while not identical to the work he performs on behalf of TURN in CPUC proceedings, is very analogous in terms of the required analytical and advocacy skills and resulting written and oral work product. Mr. Jones should qualify for the 7-12 year experience band in the Commission's range for expert witnesses. In Resolution ALJ-303, addressing authorized rates for 2014, the hourly rate range for this band is \$170-\$285. The \$155 rate for work Mr. Jones performed in most of 2013 and 2014 is below the low end of the scale for experts with similar training and experience. The requested \$180 rate would place him in the bottom 10% of the \$170-\$285 range.</p> <p>The Commission should also approve the \$180 rate for work performed after October 1, 2014 because it is the market rate that JBS Energy charges each of its clients for work performed by Mr. Jones. If the Commission were to approve a lower rate for his work during that period, there would be a shortfall between the amount JBS invoiced for Mr. Jones's work and the amount awarded for that work. The Commission has long recognized that JBS Energy is a unique and valued resource because the firm consistently provides first-rate analysis at cut-rate prices. This is so for Mr. Jones's work even at a \$180 hourly rate.</p> <p>TURN submits that this information is more than sufficient for the Commission to grant the requested increase to Mr. Jones's hourly rate. However, should the Commission disagree and believe that it needs more information to support the request, TURN asks that we be given an opportunity to provide additional information before a draft decision issues on this compensation request.</p>
<p>Comment 3</p>	<p>2015 Hourly Rate for Matthew Freedman</p> <p>TURN seeks compensation for Mr. Freedman's 2015 work relating to SCE's Application for Rehearing and the preparation of the compensation request based on the \$410 hourly rate for 2014 (as authorized by D.14-11-019 and RESOLUTION ALJ-303). TURN is not requesting here that the Commission establish an hourly rate of \$410 for Mr. Freedman's work in 2015. At the time this request for compensation was submitted, the Commission had not yet determined the general COLA for 2015. Therefore, TURN is using the \$410 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 of \$410 for work Mr. Freedman performed in 2014.</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
1	<p>Hourly Rates</p> <p>Hourly Rate for Bruce Lacy:</p> <p>TURN's requested \$365 hourly rate for Lacy's work in 2013 and 2014 is the rate JBS Energy billed for Lacy's 2013 and 2014 work. The Commission previously awarded Lacy \$345 for his work performed in 2009 and 2010. (See D.11-03-022.) When applying the first step increase of 5% and the COLA in Resolution ALJ-287 of 2% for work performed in 2013, the cumulative impact would be a hourly rate of up to \$370 for 2013. The 2.58% cost of living increase adopted for 2014 in Resolution ALJ-303 would result in a reasonable 2014 hourly rate of up to \$380. Therefore, TURN's requested hourly rate of \$365 for Lacy's 2013 and 2014 work is reasonable.</p> <p>Hourly rate for Garrick Jones:</p> <p>TURN requests an hourly rate of \$180 for Jones' work commencing in October 2014 because JBS Energy increased Jones' hourly rate to \$180 at that time. Jones joined JBS Energy in June 2007 and thus had a little over seven years of experience in late 2014. Pursuant to Resolution ALJ-303, the hourly rate range for an expert with 7-12 years of experience is \$170 to \$285. Because Jones has just entered this category, he is eligible for his first step increase. Therefore, an hourly rate of \$180 for his work commencing in October 2014 is reasonable (\$170 hourly rate plus a first 5% step increase = \$180.) We therefore approve Jones' requested hourly rate of \$180 commencing in October 2014.</p> <p>Hourly Rate for Matthew Freedman</p> <p>The hourly rate for Matthew Freedman's 2015 work (\$410) remains the same in 2015 because Resolution ALJ-308 did not authorize a COLA.</p>
2	<p>Comments on Requested Hours</p> <p>Hours Spent on Trust Fund Assumptions</p> <p>TURN's participation on this issue gave the Commission important information regarding all issues that needed to be considered on this issue, albeit at a high level. (See e.g., D.08-04-004.) Nonetheless, the Commission failed to adopt TURN's detailed recommendations. We therefore reduce TURN's time spent on this issue by 25%. This results in a reduction of the following hours: a reduction of 0.3 hours for Lacy for 2013; a reduction of 30.04 hours for Jones in 2013 and 4.88 hours (pre-October 2014) and 1.5 hours (commencing in October 2014) in 2014; and a reduction of 2.4 hours for Freedman in 2013.</p> <p>Hours Spent Opposing Application for Rehearing</p> <p>Because TURN's response to SCE's Application for Rehearing of D.14-12-082 gives the Commission important information regarding all issues that needed to be considered in deciding that application (see D.08-04-004), and TURN's 8.5 hours spent on the response are efficient, we grant compensation for this work. Nothing in this decision prejudices the</p>

	outcome of SCE's application for rehearing. Miscellaneous We reduce Bruce Lacy's 2014 hours by 1.5 for reviewing the proposed decision on December 18, 2014 as the Commission voted out D.14-12-082 on December 18, 2014, and thus this work did not substantially contribute to the decision.
--	---

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made substantial contributions to D.14-02-024 and D.14-12-082.
2. The requested hourly rates for TURN's representatives are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$346,757.25.

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 \$346,757.25.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network (TURN) their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric and gas revenues for the 2013 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 May 6, 2015, the 75th day after the filing of TURN's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

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

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1402024 and D1412082	
Proceeding(s):	A1212012; A1212013	
Author:	ALJ Darling	
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	2/20/2015	\$354,057	\$346,757.25	N/A	Reduction for hours that lacked substantial contribution

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	\$400	2013	\$400
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	\$410	2014	\$410
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	\$410	2015	\$410
Bruce	Lacy	Expert	TURN	\$365	2013	\$365
Bruce	Lacy	Expert	TURN	\$365	2014	\$365
Garrick	Jones	Expert	TURN	\$155	2013	\$155
Garrick	Jones	Expert	TURN	\$155	2014	\$155
Garrick	Jones	Expert	TURN	\$180	2014	\$180
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$265	2013	\$265

(END OF APPENDIX)