

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue Implementation and Administration of California Renewable Portfolio Standard Program.	Rulemaking 11-05-005 (Filed May 5, 2011)
--	---

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO PACIFIC FOREST TRUST FOR CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 14-12-081**

<b>Intervenor: Pacific Forest Trust</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 14-12-081</b>
<b>Claimed: \$47,115.00</b>	<b>Awarded: \$36,106.00</b> (reduced 23.3%)
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Carla Peterman</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Anne E Simon</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	This decision implements the provisions of SB 1122 (Rubio, 2012), requiring investor owned utilities to procure mandated quantities of specified types of bioenergy.
--	--

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

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	N/A	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	April 16, 2013	May 16, 2013
3. Date NOI filed:	May 15, 2013	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.11-10-003	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 18, 2012	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:	R.11-10-003	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 18, 2012	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-12-081	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 26, 2014	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	February 24, 2015	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

### C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
2		Ruling Issued by ALJ DeAngelis on April 16, 2013 set May 16, 2013 as deadline for submittal of new NOIs.

## PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

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

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p><b>ISSUE A</b></p> <p><i>Definition of Sustainable Forest Management</i></p> <p>The Pacific Forest Trust (PFT) made extensive comments on the need to define “sustainable forest management” in a way that exceeds minimum legal requirements and which maximizes ratepayer and public benefits. The final decision acknowledged and accommodated that recommendation by requiring</p>	<p>Decision 14-12-081 acknowledges the challenges of implementing a program based on “sustainable forest management” when there is no existing statutory or regulatory definition of that term. See section 2.2.3. The Decision does require feedstock to be sourced from practices that exceed minimum legal requirements and that seek to maximize ratepayer and environmental benefits, by relying on the “forest biomass sustainability byproduct eligibility form” from the CalFire white paper.</p> <p>See page 32 of the Decision: “We therefore modify the CAL FIRE staff</p>	Yes.

<p>fuel derived from “sustainable forest management” to meet criteria developed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) and articulated in a white paper and accompanying checklist. PFT coordinated extensively with CalFire on these criteria through a stakeholder process.</p> <p>See pages 4-11 of PFT’s comments on the ALJ ruling seeking comments on the Staff Proposal. Some relevant excerpts include:</p> <p><b>II. STAFF PROPOSAL ON ELEMENTS OTHER THAN PRICE – D. BIOENERGY CATEGORIES – QUESTION 3. BIOENERGY USING BYPRODUCTS OF SUSTAINABLE FOREST MANAGEMENT</b></p> <p>The SP’s definition and characterization of the sustainable forest management byproduct category of bioenergy (SP, pages 25 – 27) is unsatisfactory as it does not accord with the plain meaning of SB1122 and the guiding principles of the SP by not maximizing the environmental and ratepayer benefits of forest bioenergy.</p> <p>PFT believes that the PUC can remedy the SP’s definition of sustainable forest management by following the recommendation of the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFIRE) to define the term to</p>	<p>white paper checklist in order to use it as the basis for the determination of eligibility of fuel under SB 1122, when eligibility is claimed on the basis that the fuel is the byproduct of other sustainable forest management practices not covered in the areas of fire threat reduction, fire safe clearance activities, and infrastructure clearance activities set forth above.” The modified CalFire checklist is attached to the decision as Appendix B.</p> <p>See also Findings of Law 15-22 on pages 83-85 of the Decision</p>	
--	---	--

require that fuel be sourced from forest management that exceeds the minimum requirements of the law.

*Page 4*

**A) The term “sustainable forest management” on its face requires the prioritization of forms of forest management that maximize environmental and ratepayer benefits** SB1122 requires the PUC to direct utilities to purchase a given number of megawatts of bioenergy sourced from the byproducts of sustainable forest management (Public Resources Code Sec. 399.20(f)(2)(A)(iii)). While the legislature could have simply said “forest management” or “legal forest management,” it specifically chose the words “sustainable forest management” to differentiate this form of management from merely legal forms of forest management.

*Page 5*

As is apparent from SB1122’s juxtaposition of unmodified “dairy” and “agricultural” operations with the term “forest management” modified by the word “sustainable,” the use of fuel from mere “forest management” is insufficient. It must be from “sustainable” forest management. The SP fails to differentiate any legal

<p>form of forest management from another, and therefore broadens the definition of sustainable forest management beyond what the legislature intended.</p> <p>This failure to differentiate is critical, as some forms of otherwise legal forestry in California minimize environmental and ratepayer benefits. A legal form of forest management where virtually all trees are removed from 20-acre sections of the landscape at a time (hereinafter “clearcutting”) is particularly harmful to the environment when applied across a landscape or watershed. Aside from destroying species richness and abundance of forest-dependent species of an area (Semlitsch, 2009), it also creates significant hydrological risks (Klein, Lewis and Buffleben, 2011). It is also perfectly legal in California, and CalFIRE regularly approves clearcutting on tens of thousands of acres in the state.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Page 6</i></p> <p>While clearcutting is “sustainable” in the sense that growth of new timber products will not be exceeded by removal or harvest of those products over decades, many other forms of forestry provide greater environmental and ratepayer benefits in comparison. PFT is</p>		
---	--	--

<p>particularly focused on restoring resilient forest landscapes in California that can adapt to the challenges presented by climate change and increasing frequency and severity of wildfire. Such resilient, healthy forests have fewer and bigger trees per acre with spacing between trees and thus less competition for increasingly scarce water, and a more natural range of species and ages. Promoting such resilient forests provides environmental and ratepayer benefits such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced risk of wildfire intensity with less risk to homes and utility infrastructure.</li> <li>• Restoring hydrological ecosystem services and enhancing water filtration and regulation.</li> <li>• Greater adaptability for future climate conditions that benefits wildlife habitat, sensitive species and recreational industries.</li> </ul> <p>There are a variety of forms of highly practical, widely accepted, and legal forest management that can encourage this kind of resilient forest. All are practices above the legal minimums.</p> <p>Unfortunately, by not creating discrete space in the definition of sustainable forest management for those forms of forest management with high levels of environmental and ratepayer benefits, these more</p>		
---	--	--

<p>beneficial forms of forestry will likely not receive the financial incentives provided by SB1122. The environmental and ratepayer benefits will therefore be minimized, and as a result the SP's definition of sustainable forest management is contrary to the legislature's intent to distinguish and financially incentivize those forms of forestry that provide maximized environmental and ratepayer benefits.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Pages 10-11</i></p> <p>Notably, PFT's recommendations for "sustainable forest management" summarized on pages 16-17 (See below) of our initial comments were almost completely incorporated into the decision.</p> <p><b>PFT recommendations</b></p> <p>In order to ensure that the intent of the legislature and the SP's own guiding principles are complied with, PFT makes the following recommendations with respect to the SP's definition of sustainable forest management:</p> <p>The PUC should make clear in its final ruling that sustainable forest management requires more than minimum compliance with the law. Pursuant to CalFIRE's recommendation, the definition of the term should focus on those forms of forest</p>		
--	--	--

<p>management that reduce fuel loads and restore healthy forests.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The definition of sustainable forest management should contain meaningful differentiation of those forms of forestry management with standards that maximize environmental and ratepayer benefits. The definition should create discrete space for these highly beneficial management practices to be incentivized by SB1122 so that they are not crowded out by cheap and abundant byproducts of legal forestry operations that minimize environmental and ratepayer benefits.</li> <li>▪ The specific mention of fire threat reduction management in the first three components of the definition begins this process. These specifically mentioned management activities could be augmented by including the exemptions for fire threat treatments on private lands outlined in Public Resources Code Sec. 4584(j) (commonly known as the “LaMalfa exemption”), as well as byproducts from the execution of non-industrial timber management plans (NTMPs) that have been certified by CalFIRE.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

<p><b>ISSUE B</b></p> <p><i>Monitoring and verification of fuel sources.</i></p> <p>“PFT supports annual monitoring of the fuels used by a generation facility, and agrees with the SP that the requirements of SB1122 “would be rendered meaningless” if plant operators were allowed to switch feedstocks midstream (SP, p. 33).</p> <p>However, PFT is concerned that the utility is not the best potential auditor of the fuels used by a facility. PFT recommends that the SP be revised to place the ultimate auditing power in the hands of a state agency with the expertise and authority to determine if the appropriate feedstocks are being used. In the case of forest bioenergy, this could be CalFIRE. Alternatively, the PUC might choose to oversee the auditing performed by utilities. In that event the PUC could retain the ultimate auditing authority or delegate such a ministerial duty to another agency with relevant expertise such as CalFIRE or the CEC. In either event, PFT recommends that the SP be revised to make clear that the ultimate auditing authority and responsibility lies with the state and not with the utility.” – <i>PFT initial comments, page 18</i></p>	<p>Decision at page 74:</p> <p>“Once the bioenergy FiT has been in operation, the Director of Energy Division is directed to investigate, through a workshop or other means, the possibilities for third-party verification of fuel use and/or third-party monitoring of fuel use. Such an investigation should be commenced within six months of the beginning of the first program period.”</p> <p>Finding of Law #51 (page 90):</p> <p>51. In order to ensure that fuel use complies with the requirements of the bioenergy FiT, the Director of Energy Division should take appropriate steps, commencing not later than six months after the beginning of the first program period, including but not limited to holding a workshop, to explore possible standards and format for third-party verification of fuel sources use by generators in all categories of the bioenergy FiT.</p>	<p>No. As noted on page 34 of the Final Decision, these suggestions, “while relevant, are premature.”</p>
---	---	---

<p><b>ISSUE C:</b> <i>Allocation amongst Categories</i></p> <p>PFT Initial Comments at page 17:</p> <p>PFT fully supports the SP’s allocation of the capacity targets to the various utilities. The allocation of 47 megawatts for sustainable forest management bioenergy to PG&amp;E is entirely proper given the overgrown and potentially dangerous nature of forest stands throughout PG&amp;E’s service area. The maximum public benefits realized through resilient forest landscapes and fuels reduction can be most efficiently realized in PG&amp;E’s service area. The SP appropriately magnifies the beneficial effects of SB1122 on California’s forests by allocating 47 megawatts of forest bioenergy to PG&amp;E.</p>	<p>Decision at Page 38:</p> <p>“The consultants in the B&amp;V Report used the information in the <i>Biomass Potentials</i> report to develop an allocation of Category 3 targets: 47 MW to PG&amp;E; 2.5 MW to SCE; and 0.5 MW to SDG&amp;E. No party objects to the methodology used in the B&amp;V Report. These targets are adopted.”</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p><b>ISSUE D:</b> <i>Locational Requirement</i></p> <p>PFT fully supports the SP’s interpretation of the locational requirement to allow a generation facility to use fuel feedstock from a source outside the utility’s service area. This will ensure that a greater amount of byproducts from relatively beneficial forest management is eligible for use in SB1122 facilities.</p>	<p>See Decision at pages 44-46, including footnote 67, rejecting arguments to restrict sources of forest biomass material to within an IOU’s territory.</p> <p>“Although the environmental concerns raised by parties are legitimate, they offer no clear way to address them. A limitation to the IOU’s service territory is somewhat arbitrary. An IOU’s service territory covers hundreds of miles, within which acquisition of various fuel sources would be allowed, while the territory of a neighboring IOU might be only a few miles away from</p>	<p>Yes, but duplicative of BAC, ORA, Placer APCD and PG&amp;E. This demonstrates a failure to adequately coordinate by these parties.</p>

	<p>some generation projects. AECA offers a fallback position of a radius of 50 miles from the project; CBD suggests a 25-mile radius; Reid suggests that the fuel source must be within the service territory of one of the IOUs. These suggestions show that there is no consensus on how to craft a limitation on fuel source by geography.”</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?<sup>1</sup></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: Placer County Air Pollution Control District, CalFire (not a party, but relied upon by CPUC staff for guidance), Center for Biological Diversity</b>		Verified, including Bioenergy Association of California
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: While PFT’s positions were distinct from the parties listed above, and we pursued different arguments in our comments, we coordinated extensively in an attempt make consensus recommendations. Much of this coordination occurred through the Forest Biomass Work Group which included CalFire, PFT, Placer Air Pollution Control District, and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy. That process resulted in the CalFire white paper that serves as the basis for the PUC’s implementation of a “sustainable forest management” definition.</b>		Verified, but still duplicative.

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

<b>#</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comment</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
	As acknowledged in the Decision (pages 21-26) there is no existing	CalFire’s workshops were conducted at the request of the Commission’s Energy Division, and Pacific Forest Trust

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

<p>definition of Sustainable Forest Management in the California Code of Regulations. The decision relies on the CalFire white paper, which was the result of substantial input from Pacific Forest Trust, Placer County Air Pollution Control District, the Sierra Nevada Conservancy, and others. While footnote 32 on page 23 of the Decision notes that the CalFire stakeholder process “is not part of the record or process in this proceeding”, it was the forum for coordination by several of the parties (including PFT and Placer Air) as well as CalFire. Indeed, the participation in that stakeholder effort was essential to the efficient participation by PFT and other parties, and led to the standards and checklist relied upon by the CPUC to define Sustainable Forest Management in the Decision. Time spent coordinating with this process is reflected in the attached timesheets.</p>	<p>should be compensated for these hours.</p>
--	---

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>Pacific Forest Trust has extensive experience and specialization in California policy actions to achieve Sustainable Forest Management. While it is difficult to quantify the economic benefit of Sustainable Forest Management, there will be ratepayer benefits achieved by ensuring that forestry practices exceed minimum legal requirements. These include reduced threats to electricity distribution infrastructure by reducing forest fire intensity, reducing sedimentation to reservoirs associated with intense wildfires, and improved watershed health that maintains water production for hydroelectric facilities.</p> <p>The time spent by Patrick Doherty on the definition of Sustainable Forest Management exceeded our initial estimate of 100 hours by approximately 36%. This was due to the extreme complexity of the subject matter and regulatory</p>	<p><b>CPUC Discussion</b></p> <p>Verified</p>
--	---

<p>framework, as well as to the lack of clarity about where the definition would be determined: at CalFire, at the Board of Forestry, or independently at the CPUC. It was our determination that given the complexity of the issue, and the regulatory role of CalFire, that they would play a key role in developing a mechanism for implementing the Sustainable Forest Management standard. The Decision’s use of the CalFire white paper and checklist confirms that assumption was correct.</p> <p>The development of the CalFire white paper and checklist was the product of extensive interagency, stakeholder, and workgroup consultation. While we worked to engage in those discussions efficiently, those discussions were more extensive than expected. They were also an essential part of our contribution to the proceeding, and to the PUC’s satisfactory resolution to this difficult issue.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>Pacific Forest Trust’s Policy Associate Patrick Doherty lead PFT’s work on this proceeding. Supervision and guidance was provided by senior staff with more expertise on California forest policy issues. PFT has significant expertise in sustainable forest management, and contributed substantially to the appropriate resolution of a difficult policy issue for the CPUC.</p> <p>Mr. Doherty is an attorney licensed to practice in California since 2001. We look to PUC guidance document Res ALJ-287 for guidance as to his rate. As this was his first proceeding before the PUC we utilize the low end of the suggested range.</p> <p>Paul Mason is the Vice President for Policy and Incentives for PFT, and has over 20 years of experience in California forest policy. He has a PUC approved rate of \$225/hour. While that rate is lower than Mr. Doherty’s, due to broader job responsibilities Mr. Mason was not available to play the more extensive role undertaken by Mr. Doherty. Significant amounts of Mr. Mason’s supervision and feedback time are not included in this compensation filing.</p> <p>Note that the Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation contains an inexplicable error in the rates to be claimed. Appropriate rates based on PUC guidance are reflected in this filing.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:                  Definition of Sustainable Forest Management – 62%                  Monitoring and Verification of Fuel Sources – 4%                  Allocation Amongst Categories of Bioenergy – 4%                  Locational Requirements for Fuel Sources – 8%                  Crosscutting Activities &amp; Workshops – 22%</p>	<p>Verified</p>

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Patrick Doherty	2013	135	\$310	Res. ALJ-287	\$41,850	110.95 <sup>[A]</sup> [B]	\$280.00 <sup>[C]</sup> [D]	\$31,066.00
Patrick Doherty	2014	9	\$310	Res. ALJ-303	\$2,790	8.0 <sup>[B]</sup>	\$285.00	\$2,280.00
Paul Mason	2013	6	\$225	Dec. 13-11-019	\$1,350	6	\$230.00 <sup>2</sup>	\$1,380.00
<b>Subtotal: \$45,990</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$34,726.00</b>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION**								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Paul Mason	2015	10	\$112.5	Dec. 13-11-019	\$1,125	12.0 <sup>[C]</sup>	\$115.00	\$1,380.00
<b>Subtotal: \$1,125</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$1,380.00</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$47,115</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$36,106.00</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. 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 <sup>3</sup>			Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation			
Patrick Doherty	12/27/2001			#218596	Filed as Inactive on 2/1/2013. Active again as of 9/11/2014			

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

<sup>2</sup> Application of Res. ALJ-287 2.0% Cost of Living Adjustment to rate granted in D.13-11-019.

<sup>3</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	PFT Articles of Incorporation
3	Time sheets

**D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
A	Reduction of 9.5 hours for miscalculation of total hours. Reduction of 7.25 hours for excessive time spent researching California forest practices. Reduction of 2.3 hours, or a 20% reduction, for duplication on Issue D. Reduction of 5 hours attributable to Issue B, monitoring and verification of fuel sources, which are dismissed without prejudice and can be claimed after the issue has been addressed by the Commission.
B	Reduction to Doherty's hours of one hour from 2013 and one hour from 2014 for time spent filing comments.
C	Addition of two hours for NOI preparation originally attributed to normal hours.
D	Pacific Forest Trust requests a rate of \$310.00 for work completed by Doherty in 2013. However, a review of Doherty's experience shows that Doherty has not worked as an attorney for much of his career, and was inactive during the time period he participated in this proceeding. The Commission finds it reasonable to grant Doherty a rate of \$280.00 per hour, the highest rate available to experts with 7-12 years of experience.

**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. Pacific Forest Trust has made a substantial contribution to D.14.12-081.
2. The requested hourly rates for Pacific Forest Trust'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 \$36,106.00.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. Pacific Forest Trust shall be awarded \$36,106.00
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 Pacific Forest Trust 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 10, 2015, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Pacific Forest Trust'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**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1412081		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R1105005		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Simon		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company		

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier ?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
Pacific Forest Trust	February 24, 2015	\$47,115.00	\$36,106.00	N/A	Reductions for duplication, decreased hourly rates, and inefficient hours.

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Patrick	Doherty	Expert	Pacific Forest Trust	\$310.00	2013	\$280.00
Patrick	Doherty	Expert	Pacific Forest Trust	\$310.00	2014	\$285.00
Paul	Cohen	Expert	Pacific Forest Trust	\$225.00	2013	\$230.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**