

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ DEANGELIS** (Mailed 9/30/2015)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E) for Authority to Implement Optional Pilot Program to Increase Customer Access to Solar Generated Electricity.

Application 12-01-008
(Filed January 17, 2012)

And Related Matters.

Application 12-04-020
Application 14-01-007

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CLEAN COALITION FOR
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 15-01-051**

Intervenor: Clean Coalition	For contribution to Decision (D.) 15-01-051
Claimed: \$72,642.50	Awarded: \$26,500.00 (reduced 63%)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJ: Regina M. DeAngelis

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	The decision approves the Green Tariff Shared Renewables (GTSR) programs of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Edison Company (SCE), pursuant to Senate Bill 43.
--	---

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 10, 2014*	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	Apr. 9, 2014	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, Clean Coalition timely filed the notice of intent to claim

		intervenor compensation.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-05-006	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 19, 2011	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, Clean Coalition demonstrated appropriate status.
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-05-006	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 19, 2011	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, Clean Coalition demonstrated significant financial hardship.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-12-035	D.15-01-051
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	Dec. 22, 2014	February 2, 2015
15. File date of compensation request:	Feb. 20, 2015	April 3, 2015
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, Clean Coalition timely filed the request for compensation.

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
I.B.1,2	This proceeding consists of the three utilities’ applications regarding the GTSR program. The proceedings were consolidated by ruling dated April 1, 2014. A scoping memo for	The Commission accepts this assertion.

	<p>the consolidated proceeding, dated Apr. 2, 2014, established the NOI filing date for the consolidated proceeding. Clean Coalition timely filed an NOI for the consolidated proceeding. Thus, the Clean Coalition believes all of its work in this proceeding is compensable. Some of the work was performed in the separate applications before the consolidation occurred.</p> <p>The first application in this proceeding was A.12-01-008, filed on Jan. 17, 2012. A Dec. 5, 2012 ruling in A.12-01-008 granted the Clean Coalition’s Motion to Late-File an NOI, giving a deadline of Dec. 14, 2012 in which to file the NOI. The Clean Coalition did not file an NOI in A.12-01-008 prior to the 2014 consolidation. The Clean Coalition also did not file an NOI in A.12-04-020 prior to the 2014 consolidation. A Sep. 26, 2012 Scoping Memo in A.12-04-020 established July 27, 2012 as the filing date for the NOI in that proceeding.</p>	
<p>I.B.5,9</p>	<p>In R.14-07-002, the ALJ requested an amended NOI, providing additional information to substantiate Clean Coalition’s customer status and showing of significant hardship. That amended NOI was filed on Mar. 19, 2015 in R.14-07-002 and copied to the intervenor compensation coordinator.</p>	<p>The Commission accepts this assertion.</p>

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

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

<p>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</p>	<p>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</p>	<p>CPUC Discussion</p>
--	---	-------------------------------

<p>1. Locational Value. The Clean Coalition urged that in valuing GTSR projects, that locational value be considered. As part of the requirement of non-participating ratepayer indifference, SB 43 requires that a GTSR ratepayer be debited or credited with all Commission approved costs and benefits. <i>See</i> Cal. Pub. Util. Code § 2831(m).</p> <p>The Clean Coalition documented a number of benefits that could be provided by small distributed generation, benefits such as: 1) Avoided Transmission Access Charges; 2) Avoided Future Transmission Increases; 3) Local Capacity Value; 4) Avoided Transmission System Impact Costs; and 5) Avoided Line Losses. <i>See</i> Clean Coalition Rebuttal Testimony Regarding PG&E and SDG&E’s Applications to Establish GTSR Programs (“Jan. 10, 2014 Testimony”), pp. 1-14.</p> <p>We argued that a proper valuation of GTSR projects required that the above “locational value” be credited to the GTSR project. <i>See</i> Clean Coalition’s Reply Comments to Opening Testimony by SDG&E and PG&E (“Dec. 20, 2013 Reply Comments”), pp. 5-9; Reply Brief of the Clean Coalition Regarding Proposals of PG&E and SDG&E (“Apr. 9, 2014 Reply Brief”), pp. 3-4; Opening Brief of the Clean Coalition Regarding SCE’s Application to Establish Green Rate and Community Renewables Program (“May 2</p>	<p>In considering what benefits should be credited to a GTSR project, the Commission considered Clean Coalition’s recommendation that credits be included that represent locational system benefits. <i>See</i> p. 125.</p> <p>The Commission required that locational grid benefits be authorized by a Commission proceeding first citing R.14-08-013, which the Commission designed for that purpose. R.14-08-013 was established subsequent to the Clean Coalition’s testimony addressing locational value and is informed by that testimony. Commission review of previously adopted Least Cost Best Fit bid evaluation practices is also anticipated. The Commission ordered the utilities to propose methodologies for calculating locational grid benefits via Advice Letter 60 days after a Commission decision in R.14-08-013. <i>See</i> p. 125-26; <i>see also</i> COL 61.</p>	<p>For explanation of adjustments related to substantial contributions, <i>see</i> Part III.D., below.</p>
---	---	--

<p>Brief”), pp. 3-13; Clean Coalition Comments on Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling Setting Status Conference and Reopening the Record (“Dec. 18, 2014 Comments”), pp. 5-7; Clean Coalition Comments on the Proposed Decision (“Jan. 20 2015 Comments on PD”), pp. 2-8; Clean Coalition Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision (“Jan. 26 2015 Reply Comments on PD”), pp. 9-10.</p>		
<p>2. Environmental Justice (“EJ”) The Clean Coalition advocated for a successful implementation of EJ Reservation.</p> <p>The Clean Coalition presented many recommendations regarding the EJ Reservation, including:</p> <p>The need to ensure that procurement for the EJ reservation occurs, including prioritized procurement and smaller project sizes. <i>See</i> Jan 10, 2014 Testimony, pp. 14-15; Clean Coalition Comments on PG&E’s Enhanced Local Community Renewables Proposal (“Mar. 7, 2014 Comments”), p. 7; Apr. 9, 2014 Reply Brief, p. 5.</p> <p>The need to ensure broad regional representation in the EJ Reservation. <i>See</i> Jan. 20, 2015 Comments on PD, pp. 10-13.</p>	<p>The Commission will consider strategies to ensure EJ Reservation procurement in Phase IV of the proceeding, including prioritized procurement and smaller project size. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 55-56.</p> <p>In response to Clean Coalition comments on the Proposed Decision, the Final Decision changed the selection of the census tracts selected for the EJ Reservation from a statewide 20% most disadvantaged selection, to a selection of 20% most disadvantaged within each service territory. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 54-55.</p> <p>The Commission will consider the</p>	<p><i>See</i> Part III.D., below.</p> <p>Yes.</p>

<p>The need to include race and ethnicity in the selection factors of the EJ Reservation, in order to ensure diverse communities are represented. <i>See</i> Jan. 20, 2015 Comments on PD, pp. 13-14; Mar. 7 Comments, p. 7, Jan. 26 Reply Comments on PD, p. 9.</p>	<p>inclusion of race and ethnicity in the selection factors of the EJ Reservation in Phase IV of the proceeding. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, p. 54.</p>	
<p>3. Procurement. The Clean Coalition argued for robust procurement processes for the GTSR Program, including set procurement goals and the use of ReMAT.</p> <p><i>See</i> Jan. 10 2014 Testimony, p. 15, Mar. 7 2014 Comments, p. 8, Jan. 26 Reply Comments on PD, pp. 4-8.</p>	<p>The Commission required advanced procurement goals, including requirements for EJ procurement, and utility advice letters delineating the plans for advanced procurement. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 27-28, 32-33.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>4. Diverse Projects. The Clean Coalition advocated that the GTSR program allow for many different business models. Size restrictions for GTSR projects should be removed, as smaller projects (less than 500 kW) may be more appropriate. <i>See</i> Mar. 7 2014 Comments, pp. 4-7.</p>	<p>The Commission will consider whether to allow projects smaller than 500 kW in Phase IV. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 36-37.</p> <p>The Commission will consider whether projects smaller than 500 kW are especially appropriate for the EJ Reservation. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 55-56.</p>	<p><i>See</i> Part III.D., below.</p>
<p>5. Community Proximity. The Clean Coalition presented and advocated for rules that enforced the SB 43 requirement that projects be located in reasonable proximity to subscribers. Regarding the Enhanced Community Renewables component, Clean Coalition presented rules and procedures that implemented the SB 43 requirement that projects be tied to a community.</p>	<p>The Commission found that the utility proposals implementing SB 43’s “reasonable proximity to subscribers” requirement were insufficient, and will further consider the issue in Phase IV. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 34-36.</p> <p>The Commission established some rules regarding community interest, and ordered further analysis in Phase IV. <i>See</i> D.15-01-051, pp. 67-69.</p>	<p><i>See</i> Part III.D., below.</p>

<p>See Jan. 10, 2014 Testimony, p. 14, Mar. 7, 2014 Comments, pp. 8-9, Jan. 20 2015 Comments on PD, pp. 9-10; Jan. 26 2015 Reply Comments, pp. 7-8.</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>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: Vote Solar, California Solar Energy Industries Association, the Solar Energy Industries Association, the Interstate Renewable Energy Council, California Environmental Justice Alliance (“CEJA”), Sustainable Economies Law Center (“SELC”).</p>		<p>Yes.</p>
<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: The parties cited above also supported the recognition of various benefits, similar to locational value, as part of the credits of a GTSR program. However, the locational values identified by Clean Coalition and by these parties were dissimilar. The methodology proposed by Clean Coalition to evaluate locational grid benefits are also different from the above parties, including general ratepayer and participant economic impact of energy delivery factors not raised by other parties. CEJA and SELC supported robust procurement for the EJ Reservation, similarly to the Clean Coalition. However, the perspectives of these parties were different. CEJA and SELC approached the issue as representatives of disadvantaged communities. The Clean Coalition approached the issue of EJ procurement and GTSR procurement in general from the perspective of experts in the development of small distributed generation policy. The Clean Coalition provided information regarding what is necessary to create a viable market for small distributed generation projects, and proper of the identification of disadvantaged communities within each service territory for siting generation resources.</p>		<p>Although there was considerable overlap in the recommendations of Intervenor and those of the other parties mentioned, Intervenor’s analysis was different. We therefore accept Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication.</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.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
<p>The Clean Coalition contributed to D.15-01-051 by providing information and expertise derived from our leading role in small distributed generation valuation, procurement, and development policy. We provided information about how to successfully procure the small distributed projects which the GTSR program may rely upon in fulfilling the requirements to locate generation in reasonable proximity to program participants, coordination with the forthcoming Distribution Resource Planning, avoiding transmission related costs, and in meeting the Enhanced Community Renewables and Environmental Justice procurement components.</p> <p>Our contributions will lead a proper valuation of GTSR projects, such that GTSR subscribers will have a more affordable rate. Thus, our contribution will lead to significant cost savings for thousands of GTSR subscribers.</p> <p>In addition, our testimony identified avoidable cost impacts associated with use of transmission capacity that impact all ratepayers. As noted, new transmission capacity has an average cost of \$1 Million per MW, and reducing future capacity requirements by a single MW represents a ratepayer value more than ten times greater than our total requested compensation.</p> <p>Our contributions will also contribute to successful procurement of projects for the GTSR program. The Commission and the utilities are charged with implementing GTSR programs, and they cannot be successfully implemented without adequate procurement.</p>	<p>For most of Intervenor’s work, determination of cost reasonableness (including efficiency and productivity) must be deferred because the Commission has not yet resolved most of the substantive issues that Intervenor addressed. <i>See also</i> Part III.D., below.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>The Clean Coalition contributed to D.15-01-051 in through our expertise in locational value and procurement processes, which formed the largest part of our contributions.</p> <p>The hours we claim for work in this proceeding represent a great deal of technical expertise. Although we have spent a significant amount of time</p>	<p>For most of the hours claimed, determination of the reasonableness must be deferred because the Commission has not yet resolved the substantive issues that Intervenor’s addressed. <i>See also</i></p>

<p>developing this expertise regarding locational value and procurement, only those staff hours spent specifically developing the recommendations for this proceeding are part of this compensation request.</p> <p>Director of Economics and Policy Analysis Kenneth Sahn White provided most of the staff hours regarding locational value. He also drafted the testimony in the proceeding. This testimony was not disputed, although Mr. White was required to appear for cross examination. Mr. White’s requested rates of \$290 and \$300 reflect the significant level of expertise he has developed working on energy issues over more than 15 years, including 5 years practicing in front of the Commission.</p> <p>Policy Director Stephanie Wang drafted comments and briefs through the majority of this proceeding. We are requesting a rate increase of \$25 for Ms. Wang in 2014 to reflect a step increase as well as a cost-of-living adjustment from her hourly rate of \$305 in 2013. Ms. Wang’s resume is attached.</p> <p>Policy Director Enrique Gallardo prepared the final rounds of comments in this proceeding as well as the intervenor compensation claim. Mr. Gallardo has extensive experience before the Commission, and is very efficient in his work.</p>	<p>Part III.D., below.</p>
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>The request for compensation is divided into three issues: 1) Locational Value; 2) Environmental Justice; 3) Procurement; 4) Diverse Projects; and 5) Community Proximity. This was the most efficient and coherent division into issues. The Clean Coalition also provided other, smaller contributions regarding a myriad of issues in this proceeding, but we have simplified the claim here.</p>	<p>In addition to these five (not three) issues, Intervenor also allocates time to “General.” We find the allocation of hours by issue to be reasonable.</p>

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Kenneth Sahn White	2013	5	\$290	D.13-12-023 and ALJ-287	\$1,450.00	2.50	\$285.00	\$712.50
Kenneth Sahn White	2014	43.75	\$300	D.13-12-023 and ALJ-303	\$13,125.00	9.25	\$290.00	\$2,682.50

Kenneth Sahm White	2015	10.75	\$310	D.13-12-023 and ALJ-303	\$3,332.50	1.75	\$290.00	\$507.50
Stephanie Wang	2013	28.25	\$330	D.14-12-075 and ALJ-303	\$9,322.50	10.75	\$305.00	\$3,278.75
Stephanie Wang	2014	69.5	\$340	D.14-12-075 and ALJ-303	\$23,630.00	20.25	\$315.00	\$,6378.75
Enrique Gallardo	2014	13.2	\$400	D.14-12-068	\$5,280.00	4.2	\$400.00	\$1,680.00
Enrique Gallardo	2015	36.7	\$410	D.14-12-068 and ALJ-303	\$15,047.00	24.6	\$400.00	\$9,840.00
Subtotal: \$71,187.00						Subtotal: \$25,080.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Enrique Gallardo	2015	7.1	\$205	D.14-12-068 and ALJ-303	\$1,455.50	7.1	\$200.00	\$1,420.00
Subtotal: \$1,455.50						Subtotal: \$1,420.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$72,642.50						TOTAL AWARD: 26,500.00		
<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>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ²	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Enrique Gallardo	December 1997	191670	No
Stephanie Wang	September 29, 2008	257437	No

C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
Part II.A	<p>Today's decision awards compensation to Intervenor for work that contributed to several procedural determinations in D.15-01-051 on several issues on which intervenors had made substantive recommendations that we will resolve in later decisions. Because the Commission has not yet responded to those substantive recommendations, the Intervenor should renew its request for compensation in subsequent claim(s) filed after the decision(s) in which the Commission resolves the substantive issues related to those recommendations. The later claim(s) must be limited to hours that are not specifically allowed or disallowed in today's decision.</p> <p>Today's decision also awards compensation to Intervenor for work on two substantive issues that D.15-01-051 <u>did</u> address. Intervenor's arguments related to procurement made a substantial contribution, and today's decision awards compensation for all of Intervenor's hours allocated to that issue.</p> <p>Intervenor also made a substantial contribution on the appropriate method for selecting census tracts for purposes of the Environmental Justice Reservation. However, the work on selecting census tracts appears to be a relatively small subset of Intervenor's hours devoted to Environmental Justice, and intervenor's time records are not sufficiently specific to enable us to disaggregate hours devoted to the census tract issue. Intervenor's arguments on this issue appear chiefly in its January 20, 2015 Comments on the Proposed Decision (PD). Thus, today's decisions awards compensation for the 11.65 hours allocated to work on Environmental Justice as addressed in the PD.</p> <p>Intervenor is also awarded compensation for its contribution to the procedural determinations in D.15-01-051. There is no exact way to measure Intervenor's hours for this purpose, largely because Intervenor devoted its arguments and analysis to the underlying substantive issues in anticipation that the Commission would decide them now rather than defer them until later. Nevertheless, the Commission, by ruling that it would resolve these substantive issues at a later time, essentially agreed with Intervenor's emphasis on the importance of these issues. A reasonable way to</p>

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

	<p>compensate Intervenor for its contribution to the rulings is to award compensation now to these hours allocated to “General” (a total of 33.20 hours). Such hours typically do not focus on a particular issue but instead serve to acquaint the Intervenor with the background of a proceeding, study the positions of the other parties, and preform similar activities necessary for effective participation.</p> <p>To summarize today’s award, we allow full compensation for a total of 72.30 hours. We also allow full compensation for 7.1 hours that Intervenor requests for preparation of its compensation claim. As discussed below, we disallow 6.0 hours that Intervenor claims for travel time. We disallow <u>without prejudice</u> the remaining 127.85 hours in Intervenor’s claim for compensation. With respect to these 127.85 hours, Intervenor may renew its request for an award of compensation when the Commission resolved the issues that it has deferred by procedural rulings in D.15-01-051. Intervenor of course must demonstrate in its renewal request that the work reflected in these hours made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the issues.</p>
Miscellaneous	<p>Today’s decision disallows travel time of 6.0 hours claimed by K. Sahn White. The travel (approximately 82 miles each way) is within the distance considered as a normal, routine commute.</p> <p>Today’s decision also adjusts downwards the hourly rates requested for K. Sahn White (2013, 2014, and 2015), S. Wang (2013 and 2014), and E. Gallardo (2015). The hourly rates awarded are consistent with prior decisions addressing the work of these representatives in the respective time periods (<i>see</i> D.15-07-023 [K. Sahn White]; D.15-06-027 [S. Wang], and Resolution ALJ-308 (March 26, 2015), in which the Commission determined not to apply a cost-of-living adjustment for work performed in 2015).</p>

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS
Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff
or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

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

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion
	No comments were filed.	

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Clean Coalition has made a substantial contribution to D.15-01-051.

2. The requested hourly rates for Clean Coalition'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 \$26,500.00.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.
2. Clean Coalition may seek compensation for hours in this claim that were devoted to issues which the Commission ruled in D.15-01-051 would be considered in later decisions.
3. To facilitate prompt payment of the award, today's decision should be made effective immediately.

ORDER

1. Clean Coalition shall be awarded \$26,500.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric, and Southern California Edison Company shall pay Clean Coalition their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional 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 June 17, 2015, the 75th day after the filing of Clean Coalition's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.
4. As set forth in Part III.D and Conclusion of Law 2, above, Clean Coalition may renew its claim for compensation for up to 127.85 hours that are disallowed without prejudice in today's decision. In renewing its claim, Clean Coalition must demonstrate that it made substantial contributions to the Commission's eventual resolution of the issues deferred in D.15-01-051.
5. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, 2015, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX
Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1501051		
Proceeding(s):	A1201008, A1204020, A1401007		
Author:	ALJ DeAngelis		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric, and Southern California Edison Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Clean Coalition	04/03/2015	\$72,642.50	\$26,500.00	N/A	See Disallowances & Adjustments, above.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Kenneth Sahn White	White	Expert	Clean Coalition	\$290.00	2013	\$285.00
Kenneth Sahn White	White	Expert	Clean Coalition	\$300.00	2014	\$290.00
Kenneth Sahn White	White	Expert	Clean Coalition	\$310.00	2015	\$290.00
Stephanie Wang	Wang	Attorney	Clean Coalition	\$330.00	2013	\$305.00
Stephanie Wang	Wang	Attorney	Clean Coalition	\$340.00	2014	\$315.00
Enrique Gallardo	Gallardo	Attorney	Clean Coalition	\$400.00	2014	\$400.00
Enrique Gallardo	Gallardo	Attorney	Clean Coalitions	\$410.00	2015	\$400.00

(END OF APPENDIX)