

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company To Revise Its  
Electric Marginal Costs, Revenue Allocation, and Rate Design.  
(U39M)Application 13-04-012  
(Filed April 18, 2013)**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM  
NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 15-08-005**

<b>Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 15-08-005</b>
<b>Claimed: \$ 127,697.04</b>	<b>Awarded: \$127,697.04</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Stephen C. Roscow</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	D.15-08-005 adopts eight separate settlements relating to Pacific Gas and Electric Company's electric marginal costs, revenue allocation and rate design as proposed by the settling parties and resolves the remaining outstanding issues based on the merits of the litigated positions.
--	--

**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):	June 3, 2013	Verified.
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	July 2, 2013	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, The Utility Reform Network (TURN) timely filed the notice of intent to claim intervenor compensation.

<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.12-11-009	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, TURN demonstrated appropriate status.
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.12-11-009	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	September 6, 2013	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, TURN demonstrated significant financial hardship.
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.15-08-005	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	August 18, 2015	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	October 19, 2015	Verified.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, TURN timely filed the request for intervenor compensation. The 60th day following the date of issuance of the Decision fell on a Saturday, allowing TURN to file on the following Monday (October 19, 2015). See Rule 1.15, CPUC Rules of Practice and Procedure.

**C. Additional Comments on Part I (use line reference # as appropriate):**

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
5-7	The Commission did not issue a formal ruling on TURN’s customer status in A.13-04-012 in response to TURN’s Notice of Intent to claim compensation.	Verified. The Ruling A.12-11-009 satisfies the Commission’s requirements of customer/customer-related status and significant financial hardship.

**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>1. MARGINAL COSTS AND REVENUE ALLOCATION</b></p> <p>TURN offered a comprehensive showing through prepared testimony on marginal cost issues (customer, distribution, generation) and revenue allocation. Because these issues were resolved through a comprehensive “black box” settlement, many of the particular disputes between parties were not resolved with any specificity.</p> <p>Under the revenue allocations recommended by various parties, the residential class would have received changes ranging from increases of 0.6% (PG&amp;E) to 2.7% (CLECA). TURN recommended a 2.0% decrease for bundled service residential customers (after the application of a cap). The adopted settlement limits the bundled residential class increase to 0.5% and caps changes to non-residential bundled customer classes to a maximum decrease of 0.78% and a maximum increase of no more 0.95%.</p> <p>TURN opposed PG&amp;E’s proposal</p>	<p><u>Testimony of Bill Marcus on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation, December 13, 2013.</u></p> <p><u>Direct Testimony of Jeff Nahigian on Marginal Customer Costs and the ET Submetering Discount, December 13, 2013, pages 1-15.</u></p> <p><u>Revenue Allocation and Marginal Cost settlement, page 9</u></p> <p><u>Ex. PG&amp;E-4, Volume 1, page 1-13.</u></p> <p><u>CLECA testimony, December 13, 2013, page 75</u></p> <p><u>Testimony of Bill Marcus on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation, December 13, 2013, page A-46.</u></p> <p><u>Revenue Allocation and Marginal Cost settlement, pages 9-11.</u></p>	<p>Verified.</p> <p>TURN’s representation of the terms of the settlement approved in D.15-08-005 is accurate and its description of its prior litigation positions is also accurate. Pursuant to (D.) 94-10-029, the Commission has discretion to award compensation to parties who participated in settlement agreements, when there is a finding that they made a substantial contribution to a decision. We find that TURN’s participation in the settlement made a substantial</p>

<p>to allocate the CPUC fee revenue requirement using an Equal Percentage of Marginal Costs for Distribution revenues and proposed an equal cents per kWh allocation. The settlement calls for the CPUC Fee revenue requirement to be allocated on an equal cents per kWh basis and collected in distribution rates.</p> <p>The adopted settlement does not adopt any specific marginal cost principles or proposals as the basis for revenue allocation. Revenue allocation was performed as part of a “black box” approach to achieving consensus on the results. However, the settlement does identify certain marginal costs to be used for very limited purposes. In testimony, TURN calculated a variety of marginal costs. For residential marginal customer access costs, TURN calculated \$60.01/customer/year while PG&amp;E proposed \$70.16 and CLECA proposed \$172.89. The settlement identifies, for limited purposes, residential marginal customer access costs of \$73.72. Other marginal costs also settled between the values in proposals made by TURN and other settling parties.</p>	<p><u>Testimony of Bill Marcus on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation, December 13, 2013, page 41.</u></p> <p><u>Revenue Allocation and Marginal Cost settlement, page 15.</u></p> <p><u>D.15-08-005</u></p> <p><u>Testimony of Bill Marcus on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation, December 13, 2013, pages 13-26, 41</u></p> <p><u>Revenue Allocation and Marginal Cost settlement, Appendix A, page A3.</u></p> <p><u>D.15-08-005.</u></p>	<p>contribution to D.15-08-005.</p>
<p><b>2. RES RATES / MASTER METER SUBMETERING DISCOUNT</b></p> <p>TURN proposed a base discount for Master Meter Mobile Home Park customers served under Schedule ET of \$7.70 per dwelling space per month. By comparison, PG&amp;E proposed a base discount of \$8.43, the Office of Ratepayer Advocated proposed \$9.12 and the Western</p>	<p><u>Direct Testimony of Jeff Nahigian on Marginal Customer Costs and the ET Submetering Discount, December 13, 2013, pages 16-21.</u></p> <p><u>Prepared Direct Testimony of the Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association, December 13, 2013, page 3.</u></p> <p><u>Residential Rate Design Settlement</u></p>	<p>Verified.</p> <p>TURN’s representation of the terms of the settlement approved in D.15-08-005 is accurate and its description of its prior litigation positions is also accurate. Pursuant to</p>

<p>Manufactured Housing Communities Association (WMA) proposed \$15.23. The adopted settlement includes a Base ET Discount of \$8.58 per dwelling space per month.</p> <p>In addition, the settlement declines to adopt the WMA proposal to modify Schedule ET Special Condition #9 relating to the definition of costs recoverable via adjustments to rental payments. TURN opposed this change and would have opposed this proposal in rebuttal testimony had the issue not been addressed in settlement.</p> <p><u>See Comment #1</u></p> <p>TURN also agreed that the requirements of Decision 11-12-053 (Ordering Paragraph 23), relating to the development of a methodology to collect data for actual MHP connection costs, had been satisfied by PG&amp;E's actions and showing in this proceeding.</p> <p><u>See Comment #1</u></p>	<p><u>Agreement, page vi.</u> <u>D.15-08-005, page 10.</u></p> <p><u>Prepared Direct Testimony of the Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association, December 13, 2013, pages 42-46.</u></p> <p><u>Residential Rate Design Settlement Agreement, page viii</u> <u>D.15-08-005, page 10.</u></p> <p><u>Motion of Settlement Parties for Adoption of Residential Rate Design Supplemental Settlement Agreement, July 24, 2014, Settlement pages x-xi</u> <u>D.15-08-005, page 10.</u></p>	<p>D.94-10-029, the Commission has discretion to award compensation to parties who participated in settlement agreements, when there is a finding that they made a substantial contribution to a decision. We find that TURN's participation in the settlement made a substantial contribution to D.15-08-005.</p>
<p><b>3. SMALL LIGHT AND POWER FIXED CHARGE</b></p> <p>TURN opposed PG&amp;E's proposal changes to the fixed charges for Schedule A-1, A-6 and A-15 basic service fees for single-phase customers from \$10 per month to \$20, and to increase the charge for olyphaser service from \$20 per month to \$30 per month. Although TURN did not serve direct testimony on this issue, TURN did enter into settlement negotiations and joined the small commercial rate design settlement. The settlement does not include PG&amp;E's proposal and instead retains the current fixed charge levels for single/olyphaser</p>	<p><u>Motion Of The Settling Parties For Adoption Of Small Commercial Rate Design Settlement Agreement, September 5, 2014, page 3</u> <u>D.15-08-005, page 17.</u></p>	<p>Verified.</p> <p>TURN's representation of the terms of the settlement approved in D.15-08-005 is accurate and its description of its prior litigation positions is also accurate. Pursuant to D.94-10-029, the Commission has discretion to award compensation to parties who</p>

<p>customers in Schedules A-1 and A-6. The settlement was adopted by the Commission.</p> <p><u>See Comment #1</u></p>		<p>participated in settlement agreements, when there is a finding that they made a substantial contribution to a decision. We find that TURN's participation in the settlement made a substantial contribution to D.15-08-005.</p>
<p><b>4. E-CREDIT SETTLEMENT</b></p> <p>TURN prepared testimony critiquing changes made by PG&amp;E to its revenue cycle services model used to calculate the Marginal Customer Access Costs which are relevant to the calculation of a reasonable E-CREDIT. TURN joined the original and amended E-CREDIT settlement agreement governing the direct access and community choice aggregation service fees and credits. The settlement was adopted by the Commission.</p>	<p><u>Direct Testimony of Jeff Nahigian on Marginal Customer Costs and the ET Submetering Discount, December 13, 2013, pages 1-14.</u></p> <p><u>Motion of the settling parties for adoption of an E-Credit Rate Design Settlement Agreement, August 29, 2014</u></p> <p><u>D.15-08-005, page 13.</u></p>	<p>Verified.</p> <p>TURN's representation of the terms of the settlement approved in D.15-08-005 is accurate and its description of its prior litigation positions is also accurate. Pursuant to D.94-10-029, the Commission has discretion to award compensation to parties who participated in settlement agreements, when there is a finding that they made a substantial contribution to a decision. We find that TURN's participation in the settlement made a substantial contribution to D.15-08-005.</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>	<b>Yes</b>	Verified.
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	<b>Yes</b>	Verified.
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> Greenlining Institute, Center for Affordable Technologies		Agreed. However, “Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)” is the correct name of the intervenor.
<b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b>  Apart from ORA, no other active party in this proceeding represented the interests of residential bundled customers. TURN was the only representative solely focused on the impacts to the residential class. All other parties in the case represented the interests of other customer classes.  TURN played a leading role in the development of both the marginal cost and revenue allocation settlement and the residential rate design supplemental settlement. In the marginal cost and revenue allocation settlement, TURN provided unique technical expertise (in the form of Bill Marcus) and coordinated with ORA and other intervenors to achieve an acceptable outcome on all disputed issues. TURN’s involvement was critical to achievement of that settlement.  In the residential rate design supplemental settlement, the only active parties addressing the Master Meter Mobile Home Park Schedule ET discount were TURN, ORA, PG&E and WMA. TURN worked with these parties to find an acceptable resolution of the ET discount and helped all parties to avoid extensive litigation. TURN was also the only representative of the residential class involved in the Small Commercial rate settlement and was the only party focused on preventing increases to fixed customer charges.  Given that TURN served as the sole voice uniquely representing the residential class, the Commission should not conclude that any reductions in compensation are warranted based on duplication of effort.		Verified.

<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.

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

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion
1	Settlement discussions were initiated before the submission of direct testimony and no rebuttal testimony was submitted by either TURN or other parties. As a result, TURN did not formally address (in testimony) certain issues raised by other parties in direct testimony that were the subject of settlement negotiations. As a result, a number of issues that would have been expressly identified and explained in TURN’s rebuttal testimony were instead resolved in the settlement.	Verified.

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<p>As demonstrated in the substantial contribution section, TURN’s participation led to substantial savings for residential ratepayers. Monetary benefits from TURN’s contribution include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The revenue allocation settlement led to a 0.5% increase in the residential customer allocation of overall revenues, a far smaller increase than was proposed by many parties.</li> <li>• The Schedule ET submetering discount was maintained at a reasonable level, thereby benefiting PG&amp;E residential customers who would otherwise be forced to pay higher rates in the event that the higher discount level sought by WMA had been approved.</li> <li>• The fixed customer charge for A-6/A-10 customers was not increased, thereby protecting smaller commercial users and preserving key incentives for conservation and efficiency.</li> </ul> <p>Taken together, the benefits obtained by TURN far exceed the cost of TURN’s participation in the proceeding. TURN’s claim should be found to be reasonable.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>CPUC Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Verified.</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>Given the breadth and depth of TURN’s contributions to the final resolution of issues incorporated into settlements adopted by the Commission, the amount of time devoted by its staff and consultants is fully reasonable.</p> <p>TURN retained the services of JBS Energy to assist with the preparation of testimony on a wide range of issues. JBS Energy consultants, led by Bill Marcus, have extensive experience in Phase 2 General Rate Cases and were able to effectively analyze very challenging data. Bill Marcus prepared testimony on marginal distribution demand costs, marginal customer costs, marginal generation capacity costs, marginal energy costs, and revenue allocation. Mr. Marcus devoted substantial time to settlement</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>negotiations on Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation. In that process, several key individuals were designated by the entire settlement group as leads who could work through details and develop a framework for agreement. Bill Marcus was one of these key people without whom a final settlement may not have been possible. Mr. Marcus also assisted with settlements on Small Commercial Rate Design and Residential Rate Design.</p> <p>JBS Energy consultant Jeff Nahigian prepared testimony on Marginal Customer Access costs and the Master Meter Mobile Home Park Schedule ET discount. Mr. Nahigian was critical to the achievement of a residential rate design settlement that resolved the Schedule ET discount.</p> <p>JBS Energy consultant John Sugar performed analysis on marginal cost data to assist Bill Marcus and Jeff Nahigian in the preparation of testimony on marginal customer costs, marginal generation and energy costs, marginal customer access costs, and marginal distribution costs. JBS Energy consultant Garrick Jones provided assistance on value of service issues to assist Bill Marcus with settlement negotiations.</p> <p>The legal, policy and technical issues addressed in this proceeding were extremely complex and, in some instances, required time by different TURN attorneys due to the unique expertise held by different individuals. Matthew Freedman was the lead attorney for TURN in this proceeding. Mr. Freedman drafted pleadings, reviewed and edited testimony, and participated in settlement negotiations. Mr. Freedman was assisted by several other TURN attorneys over the course of the proceeding. Robert Finkelstein assisted with reviewing and editing draft testimony and covering case management when Mr. Freedman was unavailable. Hayley Goodson assisted with reviewing discovery, coordinating with PG&amp;E, and reviewing and editing draft testimony on marginal costs and the Schedule ET discount. Marcel Hawiger assisted with certain discovery tasks and working with JBS Energy on marginal cost issues.</p> <p>Given the critical role played by TURN in achieving several adopted settlements, the Commission should find that the number of hours claimed for each of its experts and attorneys is fully reasonable.</p> <p><u>Pre-application work</u> This request includes a small number of hours relating to meetings with PG&amp;E and other parties prior to the filing of the application. These hours related to meetings that were convened by PG&amp;E to inform parties of specific issues relevant to the upcoming application and solicit input.</p> <p><u>Compensation Request</u> TURN’s request also includes 12 hours devoted to the preparation of compensation-related filings. The time devoted to this compensation request is appropriate and should be found to be reasonable.</p>	
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>TURN has allocated all of our attorney and consultant time by issue area or activity, as evident on our attached timesheets. The following codes relate to 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>Verified.</p>

<p><b>GP – 48.73 hours – 10% of total</b></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><b>MC – 273.64 hours – 53% of total</b></p> <p>Work on marginal cost issues including data requests, model development, and preparation of testimony on marginal customer costs, marginal distribution costs, marginal generation costs, and marginal customer access costs. These issues were resolved in the Marginal Cost and Revenue Allocation settlement.</p> <p><b>RA – 19.13 hours – 6% of total</b></p> <p>Work on the calculation of inter-class revenue allocation. These issues were resolved in the marginal cost and revenue allocation settlement.</p> <p><b>ET – 94.75 hours – 19% of total</b></p> <p>Includes work on Schedule ET discount issues for Master Meter customers serving mobile home park submetered tenants and related Schedule ES discount issues.</p> <p><b>SETT/MCRA – 45.33 hours – 9% of total</b></p> <p>Work on the marginal cost and revenue allocation settlement.</p> <p><b>SETT/RES – 5.58 hours – 1% of total</b></p> <p>Work on the residential rate design settlement including the ET submetering discount.</p> <p><b>SETT/SMLP – 8.5 hours – 2% of total</b></p> <p>Work on the small commercial rate design settlement.</p> <p><b>SETT/ECREDIT – 2.58 hours – 1% of total</b></p> <p>Work on the E-Credit rate design settlement.</p> <p><b>COMP – 12 hours</b></p> <p>Work preparing TURN’s notice of intent to claim compensation and the final request for compensation.</p> <p>TURN submits that under the circumstances this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission’s rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.</p>	
--	--

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Matthew Freedman	2013	13	400	D.14-11-019	5,200.00	13.0	400.00	5,200.00
Matthew Freedman	2014	35.5	410	D.14-11-019, RESOLUTION ALJ-303	14,555.00	35.5	410.00	14,555.00
Matthew Freedman	2015	3.5	410	D.14-11-019, RESOLUTION ALJ-303; <i>See</i> Comment #1	1,435.00	3.5	410.00	1,435.00
Robert Finkelstein	2013	2.75	490	D.14-05-015	1,347.50	2.75	490.00	1,347.50
Robert Finkelstein	2014	1	505	D.15-08-023	505.00	1	505.00	505.00
Hayley Goodson	2013	17.25	345	D.14-05-015	5,951.25	17.25	345.00	5,951.25
Marcel Hawiger	2013	2.75	400	D.14-05-015	1,100.00	2.75	400.00	1,100.00
John Sugar	2013	119.5	210	D.14-05-015	25,095.00	119.50	210.00	25,095.00
John Sugar	2014	9.16	210	D.14-05-015	1,923.60	9.16	215.00 Res. ALJ-303	1,923.60
Jeff Nahigian	2012	0.75	200	D.13-08-022	150.00	0.75	200.00	150.00
Jeff Nahigian	2013	194.25	205	D.14-05-015	39,821.25	194.25	205.00	39,821.25
Jeff Nahigian	2014	22	205	D.14-05-015	4,510.00	22.0	210.00 D.15-08-023	4,510.00
William Marcus	2012	2.75	260	D.13-08-022	715.00	2.75	260.00	715.00
William Marcus	2013	56.17	265	D.14-05-015	14,885.05	56.17	265.00	14,885.05
William Marcus	2014	28.74	265	D.14-05-015	7,616.10	28.74	270.00 D.15-05-027	7,616.10
Garrick	2013	2.5	155	D.14-05-015	387.50	2.5	160.00	387.50

Jones							D.15-08-023	
<b>Subtotal: \$125,197.25</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$ 125,197.25</b>		
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Matthew Freedman	2013	1	\$200	D.14-11-019 (@ 50% of \$400)	200.00	1	200.00	200.00
Matthew Freedman	2015	11	\$205	D.14-11-019 (@ 50% of \$400); See Comment #1	2,255.00	11	205.00	2,255.00
<b>Subtotal: \$2,455.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$2,455.00</b>		
<b>COSTS</b>								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1	Copies	Copies for pleadings			31.40	31.40		
2	Phone	Costs of phone calls relating to this proceeding			0.83	0.83		
3	Postage	Costs of mailing copies of pleadings and testimony			12.56	12.56		
<b>Subtotal: \$44.79</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$44.79</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$127,697.04</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$127,697.04</b>		
<p>**We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate.</p>								

<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation</b>
Matthew Freedman	March 29, 2001	214812	No
Robert Finkelstein	June 13, 1990	146391	No
Hayley Goodson	December 5, 2003	228535	No
Marcel Hawiger	January 23, 1998	194244	No

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

<b>Comment #</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comment(s)</b>
Comment 1	<p><b>2015 Hourly Rate for Matthew Freedman</b></p> <p>TURN seeks compensation for Mr. Freedman’s 2015 work 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. TURN made a similar request for Mr. Freedman’s 2015 in its compensation request submitted in A.12-12-012/A.12-12-013.</p>

**D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reason</b>

**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))**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. TURN has made a substantial contribution to D.15-08-005.
2. The requested hourly rates for TURN's representatives, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$127,697.04.

**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 is awarded \$127,697.04.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay Intervenor the total award. 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 January 02, 2016, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Intervenor's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, 2015, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX**  
**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1508005		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R1304012		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Roscow		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and 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>
The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	10/19/2015	\$127,697.00	\$127,697.04	N/A	See CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

**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>
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	\$400.00	2013	\$400.00
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	\$410.00	2014	\$410.00
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	TURN	\$410.00	2015	\$410.00
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$490.00	2013	\$490.00
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$505.00	2014	\$505.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	TURN	\$345.00	2013	\$345.00
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	\$400.00	2013	\$400.00
John	Sugar	Expert	TURN	\$210.00	2013	\$210.00
John	Sugar	Expert	TURN	\$210.00	2014	\$215.00
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	TURN	\$200.00	2012	\$200.00
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	TURN	\$205.00	2013	\$205.00
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	TURN	\$205.00	2014	\$210.00
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$260.00	2012	\$260.00
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$265.00	2013	\$265.00
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	\$265.00	2014	\$270.00
Garrick	Jones	Expert	TURN	\$155.00	2013	\$160.00

**(END OF APPENDIX)**