Decision 16-06-049 June 23, 2016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Alternative-Fueled Vehicle Programs, Tariffs, and Policies.	Rulemaking 13-11-007 (Filed November 14, 2013)
And Related Matter.	Application 14-04-014 (Filed April 11, 2014)

DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE GREEN POWER INSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS 14-12-079 AND 16-01-045

Intervenor: Green Power Institute	**For contribution to Decisions: D.14-12-079, D.16-01-045**
Claimed: $170,239	**Awarded: $163,306.00**
Assigned Commissioner: Carla Peterman	**Assigned ALJ: John S. Wong**

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision D.14-12-079 establishes policy to expand the role of the IOUs in EV infrastructure development. Decision D.16-01-045 approves a scaled down version of SDG&E's vehicle grid integration pilot.

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):	February 11, 2014	No. February 26, 2014.
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	March 7, 2014	No. March 28, 2014.
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, The Green Power Institute (GPI) timely filed the notice of intent to claim intervenor

		compensation, despite providing the Commission with incorrect information.
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.13-11-007	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 29, 2014	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, GPI demonstrated appropriate status.
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.13-11-007	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 29, 2014	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, GPI demonstrated significant financial hardship.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.16-01-045	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	February 4, 2016	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	April 1, 2016	Verified.
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, GPI timely filed the request for intervenor compensation.

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

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
	In addition to the NOI we filed in R.13-11-007, as detailed above, we also timely filed an NOI in A.14-04-014 on Sept. 15, 2014, before it was consolidated with R.13-11-007. A Ruling was issued on Sept. 26, 2014, in	Verified.

	A.14-04-014, affirming our showing of customer status and 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
D.14-12-079 in R.13-11-007 establishes policy to expand the role of the IOUs in EV infrastructure development.	(Please note that Attachment 2 includes a list of issue areas, and of GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.)	
Allow direct role for utilities in EV charging infrastructure: GPI offered detailed recommendations on Phase 1, Question 2, as to whether the utilities should be given the ability to take a direct role in EV charging infrastructure ownership, and how the Commission should interpret its rule for a specific showing of "market failure" or "underserved markets." We argued that the Commission should maintain the balancing test governing when utilities could become directly involved in owning EV charging infrastructure, and we offered detailed recommendations on how these rules should be fleshed out beyond their brief initial delineation in D.11-07-029. The Commission agreed with us and other parties that it should maintain the balancing test, and that the utilities should be given the chance to make a showing as to why they should be allowed a more direct role in EV charging infrastructure ownership, which is contrary	The Decision agreed in part with our recommendations by continuing the balancing test for IOU ownership of EV charging infrastructure, but modified it to allow case-specific determinations. The Decision did not address our recommendations in terms of fleshing out the meaning of "market failure" or "underserved markets," because these terms were eliminated from the revised rule. (Decision, p. 4) We also note that the Commission agreed with us and with other parties that the utilities should be given the opportunity to make their case for expanded ownership opportunities: "We agree with the majority of comments received, and endorse an expanded role for utility activity in developing and supporting PEV charging infrastructure." (Decision, p. 4). With respect to how "market failure" and "underserved markets" should be interpreted, the Decision concluded: "This decision reaffirms the balancing test applied in D.11-07-029, that the benefits of utility ownership of PEV charging infrastructure must be balanced against the competitive limitation that may result from that ownership. However, we eliminate the necessity of a showing that, but for the utility program, a market failure or underserved market would result, or if already in existence, would continue." (P. 5)	Verified. Verified, at 5. Verified.

to the determination in D.11-07-029. In the Decision the Commission eliminated the "market failure" and "underserved market" rules entirely in favor of a case-specific determination, which cleared the way for the utility EV program applications. While the Commission did not adopt all of our recommendations, we made a substantial contribution on the key issue of utility ownership of charging infrastructure with our detailed recommendations and participation in this proceeding in workshops, briefings and collaboration with other parties, which has been an ongoing process over the last five years.		
Support participation of NEM in submetering pilots, and support electric bus pilot: GPI has long pointed out the nexus between PV ownership and EV ownership. We have argued consistently in the EV proceeding and in relation to the pilot applications for full consideration for the participation of PV owners on NEM tariffs in the pilots. Draft Resolution E-4561 proposed reducing NEM customer participation in the EV pilots from 25% to 10%. We urged the Commission to maintain the 25% level. The final resolution left the proposed change out, thus maintaining the 25% level.	Resolution E-4561 deletes the proposal in the draft resolution to reduce NEM customer participation in the EV pilots from 25% to 10%. Resolution E-4628 approves PG&E's proposed 3-year pilot program for electric busses.	Verified.

GPI supported PG&E's proposed 3-year pilot program for electric busses, and recommended that during the pilot preparations should be made for giving transit agencies the assurances they need to start planning for electric buses today. GPI made substantial contributions to both maintaining the level of NEM participation in the EV pilots, and implementation of the PG&E bus pilot.		
Decision D.16-01-045 in A.14-04-014 approves a scaled down version of SDG&E's vehicle grid integration pilot.		
GPI was involved from the outset of the Application with SDG&E's proposed EV pilot, supporting it at first in principle, and eventually joining the proposed Settlement Agreement. After the PD was issued we supported the Commission's proposed 2016 VGI Pilot alternative given that the Commission rejected the proposed settlement. GPI diligently pushed for less anti-competitive program design elements with respect to SDG&E's proposed ownership of chargers. We also pushed steadily for an increased focus on education and outreach because of declining sales of EVs in California. We describe each issue below as much as we are able to, given that	The Decision describes GPI's contributions in detail on pages 53 - 57.	Verified.

settlement negotiations were part of this proceeding and are confidential. The GPI made multiple substantial contributions to D.16-01-045, discussed below, by providing Testimony and Comments on SDG&E's original proposed pilot, and later by joining in the settlement agreement when some of our issues were incorporated into the agreement.		
IOU ownership of Charging infrastructure: GPI argued in our direct and rebuttal testimony that SDG&E should adopt the "make ready" approach proposed by SCE. After modifications to SDG&E's program were made during settlement negotiations, GPI supported instead the hybrid ownership approach that provided more customer choice and less anti-competitive impacts in the charging market than the pure utility ownership model. (Decision, pg. 55, GPI direct testimony, pp. 9-10).	The Commission did not agree with our initial recommendations regarding utility ownership, but did opt to allow the hybrid ownership approach from the settlement, which does provide an element of customer choice about equipment and vendors, and which GPI supported, to be the ownership structure in the 2016 VGI Pilot. (Decision, pp. 103-118.)	Verified.
Education and outreach: GPI initially argued that SDG&E's E&O budget should be expanded because all they had budgeted was a nominal amount for reaching out to potential site hosts. We also argued that SDG&E's program should include 3rd party E&O efforts, based on strong Commission precedent regarding Energy Upgrade California being the required	The Decision agreed in part with our recommendations on E&O by requiring a number of additional measures in SDG&E's E&O activities (pp. 148-149). The Commission did not agree with our recommendations for a focus on third-party E&O activities. We await action on our Motion in R.13-11-007 to open a new track on E&O.	Verified.

entity to manage all demand-side E&O efforts. When we signed onto the Settlement Agreement we compromised on our desire to expand E&O activities within the pilot, and in order to buttress our desire for increased E&O, we filed a Joint Motion to open a new track in the EV rulemaking (R.13-11-007) on E&O. Finally, we commented on the PD's apparent misperception about the nature and scope of the E&O activities it was prescribing in its detailed program. (Decision, pp. 56-57; GPI rebuttal testimony, pp. 3-4; GPI opening and reply comments on PD).		
Size of the SDG&E pilot program: In reply testimony, GPI argued that a reasonable middle ground for the size of the proposed program was 3,000 chargers at 300 locations. This is very close to what the final decision adopted in its 2016 VGI Pilot alternative to the settlement. (Decision, pp. 56-57, GPI rebuttal testimony, pp. 18-19.)	The Decision, in considering all of the parties' comments about the appropriate scope of the program, adopted a program size of approximately 3,500 chargers at 350 locations (p. 127), which is very close to the size that GPI recommended in our testimony.	Verified.
Meshing the DRP and EV pilot applications: GPI recommended that SDG&E's site selection reflect the conclusions of the DRP optimal site location analysis (Decision, p. 56).	The Decision discusses our recommendations on this issue and agrees with our recommendation that the DRP results should be used to guide EV charger site selection (pp. 129-132).	Verified.

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified.
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified.
c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN, NRDC, EDF, General Motors, The Greenlining Institute, Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, Honda, Plug In America, Sierra Club, Community Environmental Council, Vote Solar, CESA, Charge Point.		Agreed.
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: This proceeding covers a wide variety of topics related to the phase 1 Decision in the overall EV proceeding (R.13-11-007), and to SDG&E's EV pilot Application (A.14-04-014). The Green Power Institute coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties, filed numerous joint pleadings with Community Environmental Council, and joined in the Settlement Agreement. We believe that these measures ensured that we avoided duplication of effort, and added significantly to the outcome of the Commission's deliberations. Some amount of duplication has occurred in this proceeding on all sides of contentious issues, but Green Power provided our own unique perspective on issues, avoided duplication to the extent possible, and tried to minimize it where it was unavoidable.		Verified. GPI did not engage in duplicative efforts.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
The GPI is providing, in Attachment 2, a listing of all of the pleadings we provided in these consolidated Proceedings, R.13-11-007 and A.14-10-014, that are relevant to matters covered by this Claim, and a detailed breakdown of GPI staff time spent for work performed that was directly related to our substantial contributions to Decisions D.14-12-079 and D.16-01-045. The hours claimed herein in support of Decisions D.14-12-079 and D.16-01-045 are reasonable given the scope of the Proceeding, and the strong participation by the GPI. GPI staff maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to the matters settled by the Decision in this case. In preparing Attachment 2, Dr. Morris reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding, and included only those that were reasonable and contributory to the underlying tasks. As a result, the GPI submits that all of the hours included in the attachment are reasonable, and should be compensated in full. The GPI filed a Motion to Strike after the passage of D.16-01-045, which has been denied on the procedural ground that the Motion was filed after the proceeding was closed. We waited to file our Motion until after the Decision	Verified.

was passed because we did not want it to impinge on the passage of the Decision. We did not realize that in doing so our Motion became moot. Nevertheless, by filing the Motion and defending it, we were able put our arguments on the record as to why the record needed to be corrected, which we consider to be an important contribution. Thus we have included the hours spent preparing and defending the Motion in this claim, despite the fact that the Motion was denied. Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than thirty years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental fields. He is a nationally recognized expert on biomass and renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse-gas emissions analysis, integrated resources planning, and analysis of the environmental impacts of electric power generation. Dr. Morris holds a BA in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MSc in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a PhD in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Morris has been actively involved in electric utility restructuring in California throughout the past two decades. He served as editor and facilitator for the Renewables Working Group to the California Public Utilities Commission in 1996 during the original restructuring effort, consultant to the CEC Renewables Program Committee, consultant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on renewable energy policy during the energy crisis years, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation. Mr. Hunt is a renewable energy law and policy expert with substantial experience in California, in local energy planning and in state energy-policy development. He has worked with local governments throughout Southern California, in his current role with Community Renewable Solutions LLC and in his previous role as Energy Program Director for the Community Environmental Council, a well-known non-profit organization based in Santa Barbara. Mr. Hunt was the lead author of the Community Environmental Council's A New Energy Direction, a blueprint for Santa Barbara County to wean itself from fossil fuels by 2030. Mr. Hunt also contributes substantially to state policy, in Sacramento at the Legislature, and in San Francisco at the California Public Utilities Commission, in various proceedings related to renewable energy, energy efficiency, community-scale energy projects, and climate change policy. Mr. Hunt is also a Lecturer in Climate Change Law and Policy at UC Santa Barbara's Bren School of Environmental Science & Management (a graduate-level program). He received his law degree from the UCLA School of Law in 2001, where he was chief managing director of the Journal for International Law and Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hunt is a regular columnist at Renewable Energy World Decision D.98-04-059 states, on pgs. 33-34, "Participation must be productive in the sense that the costs of participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through such participation. … At a minimum, when the benefits are intangible, the customer should present information sufficient to justify a Commission finding that the overall benefits of a customer's participation will exceed a customer's costs." The Phase 1 Decision in R.13-11-007 and the Decision on the SDG&E	

Application create a pilot project that is intended to help the nascent electric vehicle market grow to its potential. The value to the ratepayers of the benefits of increased electric vehicle adoption in California overwhelms the cost of our participation in this proceeding.	
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: The GPI made Significant Contributions to Decisions D.14-12-079 and D.16-01-045 by providing Commission filings on the various topics that were under consideration in the Proceeding, and are covered by this Claim. Attachment 2 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant the GPI's claim in its entirety.	Verified, *but see* CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below. [1]
c. Allocation of hours by issue: D.14-12-079 1. Provide a role for utility ownership of charging infrastructure 35 % 2. Support participation of NEM in submetering pilots 10 % 3. Support electric bus pilots 3 % D.16-01-045 4. IOU ownership of charging infrastructure 15 % 5. Education and outreach 15 % 6. Size of the SDG&E pilot program 12 % 7. Meshing the DRP and EV pilot Applications 10 %	Verified.

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate** [A] **$**	**Total $**
G. Morris	2013	7.00	$250	D.15-08-025	$1,750	7.00	$250.00	$1,750.00
G. Morris	2014	13.50	$270	D.15-06-058	$3,645	13.50	$270.00	$3,645.00
G. Morris	2015	31.00	$270	D.15-09-021	$8,370	31.00	$270.00	$8,370.00
G. Morris	2016	23.00	$270	2015 + cola	$6,210	19.00	$275.00	$5,225.00
T. Hunt	2013	44.75	$345	D.15-08-025	$15,439	44.75	$345.00	$15,439.75
T. Hunt	2014	127.25	$370	D.15-06-058	$47,083	127.25	$370.00	$47,082.50
T. Hunt	2015	187.50	$390	See comment 2	$73,125	187.50	$370.00 [1]	$69,375.00
T. Hunt	2016	31.25	$390	2015 + cola	$12,188	27.25	$375.00	$10,218.75
					Subtotal: **$167,809**			***Subtotal:*** **$161,106.00**

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Hours**	**Rate**	**Total $**
G. Morris	2016	16.00	$135	½ rate for 2015	$2,160	16.00	$137.50	$2,200.00
					***Subtotal:* $2,160**			***Subtotal:* $2,200.00**

COSTS				
#	**Item**	**Detail**	**Amount**	**Amount**
	Trip Expenses	See Attachment 2	$270	$00.00 [3]
			TOTAL REQUEST: $170,239	**TOTAL AWARD: $163,306.00**

**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.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	**Date Admitted to CA BAR[1]**	**Member Number**	**Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)**
Tamlyn Hunt	January 29, 2002	218673	Hunt was inactive with the California Bar from January 1, 2005 until April 27, 2009.

C. Intervenor's Comments on Part III

Comment #	Intervenor's Comment(s)
Comment #1	Mr. Hunt has represented various intervenors before the Commission since 2005, has been a Bar-certified lawyer since 2001, and has been in the renewable energy law field for over 12 years. Accordingly, the appropriate range for an attorney of his experience is $320-570, based on Res. ALJ-308. His approved rate for 2014 is $370, approved in D.15-06-058 as Hunt entered the 13+ years bracket. Resolution ALJ-308, which approved the 2015 COLA, states: "It is reasonable to allow individuals an annual 'step increase' of 5%, twice within each experience level and capped at the maximum rate for that level, as authorized by D.07-01-009." Hunt has received no step increase in the 13+ years compensation bracket and his

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

	current rate is at the lower end of the 13+ bracket. GPI is requesting a 2015 rate of $390, which reflects a $20 increase (5%) over $370, with no COLA adjustment because ALJ-308 did not apply any COLA increase. Hunt represents the Green Power Institute, the Community Environmental Council and the Clean Coalition at the Commission, reflecting the fact that he has a broad background and deep expertise in many topics before the Commission, including renewable energy policy, energy storage policy, electric vehicle policy, greenhouse gas emission policy, and other areas. Hunt is a well-known member of the California policy-making community and we feel that the requested step increase is appropriate.

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[A]	The Commission applied the 1.28% cost-of-living adjustment (COLA), adopted in Res. ALJ-329, to all 2016 rates.
[1]	GPI's motion to strike, that was filed after D.16-01-045 was issued, did not make a substantial contribution to D.16-01-045. Accordingly, we have reduced the 2016 hours for Morris and Hunt by four hours each.
[2]	As noted above, Hunt was admitted to the State Bar of California on January 29, 2002 and was inactive from January 1, 2005 until April 27, 2009. Based on that information, Hunt has 10 years of experience working as an attorney. The Commission acknowledges our mistake in overstating Hunt's experience in past decisions. Based on a review of Hunt's requested rates, Hunt previously requested two step increases for his current experience bracket. As such, the Commission cannot award another step-increase. In addition, as the Commission stated in D.08-04-010, "[s]tep increases are separate from and not considered in the establishment of rate ranges for each level of experience, **but may not result in rates above the highest rate for any given range in a given year."** The rate requested by Hunt is greater than the maximum allowed by the Commission. We determine that Hunt's rate for 2015 should remain set at $370.
[3]	GPI, and Mr. Hunt, could not provide receipts for the lodging expense, as Mr. Hunt rented an apartment in San Francisco. We cannot compensate for undocumented expenses. Additionally, as Mr. Hunt lived in the San Francisco for the month, we cannot compensate for public transportation expenses; such travel is routine (under 90 miles). *See* D.10-11-032.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Green Power Institute has made a substantial contribution to D.14-12-079 and D.16-01-045.

2. The requested hourly rates for Green Power Institute'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 $163,306.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Green Power Institute shall be awarded $163,306.00.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall pay Green Power Institute $79,634.88, the portion of the total award allocated to Rulemaking 13-11-007. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall pay their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional gas and electric revenues for the 2015 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 15, 2016, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. Within 30 days of effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay Green Power Institute $83,671.12, the portion of the total award allocated to Application 14-04-014. 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 15, 2016, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

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

5. Application 14-04-014 is closed. Rulemaking 13-11-007 remains open.

This decision is effective today.

Dated June 23, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL PICKER
President
MICHEL PETER FLORIO
CATHERINE J.K. SANDOVAL
CARLA J. PETERMAN
LIANE M. RANDOLPH
Commissioners

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D1606049	**Modifies Decision?**	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1601045		
Proceeding(s):	A1404014, R1311007		
Author:	ALJ Wong		
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
Green Power Institute (GPI)	04/01/2016	$170,239.00	$163,306	N/A	*See* CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, above.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Gregg	Morris	Expert	GPI	$250.00	2013	$250.00
Gregg	Morris	Expert	GPI	$270.00	2014	$270.00
Gregg	Morris	Expert	GPI	$270.00	2015	$270.00
Gregg	Morris	Expert	GPI	$270.00	2016	$270.00
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	GPI	$345.00	2013	$345.00
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	GPI	$370.00	2014	$370.00
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	GPI	$390.00	2015	$370.00
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	GPI	$390.00	2016	$370.00

(END OF APPENDIX)