

Decision 16-09-029 September 15, 2016

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 INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ALLIANCE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 16-05-006

Intervenor: California Environmental Justice Alliance	For contribution to Decision (D.) 16-05-006
Claimed: \$ 32,860.00	Awarded: \$34,566.00
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJs: Michelle Cooke

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.16-05-006 continued implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 43 (Stats. 2013, ch 413 (Wolk)), which requires that the three large electrical utilities implement the Green Tariff Shared Renewables (GTSR) Program. D.16-05-006 addresses Tracks A and B of Phase IV of the proceeding, setting forth the steps for PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to address participation of Enhanced Community Renewables (ECR) components of the GTSR Program, and other refinements as detailed below.
--	---

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):	10/2/2013	September 25, 2013

2. Other specified date for NOI:	Motion to late-file granted 12/18/2014	Verified.
3. Date NOI filed:	12/20/2013	Verified.
4. Was the NOI timely filed? Yes.		Yes, California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) 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:	A.13-06-015	Verified.
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	10/17/2013	Verified.
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes, CEJA demonstrated appropriate status.
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.13-06-015	Verified.
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	10/17/2013	Verified.
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes, CEJA demonstrated significant financial hardship.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.16-05-006	Verified.
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	05/19/2016	Verified.
15. File date of compensation request:	07/14/2016	July 18, 2016
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes, CEJA timely filed the request for intervenor compensation.

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

Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>The California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA) is an alliance of grassroots environmental justice organizations that are situated throughout the state of California. CEJA is an unincorporated organization that is fiscally sponsored by the Environmental Health Coalition. All of the members of CEJA are non-profit public interest entities. Together, the CEJA member organizations of work to achieve environmental justice for low-income communities and communities of color throughout the state of California. In particular, CEJA pushes for policies at the federal, state, regional and local levels that protect public health and the environment. CEJA also works to ensure that California enacts statewide climate change policies that protect low-income communities and communities of color.</p> <p>CEJA, its member organizations, and their community members distinguish their interests from Commission staff and other California ratepayers participating in this matter. CEJA has worked in communities throughout the state on its Green Zones Initiative, whose goal is to transform overburdened neighborhoods into healthy, thriving “Green Zones.” CEJA has worked with researchers from UC Berkeley, Occidental College, USC, and the CalEPA to map out areas of high cumulative pollution impacts using an environmental justice screening methodology. To transform the environmental justice communities into Green Zones, CEJA works to reduce existing pollution levels, institute community based land-use planning, support green community based development, and build community capacity and power. Central to this mission is ensuring renewable energy access and development in these overburdened communities.</p>	<p>The Commission recognizes the work of CEJA’s members related to environmental justice.</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).

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>The Commission examined and/or adopted many of CEJA’s recommendations regarding SB 43’s mandates to make renewable energy affordable and expand access to renewable energy to low-income and minority communities.</p> <p>The Commission adopted many of CEJA’s recommendations as illustrated below, and in particular made the conclusion of law that “disadvantaged communities should share in the benefits of local renewable development.”</p> <p>To the extent that the Commission did not adopt CEJA’s recommendations, note that in A.06-11-007, the Commission recognized that it may benefit from</p>	<p>(D.16-05-006, p. 39, Conclusion of Law 5)</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>an intervenor’s participation even where the Commission did not adopt <i>any</i> of the intervenor’s positions or recommendations. The Commission held that an intervenor’s opposition can provide important information regarding all issues that needed to be considered in deciding whether to approve a particular application. Such opposition allows the Commission to properly and thoroughly analyze all aspects leading to a decision/consider the consequences of adopting or rejecting applications.</p> <p>Here, even though the Commission did not adopt some of CEJA’s suggestions to increase low-income customer participation in the GTSR program, it still recognized those recommendations and built in procedural safeguards to the program to address those concerns. For instance, CEJA was concerned with the compatibility of the ECR program and procurement under a Renewable Auction Mechanism (“RAM”) versus the ReMAT procurement method, and commented on this issue particularly in its comments on the Proposed Decision. Although the Proposed Decision would have allowed IOUs to procure ECR projects only through RAM, the revised and final Decision allows discretion to move forward under either RAM or ReMAT solicitations. In addition, CEJA took issue with the valuation of the Renewable Energy Credit, and how it was arbitrarily undervalued. Although the Commission did not revise this value in the Decision, it nevertheless still authorized a compliance check for May 2017 involving SCE and a working group of all parties to ensure the “ongoing validity of the adopted REC value.”</p> <p>CEJA therefore requests that the Commission find a substantial contribution warranting an award of intervenor compensation for the reasonable costs and expenses incurred by CEJA as follows:</p>	<p>(D.16-05-006, p. 36)</p> <p>(D.16-05-006, p. 44.)</p>	
<p>1. <u>Need to implement program quickly</u></p> <p>CEJA noted the importance of proceeding quickly in implementing all aspects of this program, especially those provisions to ensure increased participation by low-income customers, due to the end of ITC credit in 2016, which is a significant financial incentive to low income customer participation.</p> <p>The Commission agreed.</p>	<p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track B (11/9/15), p. 1 (time is of the essence in order to achieve benefits to low income customers of the federal solar tax credit)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track B (11/9/15), p. 5 (detailing external and societal costs to low income/Environmental Justice</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

	<p>communities)</p> <p>CEJA Reply Comments on Track B (12/9/15), p. 1 (again noting the importance of moving quickly in lieu of the sunset of the program)</p> <p>CEJA Reply Comments on Track B (12/9/15), p. 3 (commenting against PGE’s suggestion to “wait and see” in regards to viable Environmental Justice projects, and the need to instead speed up)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Proposed Decision (5/2/16), pp.6-7 (regarding the relative speed and success of RAM procurement)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.9 (adopting alternative procurement option for ECR projects to speed up procurement prior to sunset of program)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.10 (procurement auctions scheduled and accelerated prior to sunset of program)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.14 (providing “priority” to Environmental Justice projects prior to the sunset of the program.)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.15 (recognizing the importance of tax revenues to low income customer participation and the need to consequently design the program)</p>	
<p>2. <u>Minimum Project Size</u></p> <p>CEJA argued that there should not be a minimum project size, in part because projects fulfilling the EJ Reservation could likely be smaller than 500 kW, and requiring larger projects could discourage EJ procurement.</p> <p>The Commission did not exactly adopt this recommendation. However, as noted above, the</p>	<p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track B (11/9/15), p. 2</p> <p>CEJA Reply Comments on Track B (12/9/15), pp.2-3</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Proposed Decision (5/2/16), pp.3-5</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>Commission did provide a mechanism to allow sub 500 kW projects – should CAISO “resolve issues surrounding sub-500kW projects in the market, the utilities should file, within 30 days, Advice Letters to modify” their programs accordingly.</p> <p>Recently, CAISO resolved such issues with sub-500kW projects and the IOUs are on track to include them in their 2017 procurement.</p>	<p>CEJA Reply Comments on Proposed Decision (5/9/16) p.4 (importance of sub-500kW projects to Environmental Justice communities/adherence with legislative intent and importance of timing with CAISO proceeding)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.18, 36 (detailing Advice Letter within 30 days of CAISO proceeding decision) p. 43 (order requiring Advice Letters within 30 days of CAISO proceeding decision)</p>	
<p>3. <u>Working with communities & community organizations in marketing, outreach, enrollment & implementation</u></p> <p>CEJA argued throughout this proceeding about the importance of working with community organizations in order to expand access to renewable energy to low-income and minority communities.</p> <p>CEJA urged that coordination with communities be prompt and continuous, and explained that community groups needed resources to participate on a continuous basis. CEJA also argued that this means providing marketing and enrollment materials in the dominant languages of the communities, and providing various channels of outreach and enrollment.</p> <p>CEJA focused its comments on the marketing, enrollment, and implementation of the program.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with CEJA on the importance of the IOUs working with communities, and that they “make the GTSR program more accessible” and improve “understandability” of the program through methods established in Phase IV of this proceeding.</p>	<p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track B (11/9/15), p. 4-5 (suggesting non-internet based methods of marketing, the use of the program by Environmental Justice communities, versus larger customers, and that costs be borne by shareholders)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Proposed Decision (5/2/16), p.5 (regarding the importance of community participation in ECR projects)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.19 (noting the importance of the IOUs working with communities, and that they “make the GTSR program more accessible” and improve “understandability” of the program through methods established in Phase IV of this proceeding.)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.40, Conclusions of Law 10 and 11 (to ensure that projects do not only target large customers, and requiring demonstrated community interest in projects from residential customers.)</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>4. <u>Affordability is a key aspect of the GTSR Program, including ECR</u></p> <p>CEJA argued extensively throughout the proceeding that affordability is a key aspect of the GTSR/ECR Program in order to make it accessible to <i>all</i> customers, including low-income communities. CEJA noted several ways of making it more affordable to customers, including, among others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term contracts with locked in rates • Elimination of certain charges • Use of a “blended” portfolio • Valuation of the REC • Other Commission subsidies <p>The Commission agreed with CEJA on the critical importance of affordability, and agreed with CEJA on several of these issues regarding affordability.</p>	<p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track A, pp. 2-3; Opening Comments on Track B, p. 5; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision pp. 4-5; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 4 (detailing product blending proposal/ “bundling” of smaller CAISO DERP projects to decrease costs to customers)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track A, p. 5; Reply Comments on Track B, p. 5; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision p. 9; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision p. 5 (detailing elimination or adjustment of PCIA fee to improve program accessibility to low income customers)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track A, p. 2; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision p. 8 (detailing long term contracts and locked in rates as a benefit to low income customer participation)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track A, p. 6; CEJA Opening Comments on Track B, p. 5; Reply Comments on Track B, p. 2; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision p. 8; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision p. 5 (supporting Commission investigation of additional program subsidies)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.20 (acknowledging CEJA’s suggestions, but requiring further development in the future)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.21 (outlining certain benefits of long term and fixed rate contracts to create certainty, and authorizing the option of having long term contracts with fixed rates)</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
---	--	------------------

	<p>D.16-05-006, p.23 (compliance report procedure for REC valuation, as noted above)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.18, 36 (detailing Advice Letter within 30 days of CAISO proceeding decision) p. 43 (order requiring Advice Letters within 30 days of CAISO proceeding decision – the CAISO proceeding emphasizes the feasibility of blending of sub-500kW projects)</p>	
<p>5. <u>Environmental Justice is a critical component of the GTSR Program & it must be considered at every stage, in particular for ECR projects</u></p> <p>CEJA argued extensively that environmental justice (EJ) is a critical component, and in fact, a main motivating factor behind SB 43. This means that one intent of SB 43 is to remedy past discrimination of siting polluting facilities in low-income and minority communities while excluding them from participation in related decisions, and from the benefits of an emerging green economy. The implementation of SB 43 must strive toward improving the environment and health of these communities, as well as providing economic benefits of having access to local, renewable energy. This applies to all aspects of the program, especially in regards to ECR projects.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with CEJA and approved mechanisms to allow priority for Environmental Justice projects.</p>	<p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track A, p.1; Opening Comments on Track B, pp.1, 3-4, 5; Reply Comments on Track B, pp. 1-3; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision pp. 1-3, 5 (outlining legislative intent, addressing need to secure intended program benefits to Environmental Justice communities)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, pp.11, 13, 15, 37 Finding of Fact 6 (providing priority/preference to ECR-Environmental Justice projects)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.12 (noting “ample” opportunity for Environmental Justice projects to participate in ECR procurement process)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.14 (allowing alternative and potentially more effective procurement methods for ECR-Environmental Justice projects)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, p.15 (recognizing “projects located in Environmental Justice areas is to ensure that disadvantaged communities share in the benefits of renewable development through potential creation of jobs and future tax revenue in disadvantaged areas”)</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

<p>6. <u>Use of CalEnviroScreen to identify EJ/Disadvantaged Communities</u></p> <p>SB 43 reserves 100 MW for “disadvantaged” communities, and CEJA argued through this proceeding that CalEnviroScreen is the best tool for this, because it is developed by CalEPA, and is specifically intended to identify communities overburdened by pollution and more vulnerable to its impacts because of socioeconomic factors. In addition, CalEPA is committed to continually updating it. CEJA was a key party convened in a working group to provide direction/a joint statement regarding the use and implementation of CalEnviroScreen.</p> <p>The Commission subsequently adopted the joint parties’ recommendations.</p>	<p>D.16-05-006, p.29 (“A working group was formed in April 2015 and included participation from ... [CEJA] ...conference calls were held on May 1, May 18, and May 28, 2015, culminating in a June 1, 2015 workshop at the Commission. The recommendation of the working group is described in a June 15, 2015 Joint Statement.)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, pp.29-30 (detailing Commission adoption of recommendation)</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p>7. <u>ECR--Program Design, Procurement, and Customer Protections</u></p> <p>With respect to the ECR program specifically, CEJA made comments regarding the appropriate program design and procurement, especially in regards to low income communities of color.</p> <p>First, CEJA argued that the program should allow other non-solar resources, such as solar, highlighting the synergistic environmental and health benefits of such coupling.</p> <p>Second, CEJA argued for a suitable procurement mechanism that would allow adequate and timely deployment of projects in Environmental Justice communities.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with both of these suggestions in Phase IV.</p>	<p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track B, p. 3; Reply Comments on Track B, p. 3; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision pp. 4- 5; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 2-3 (detailing synergy of solar and non-solar resources and applicability to Environmental Justice mandates and achievement of program benefits)</p> <p>CEJA Opening Comments on Track A, p.6; Opening Comments on Track B, pp. 3-4; Reply Comments on Track B, p. 3; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision pp. 6-7; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 3 (detailing flaws of RAM procurement to be addressed and possible alternative and more suitable mechanisms such as ReMAT.)</p> <p>D.16-05-006, pp. 12, 39 Conclusion of Law 4 (“By opening the Renewable Auction Mechanism to Enhanced Community Renewables projects we have also effectively opened eligibility to other non-solar</p>	<p>Verified.</p>

	projects.”) D.16-05-006, pp. 9, 12, 36 (adopting alternative procurement option more suited to ECR-Environmental Justice projects to speed up procurement prior to sunset of program).	
--	--	--

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?¹	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: Sustainable Economies Law Center (SELC), Clean Coalition.		Yes.
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: In order to avoid duplication of arguments, CEJA consulted with the SELC and Clean Coalition throughout Phase IV of this proceeding. CEJA maintained such cooperation, drawing on CEJA’s experience as an environmental justice movement building coalition and interactions with legislators during the drafting of SB 43. For instance, CEJA members care very much about renewables procurement and live in environmental justice communities; the outcome of this proceeding has clear and foreseeable impacts on their goals to achieve a reliable, just distributed generation system in their own communities. CEJA ensured that these concerns, underlying and integral to the success of SB 43, were conveyed adequately to first to allies, and ultimately to the Commission. We did this as efficiently as possible, collaborating early in Phase IV of the proceeding with both SELC and Clean Coalition, and even scheduling joint ex parte meetings with the Commissioners and their advisors. During the briefing stages of Phase IV of the proceeding, CEJA similarly coordinated with these organizations in order to provide analysis that highlighted our own arguments, central to our members, but that also augmented other common arguments. For instance, CEJA acknowledged and complemented Clean Coalition’s suggested methods of maintaining affordability of ECR projects, for instance through “bundling” smaller sub-500kW projects. CEJA’s inclusion of such references not only contributes a specific example to support that allies’ suggestion, but at the same time highlights how the same issue, that concerns smaller projects built in and used by the same communities, more specifically relates to the environmental justice community. Overall, CEJA’s coordination with allies has ensured non-duplication of issues and supplemented and contributed to those other parties’ similar interests.		The Commission agrees that CEJA did not engage in work duplicative of other parties.

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 (to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

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

a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:	CPUC Discussion
<p>This proceeding was to determine IOUs’ compliance with SB 43, which was passed, in part, to provide the very communities CEJA serves access to renewable energy. As a result, CEJA played an active part in shaping this proceeding and decision, as described above. CEJA’s role was to provide a critical environmental justice voice and understanding to many of the central issues in this proceeding, particularly the importance of implementing the EJ Reservation and the ECR component of the GTSR Program, as well as emphasizing the importance of community involvement and affordability within the Program. CEJA was an integral party in determining the use of CalEnviroScreen, and in suggesting use of other non-solar resources, procurement methods, and affordability and access provisions specific to benefit and further the EJ Reservation and ECR components, rather than the IOUs taking a more passive approach. These points are essential to carrying out the goals of SB 43 to provide access to local renewable to all Californians.</p> <p>CEJA has provided a unique, but necessary perspective on these issues, given the goals and intent of SB 43. This Commission should therefore recognize CEJA’s substantial contribution and participation as reasonable, especially given that Phase IV’s considerations spurred from CEJA’s concerns at earlier stages of this proceeding.</p>	<p>Verified.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>CEJA’s attorneys’ hours were extremely reasonably spent, divided into categories as shown in the attached timesheets.</p> <p>CEJA has excluded all time for all internal communications among attorneys in order to avoid duplication of time or duplication of issues. CEJA also excluded a significant amount of time on procedural matters, as well as administrative time.</p> <p>The rates requested for these tasks are at the low end of the ranges authorized by the CPUC for attorneys. In addition, CEJA is excluding compensation for any associated costs from its request.</p>	<p>Verified. <i>But see</i> CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments, below.</p>
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>CEJA divided issues so as not to duplicate work. The issues and division of work are reflected in the attached timesheets.</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 \$
Roger Lin	2015	90.9	320	Resolution ALJ-303, Table 1 (12/9/14)	29,088	70.40 [1]	300.00 <i>See</i> D.15-10-011.	21,120.00
Roger Lin	2016					30.20	305.00 <i>See Res.</i> ALJ- 329.	9,211.00
Robert Freehling	2014	14	170	Resolution ALJ-303, Table 1 (12/9/14)	2,380	14.00	190.00 <i>See</i> D.15-10-017.	3,230.00
Subtotal: \$ 31,468						Subtotal: \$ 33,561.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Roger Lin	2014	8.7	160	½ requested 2014 rate	1,392	6.7	150.00	1,005.00
Subtotal: \$ 1,392						Subtotal: \$1,005.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 32,860						TOTAL AWARD: \$34,566.00		
<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. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ²			Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?)			
Roger Lin	January 13, 2007			248144	No.			

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

C. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[1]	<p>The Commission has corrected CEJA’s filed claim to conform to the Commission’s requirements. CEJA reported all hours worked in 2014, despite the timesheets indicating that all hours were worked in 2015 and 2016. As stated in Decision 00-02-044 “[f]ailures to comply with the intervenor compensation program requirements indicate a shaky grasp of the subject matter or an inattention to providing the Commission with a reasoned and articulate Request for Compensation. Therefore, such failures in compliance will weigh against parties in our consideration of appropriate hourly rates.” Here, the Commission disallows 2.0 hours from Lin’s 2016 intervenor compensation claim.</p> <p>In addition, CEJA’s claimed hours did not correspond to the timesheets submitted to the Commission.</p> <p>Lin claimed 1.2 hours of travel time in 2015 and 1.4 hours of travel time in 2016. Lin’s travel was routine travel of less than 90 miles and is not compensable.</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 (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. California Environmental Justice Alliance has made a substantial contribution to D.16-05-006.
2. The requested hourly rates for California Environmental Justice Alliance’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 \$34,566.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. California Environmental Justice Alliance is awarded \$34,566.00.
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 California Environmental Justice Alliance their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional 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 October 1, 2016, the 75th 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.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated September 15, 2016, at San Francisco, California.

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

Commissioner Carla J. Peterman, being necessarily absent, did not participate.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D1609029	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1605006		
Proceeding(s):	A1201008, A1204020, A1401007		
Author:	ALJs Michelle Cooke and Regina 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
California Environmental Justice Alliance (CEJA)	07/18/16	\$32,860.00	\$34,566.00	N/A	N/A

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Roger	Lin	Attorney	CEJA	\$320.00	2014	\$300.00
Roger	Lin	Attorney	CEJA	\$320.00	2015	\$300.00
Roger	Lin	Attorney	CEJA	\$320.00	2016	\$305.00
Robert	Freehling	Expert	CEJA	\$170.00	2014	\$190.00

(END OF APPENDIX)