

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate and Refine Procurement Policies and Consider Long-Term Procurement Plans. | Rulemaking 13-12-010<br>(Filed December 19, 2013) |
|---|---|

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO L. JAN REID FOR  
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION (D.) 15-10-031**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Intervenor: L. Jan Reid                | For contributions to Decisions (D.) 15-10-031 |
| Claimed: \$ 32,091.78                  | Awarded: \$ 28,505.78                         |
| Assigned Commissioners: Michael Picker | Assigned ALJ: Julie Fitch                     |

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| A. Brief description of Decisions: | D.15-10-031 approved with modifications the plans of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company and San Diego Gas & Electric Company to procure electricity for their bundled customers, consistent with Pub. Util. Code § 454.5. |
|------------------------------------|---|

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 26, 2014 | February 25, 2014                |
| 2. Other specified date for NOI:   |                   |                                  |
| 3. Date NOI filed:   | March 27, 2014    | Verified                         |
| 4. Was the NOI timely filed? Yes   |                   | Yes                              |
| Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):                |                   |                                  |
| 5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:                        | R.12-03-014       | Verified                         |
| 6. Date of ALJ ruling:   | March 25, 2014    | March 25, 2014 and April 9, 2014 |

|   |                        |   |
|---|------------------------|---|
| 7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):                           |                        | N/A   |
| 8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status? Yes |                        | Yes   |
| Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):                    |                        |   |
| 9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:                         | R.12-03-014            | Verified                                    |
| 10. Date of ALJ ruling:   | March 25, 2014         | March 25, 2014 and April 9, 2014            |
| 11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):                          |                        |   |
| 12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship? Yes     |                        | Yes   |
| Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):                                |                        |   |
| 13. Identify Final Decision:  | N/A See comment below. | D.15-10-031                                 |
| 14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:                            | N/A                    | October 23, 2015                            |
| 15. File date of compensation request:                                      | December 22, 2015      | Verified. <i>See</i> Discussion is Part IC. |
| 16. Was the request for compensation timely? Yes                            |                        | Yes   |

## C. Additional Comments on Part I:

| #     | Intervenor's Comment(s)   | CPUC Discussion  |
|-------|---|--|
| 13,14 | A final decision closing proceeding R.13-12-010 has not been issued. Therefore, the request is timely pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 1804(c). I note that the compensation request was filed within 60 days days of the issuance of D.15-10-031.   | The request is timely. See Below #16   |
| 16    | This request is timely under PU Code §1804(c) because of a standard previously established in D.14-06-024. In its decision on a compensation request filed by Reid, the Commission stated that: (D.14-06-024, slip op. at 2)<br>"A final decision closing proceeding R.10-05-006 has not been issued. Therefore, the request is timely pursuant to Public Utilities Code § 1804(c)."<br>The Commission should apply the same standard to the instant request by finding that Reid's request is timely under PU Code §1804(c). | The request is timely; R.13-12-010 at 21 states, "This is a successor proceeding to the Commission's procurement rulemaking, Rulemaking 12-03-014, with respect to long-term procurement plans and the record developed in that proceeding is fully available for consideration in this proceeding."<br>Therefore, for the purposes of this claim, we treat decisions issued in R.12-03-014 as applicable to claims filed in R.13-12-010. Thus, Reid's claim was timely filed on December 22, 2015, within 60 days after the issuance of D.15-10-031 in R.13-12-010. |

**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 |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. Short Term RPS Contracts          | <p>The Commission stated that “Reid supports PG&amp;E’s request to sign renewable contracts of up to five years with suppliers that submitted winning bids in a PG&amp;E all-source RFO, subject to two conditions, and also to require PG&amp;E to file an expedited application or Tier 3 Advice Letter for approval of these contracts.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 8)</p> <p>Although the Commission did not agree with Reid on this issue, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Short Term Contracts issue.</p>   | Verified        |
| 2. Convergence Bidding               | <p>The Commission notes that” PG&amp;E’s BPP states that PG&amp;E intends to monitor the net profit and losses associated with convergence bids and, should the 365-day rolling net-loss exceed or look to exceed \$20 million, PG&amp;E will cease implementation of all convergence bidding strategies and confer with the PRG pursuant to D.10-12-034.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 11)</p> <p>Reid recommended that the Commission add three more circumstances when PG&amp;E should confer with the PRG. Reid also recommended that the Commission should order PG&amp;E to notify the PRG within two business days should any of these conditions occur. (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 12)</p> <p>The Commission adopted Reid’s three recommendations and adopted a three business day notification requirement</p> | Verified        |

|                              |   |                 |
|------------------------------|---|-----------------|
|                              | <p>instead of the two business days recommended by Reid. (D.15-10-031, Conclusion of Law 8, slip op. at 60)</p> <p>Thus, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Convergence Bidding issue.</p>  |                 |
| <p>3. Hedging Plan Tenor</p> | <p>PG&amp;E proposed changing the length of the Hedging Plan tenor, updated once annually.</p> <p>The Commission stated that “Reid opposes this change, contending that the current tenor is justified and ratepayers are not harmed by the current system.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 19)</p> <p>In his Confidential Comments, Reid provided the Commission with a number of reasons why PG&amp;E’s proposed change should be rejected. (Reid Confidential BPP Comments, pp. 3-4)</p> <p>Although the Commission did not agree with Reid on this issue, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Hedging Plan Tenor issue.</p> | <p>Verified</p> |
| <p>4. Hedging Changes</p>    | <p>The Commission stated that “PG&amp;E describes certain proposed hedging changes in redacted language on pp. 30-31 of its BPP.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 20)</p> <p>Reid opposed PG&amp;E’s proposed change and recommended that the Commission continue to define the underlying position for electricity as customer load. (Reid Confidential BPP Comments, pp. 4-5)</p> <p>Although the Commission did not agree with Reid on this issue, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Hedging Changes issue.</p>   | <p>Verified</p> |

|                                   |  |   |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| <p>5. Minimum Price Factor</p>    | <p>The Commission stated that:<br/> “PG&amp;E’s 2014 BPP makes a second change regarding the financial swap limit in redacted language on pp. 32-33 of its BPP. . . . Reid opposes PG&amp;E’s proposed change as less accurate than the current method.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 31)</p> <p>Reid opposed PG&amp;E’s proposed change and argued that the use of historical data is superior to model estimates. (Reid Confidential BPP Comments, p. 6)</p> <p>Although the Commission did not agree with Reid on this issue, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Minimum Price Factor issue</p>  | <p>D.15-10-031, slip op. at 21.<br/> Verified</p>   |
| <p>6. Operational Flexibility</p> | <p>The Commission stated that “Reid objects to the assertion by PG&amp;E that it can procure electricity for operational flexibility purposes without explicit Commission permission. Otherwise, Reid contends that PG&amp;E may procure unnecessary operational flexibility products to the detriment of its ratepayers.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 22)</p> <p>The Commission effectively agreed with Reid when it stated that “PG&amp;E, and all affected utilities, are able to procure existing flexible products pursuant to Commission orders.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 23)</p> <p>Thus, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Operational Flexibility issue.</p> | <p>No Substantial Contribution, only a misunderstanding of PG&amp;E’s statement – “PG&amp;E responds that Reid misunderstood its statement, and it was only restating a provision of the 2010 BPP, on Sheet 110. In sum, PG&amp;E agrees with Reid that procurement of new resources to address operational flexibility needs for the CAISO system is being considered in Tracks 1A and 1B.”</p> <p>Reid’s misunderstanding had no bearing on the Commission’s finding of “PG&amp;E’s BPP to be limited to already authorized</p> |

|                                       |   |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                       |   | <p>procurement.<br/>(D.15-10-031, slip op. at 22)</p>   |
| <p>7. PRG Notification and Review</p> | <p>The Commission stated that:<br/>PG&amp;E’s BPP proposes that PG&amp;E should be permitted to execute agreements of greater than three months if executed according to a PRG-reviewed strategy. . . . Reid opposes this change and recommends that PRG review of each transaction greater than three months in duration is required prior to execution of the transaction.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 23)</p> <p>In part, the Commission agreed with Reid when it stated that: “We have already determined that it is appropriate to require that the utilities consult with their PRG for all transactions over three months, not just the pre-approved procurement strategy. While it is possible that PG&amp;E could lose some time-sensitive opportunities due to required PRG consultation, this theoretical concern is outweighed by the general long-standing benefit of PRG consultation.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 24)</p> <p>Thus, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the PRG Notification and Review issue.</p> | <p>Verified</p>   |
| <p>8. Options and Swaps Balance</p>   | <p>The Commission stated that “PG&amp;E proposes to change the way it balances options and swaps, basing the new balance on the Energy Resources Recovery Account (ERRA) curve forecasts. . . . Reid opposes this change and asserts that PG&amp;E should determine the percentage of options and swaps based on their volatility and cross correlation of these two products, not on the accuracy of the ERRA forecast.</p>  | <p>No Substantial Contribution to the issue.<br/>Commission’s finding of “Reid’s theoretical concerns are not sufficiently explained or persuasive.”<br/>(D.15-10-031, slip</p> |

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <p>Further, Reid notes that PG&amp;E does not claim that this change would benefit ratepayers.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 24-25)</p> <p>Although the Commission did not agree with Reid on this issue, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Options and Swaps Balance issue.</p>  | <p>op. 25)</p>  |
| <p>9. Congestion Revenue Rights (CRRs)</p> | <p>The Commission has stated that: (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 26)</p> <p>“PG&amp;E proposes that it would no longer need pre-approval to trade CRRs, but would notify the PRG five (5) business days after transactions, and the entire CRR strategy would be reviewed once a year by the PRG”</p> <p>“Reid believes that the Commission should require PG&amp;E to discuss its CRR nomination process with the PRG in advance, even if planned trades may be different from actual CRR trades.”</p> <p>“PG&amp;E responds that the 2014 BPP does require consultation with the PRG prior to the start of the CRR process, and that the consultation would include the procurement approach and strategy.”</p> <p>The Commission effectively agreed with Reid when it stated that “With PG&amp;E’s clarifications, there appears to be no dispute.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 26)</p> <p>Thus, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the CRR issue.</p> | <p>No Substantial Contribution to the issue.</p> <p>Commission did not agree or disagree with Reid. “With PG&amp;E’s clarifications, there appears to be no dispute. This change is permitted.”</p> <p>(D.15-10-031, slip op. 26)</p> |
| <p>10. Market Heat Rate</p>                | <p>The Commission states that “PG&amp;E proposes to remove these embedded GHG costs when calculating the historical high value. . . . Reid opposes this change, since PG&amp;E provides no evidence that GHG costs are fully embedded in the forward price of electricity.”</p>   | <p>Verified</p>   |

|  |   |                 |
|--|---|-----------------|
|  | <p>(D.15-10-031, slip op. at 27)</p> <p>Although the Commission did not agree with Reid on this issue, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Market Heat Rate issue.</p>   |                 |
| <p>11. Brokerages</p>                          | <p>The Commission states that: (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 28)</p> <p>“PG&amp;E provides an updated and expanded list of brokerages and exchanges list in the 2014 BPP in Appendix J.”</p> <p>...</p> <p>“Reid opposes the additional brokerages since PG&amp;E did not explain why it needs access to one brokerage, ICE Clear Europe.”</p> <p>Although the Commission did not adopt Reid’s recommendation, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Brokerages issue.</p>   | <p>Verified</p> |
| <p>12. Independent Review of Hedging Plans</p> | <p>The Commission stated that “ORA proposes a hedging assessment performed by an independent firm with the expertise to analyze all aspects of the Commission’s hedging guidelines and the utilities’ hedging practices. . . . PG&amp;E, SCE, and Reid oppose ORA’s proposal.” : (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 51)</p> <p>...</p> <p>“Reid believes that ORA has the ability to hire a consultant to review the utilities’ risk management plans. Reid also argues that ORA does not discuss whether the ratepayers will be required to pay for the proposed services of an independent firm nor provide an estimated budget for this service.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 52)</p> | <p>Verified</p> |



|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>The Commission agreed with Reid when it stated that “We are not convinced that a need for an independent assessment of the utilities’ hedging plans exists at this time. Therefore, we do not adopt ORA’s proposal.” (D.15-10-031, slip op. at 52)</p> <p>Therefore, Reid made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s resolution of the Independent Review of Hedging Plans issue.</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

## 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? <sup>1</sup>  | Yes                    | Yes             |
| b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?  | Yes                    | Yes             |
| c. If so, provide name of other parties: PG&E and SCE (See Part II.C)   |                        |                 |
| d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Reid collaborated with a number of parties during the course of this proceeding. Although Reid does not seek compensation for all of these communications, they indicate reasonable collaboration with other parties. |                        | Noted           |

## C. Additional Comments on Part II

| Item | Intervenor’s Comment  | CPUC Discussion |
|------|---|-----------------|
| A.   | <p>Reid claims 8.3 hours for general time reasonably spent before the start of Rulemaking (R.) 13-12-010. This work was performed between January 30, 2013 and May 22, 2013. Reid has not been previously compensated by the Commission for these hours.</p> <p>The Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) which established R.13-12-010 stated that “Contributions made during the pendency of R.12-03-014 to issues within the scope of this proceeding may be considered for compensation in this proceeding, if not already compensated.” (R.13-12-10 OIR, p. 21)</p> | Noted           |

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

|           |   |                 |
|-----------|---|-----------------|
|           | <p>Thus, Reid should be fully compensated for the 8.3 hours of time spent between January 30, 2013 and May 22, 2013.</p>  |                 |
| <p>C.</p> | <p>Of the 12 issues identified by Reid in Part II.A above, the Commission did not identify any party whose position was similar to Reid’s on more than one issue. Thus, the Commission can safely find that Reid did not duplicate the work of other parties.</p> <p>Reid’s compensation in this proceeding should not be reduced for any duplication with respect to the showings of other parties. In a proceeding with subject matter as complex as in this one and with multiple parties, it is virtually impossible for Reid or any party to fully anticipate where showings of other parties may duplicate Reid’s, especially in view of the need to make a coherent and sufficient showing on the issues Reid emphasizes and on the ultimate issues.</p> <p>In evaluating Reid’s claim and the issue of duplication, the Commission should be guided by the standards established in D. 03-03-031. In this decision, the Commission stated that: (Westlaw 2003 WL 1715098, Cal P.U.C., D.03-03-031, slip op. at 1)</p> <p>“We have concluded that the application of a duplication penalty to reduce awards to participants that make a substantial contribution is not permissible under the statutes governing compensation of participating customers in commission proceedings.”</p> | <p>Verified</p> |

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED**

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>a. Concise explanation as to how the cost of Claimant’s participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation</p> <p>Reid contributed to the proceeding in a manner that was productive and will result in benefits to ratepayers that exceed the cost of Reid’s participation.</p> <p>In consolidated Rulemaking 97-01-009 and Investigation 97-01-010, the Commission required intervenors seeking compensation to show that they represent interests that would otherwise be underrepresented and to present information sufficient to justify a finding that the overall benefits of a customer's participation will exceed the customer's costs. (D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628, Finding of Fact 13 at 674, Finding of Fact 42 at 676) The Commission noted that assigning a dollar value to intangible benefits may be difficult.</p> <p>Reid made a substantial contribution to the proceeding. It is reasonable to assume that the resolution of the issues raised by Reid in this proceeding will benefit ratepayers in the future.</p> <p>As mentioned previously, Reid opposed the ORA’s suggestion that the Commission hire an outside consultant to review the IOU’s hedging</p> | <p><u>CPUC Discussion</u></p> <p>Verified</p> |
|--|---|

| <p>practices. It is reasonable to assume that ratepayers would have paid at least \$100,000 to hire this consultant or over three times the compensation that Reid has requested in this pleading.</p> <p>The Commission can safely find that the participation of Reid in this proceeding was productive. Overall, the benefits of Reid’s participation justify compensation in the amount requested.</p>  |              |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
|---|--------------|---------|------------|-------|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|-----------------|--------|--------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|-------|------------------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|--------|--------------------------|-------|---------|--------|--|
| <p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p>All of Reid’s work in this proceeding was performed by L. Jan Reid. Thus, no unnecessary internal duplication took place.</p> <p>In this pleading, Reid requests compensation in the total amount of \$32,091.78 for time reasonably devoted to the instant rulemaking. A more detailed breakdown of the time devoted to this proceeding by Reid is provided in Attachment A to this pleading.</p> <p>Reid’s work was performed efficiently. L. Jan Reid is a former Commission employee who has testified on many occasions on issues such as long term procurement plans, renewables procurement, cost-of-capital, utility finance, and electricity and natural gas procurement issues.</p> <p>Daily listings of the specific tasks performed by Reid in connection with this proceeding are available in Attachment A to this pleading. The cost listings demonstrate that the hours claimed are reasonable given the scope and timeframe of this part of the instant rulemaking.</p> <p>No compensation for administrative time is requested, in accordance with Commission practice. (D.99-06-002, discussion, slip op. at 8-10). I understand that the Commission may audit my books and records to the extent necessary to verify the basis for any award, pursuant to PU Code §1804(d).</p> | <p>Noted</p> |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| <p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Issue</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Percent</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Brokerages</td> <td>1.45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Congestion Revenue Rights (CRRs)</td> <td>2.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Convergence Bidding</td> <td>2.90%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hedging Changes</td> <td>10.16%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hedging Plan Tenor</td> <td>4.43%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Independent Review of Hedging Plans</td> <td>6.68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Market Heat Rate</td> <td>4.28%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minimum Price Factor</td> <td>1.45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Operational Flexibility</td> <td>1.45%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Options and Swaps Balance</td> <td>7.47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PRG Notification and Review</td> <td>10.89%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Short Term RPS Contracts</td> <td>9.87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>General</td> <td>36.07%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>  | Issue        | Percent | Brokerages | 1.45% | Congestion Revenue Rights (CRRs) | 2.90% | Convergence Bidding | 2.90% | Hedging Changes | 10.16% | Hedging Plan Tenor | 4.43% | Independent Review of Hedging Plans | 6.68% | Market Heat Rate | 4.28% | Minimum Price Factor | 1.45% | Operational Flexibility | 1.45% | Options and Swaps Balance | 7.47% | PRG Notification and Review | 10.89% | Short Term RPS Contracts | 9.87% | General | 36.07% | <p>Operational Flexibility<br/>1.45%</p> <p>Options and Swaps<br/>Balance 7.47%</p> <p>Congestion Revenue<br/>Rights 2.90%</p> <p>-11.82% total due to<br/>No Substantial<br/>Contribution. See Part<br/>II A above.</p> |
| Issue   | Percent      |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Brokerages  | 1.45%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Congestion Revenue Rights (CRRs)  | 2.90%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Convergence Bidding   | 2.90%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Hedging Changes   | 10.16%       |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Hedging Plan Tenor  | 4.43%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Independent Review of Hedging Plans   | 6.68%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Market Heat Rate  | 4.28%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Minimum Price Factor  | 1.45%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Operational Flexibility   | 1.45%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Options and Swaps Balance   | 7.47%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| PRG Notification and Review   | 10.89%       |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| Short Term RPS Contracts  | 9.87%        |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |
| General   | 36.07%       |         |            |       |                                  |       |                     |       |                 |        |                    |       |                                     |       |                  |       |                      |       |                         |       |                           |       |                             |        |                          |       |         |        |  |

[1-31-18] *Internal Review Draft; Subject to ALJ Division Review***CONFIDENTIAL**; *Deliberative Process Privilege*

B. Specific Claim:\*

| CLAIMED   |      |       |         |  |           | CPUC AWARD                    |                    |             |
|---|------|-------|---------|--|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES   |      |       |         |  |           |                               |                    |             |
| Item  | Year | Hours | Rate \$ | Basis for Rate*                              | Total \$  | Hours                         | Rate \$            | Total \$    |
| L. Jan Reid, Expert and Advocate  | 2013 | 8.6   | 215     | D.14-12-072, Appendix                        | 1,849.00  | 8.6                           | \$215              | \$1,849.00  |
| L. Jan Reid, Expert and Advocate  | 2014 | 92.6  | 220     | Resolution ALJ-303                           | 20,372.00 | 82.6 [1]                      | \$220 <sup>2</sup> | \$18,172.00 |
| L. Jan Reid, Expert and Advocate  | 2015 | 37.0  | 220     | Resolution ALJ-303                           | 8,140.00  | 30.7 [2]                      | \$220 <sup>3</sup> | \$6,754.00  |
| <i>Subtotal: \$ 30,361.00</i>   |      |       |         |  |           | <i>Subtotal: \$ 26,775.00</i> |                    |             |
| OTHER FEES  |      |       |         |  |           |                               |                    |             |
| Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.): |      |       |         |  |           |                               |                    |             |
| Item  | Year | Hours | Rate \$ | Basis for Rate*                              | Total \$  | Hours                         | Rate               | Total \$    |
| L. Jan Reid, Wrote NOI  | 2014 | 5.3   | 110.00  | Resolution ALJ-303                           | 583.00    | 0 <sup>4</sup>                | \$110.00           | \$0.00      |
| <i>Subtotal: \$ 583.00</i>  |      |       |         |  |           | <i>Subtotal: \$ 0.00</i>      |                    |             |
| INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **  |      |       |         |  |           |                               |                    |             |
| Item  | Year | Hours | Rate \$ | Basis for Rate*                              | Total \$  | Hours                         | Rate               | Total \$    |
| L. Jan Reid, Wrote NOI  | 2014 | 5.3   | 110.00  | Resolution ALJ-303                           | 583.00    | 5.3                           | \$110.00           | \$583.00    |
| L. Jan Reid   | 2015 | 10.0  | 110.00  | D.14-12-072, Appendix and Resolution ALJ-303 | 1,100.00  | 10.0                          | \$110.00           | \$1,100.00  |
| <i>Subtotal: \$1,100.00</i>   |      |       |         |  |           | <i>Subtotal: \$ 1,683.00</i>  |                    |             |

<sup>2</sup> See D.15-10-048<sup>3</sup> See D.16-11-020<sup>4</sup> Hours have been re-categorized as Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation.

| COSTS  |              |   |        |                                  |
|--|--------------|---|--------|----------------------------------|
| #  | Item         | Detail  | Amount | Amount                           |
| 1  | 2014 Postage | Postage on 3 large envelopes for 3 separate filings | 13.94  | \$13.94                          |
| 2  | 2014 Copying | 210 pages at 8 cents/page                           | 16.80  | \$16.80                          |
| 3  | 2015 Postage | Postage for 2 large envelopes for 3 separate filing | 8.40   | \$8.40                           |
| 4  | 2015 Copying | 108 pages at 8 cents/page                           | 8.64   | \$8.64                           |
| <i>Subtotal: \$47.78</i>   |              |   |        | <i>Subtotal: \$ 47.78</i>        |
| <b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 32,091.78</b>   |              |   |        | <b>TOTAL AWARD: \$ 28,505.78</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 ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p> |              |   |        |                                  |

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III

| Attachment or Comment # | Description/Comment   |
|-------------------------|---|
| 1                       | Certificate of Service  |
| 2                       | Service List  |
| 3                       | Attachment A: A daily listing of the work performed by Reid   |
| 4                       | <p>Reid’s Hourly Rate</p> <p>Reid requests that the Commission authorize an hourly rate of \$215 for L. Jan Reid for 2013 professional work, and \$220 for 2014 and 2015 professional work. Reid also requests an hourly rate for L. Jan Reid of \$107.50 for 2013 compensatory time, and \$110.00 for 2014-2015 compensatory time.</p> <p>As discussed in Part III.B, the Commission set Reid’s hourly rate at \$215 for 2013 professional work. The Commission has ordered that “For work performed in the 2014 calendar year, intervenors are authorized a 2.58 percent cost-of-living adjustment.” (Resolution ALJ-303, Ordering Paragraph 1, slip op. at 9)</p> <p>The Commission had previously set Reid’s hourly rate for 2013 work at \$215/hr.. (See D14-12-072, Appendix). 2.58% of \$215 is \$5.57, which rounds to a rate increase of \$5/hr. for 2014 and 2015 work. Thus, Reid’s hourly rate for 2014 and 2015 work should be set at \$220/hr. (215 + 5 =220)</p> |

[1-31-18] *Internal Review Draft; Subject to ALJ Division Review***CONFIDENTIAL**; *Deliberative Process Privilege*

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

| Item        | Reason   |
|-------------|--|
| [1] and [2] | Minus (-) 10 hours from 2014 total [1] and minus (-) 6.3 hours from 2015 total [2] due to No Substantial Contribution towards Operational Flexibility, Options and Swaps Balance, and Congestion Revenue Rights (CRRs).<br>\$3,586.00 deducted from the 2014 / 2015 Attorney, Expert, and Advocate Fees<br>\$32,091.78 - \$3,586.00 = \$28,505.78 Total Award. |
| B           | 2014 and 2015 \$220.00 per Hour fee approved for L. Jan Reid.  |

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| 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))? | Yes |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. L. Jan Reid has made a substantial contribution to D.15-10-031.
2. The requested hourly rates for L. Jan Reid 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 \$28,505.78.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. L. Jan Reid shall be awarded \$28,505.78.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company<sup>5</sup> shall pay L. Jan Reid the total award. Payment of the award shall

---

<sup>5</sup> See D.16-12-057 at 17-19.

[1-31-18] *Internal Review Draft; Subject to ALJ Division Review*

**CONFIDENTIAL**; *Deliberative Process Privilege*

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 March 6, 2016, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of L. Jan Reid's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

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

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

**APPENDIX**

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

|                        |                                  |                    |    |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|----|
| Compensation Decision: |                                  | Modifies Decision? | No |
| Contribution Decision: | D1510031                         |                    |    |
| Proceeding:            | R1312010                         |                    |    |
| Author:                | ALJ Fitch                        |                    |    |
| Payer:                 | Pacific Gas and Electric Company |                    |    |

## Intervenor Information

| Intervenor  | Claim Date | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Multiplier? | Reason Change/Disallowance                                      |
|-------------|------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---|
| L. Jan Reid | 12/22/2015 | \$32,091.78      | \$28,505.78    | N/A         | -\$3,370.12 due to No Substantial Contribution on three issues. |

## Advocate Information

| First Name | Last Name | Type   | Intervenor  | Hourly Fee Requested | Year Hourly Fee Requested | Hourly Fee Adopted |
|------------|-----------|--------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| L. Jan     | Reid      | Expert | L. Jan Reid | \$215.00             | 2013                      | \$215.00           |
| L. Jan     | Reid      | Expert | L. Jan Reid | \$220.00             | 2014                      | \$220.00           |
| L. Jan     | Reid      | Expert | L. Jan Reid | \$220.00             | 2015                      | \$220.00           |

**(END OF APPENDIX)**