

Decision 19-01-042 January 31, 2019

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Joint Applications of Broadwing Communications, LLC (U5525C); Global Crossing Local Services, Inc. (U5685C); Global Crossing Telecommunications, Inc. (U5005C); IP Networks, Inc. (U6362C); Level 3 Communications, LLC (U5941C); Level 3 Telecom of California, LP (U5358C); WilTel Communications, LLC (U6146C); and Level 3 Communications, Inc., a Delaware Corporation; and CenturyLink, Inc., a Louisiana Corporation, for Approval of Transfer of Control of the Level 3 Operating Entities Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 854(a).

Application 17-03-016

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION D.17-10-003

Intervenor: The Greenlining Institute	For contribution to Decision (D.) 17-10-003
Claimed: \$28,954.50	Awarded: \$29,017.50
Assigned Commissioner: Guzman Aceves	Assigned ALJ: DeAngelis

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES:

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.17-10-003 approves the transfer of Level 3 and its subsidiaries to CenturyLink.
-----------------------------------	---

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:	08/08/2017	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	06/05/2017 (See Comment #1)	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-02-005	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	03/29/2010	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b))		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	See Comment 2	R.17-06-023
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		09/26/2017
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.17-10-003	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	10/18/2017	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	12/11/17	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	<p>Greenlining submitted its Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation to the Commission prior to the Prehearing Conference due to uncertainty regarding whether a Prehearing Conference would be scheduled in this proceeding. Greenlining filed its Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation pursuant to Rule 17.1 (a)(2), within 30 days of its responsive pleading filed May 5, 2017, to provide sufficient notice to parties and the Commission.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
2	<p>Greenlining provided this explanation in its request for a finding of significant financial hardship in its June 5, 2017 Notice of Intent to File Intervenor Compensation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="402 1192 846 1724">1. Greenlining is an organization authorized in its Articles of Incorporation to represent the interests of both residential and small telecommunication customers, with particular focus on low-income and of-color communities and customers. A copy of Greenlining’s Articles of Incorporation was previously filed with the Commission in R.10-02-005 (as an attachment to our NOI, filed March 5, 2010). As such, Greenlining is a Category 3 customer as defined in D.98-04-059. <li data-bbox="402 1766 846 1890">2. As a Category 3 customer, Greenlining must satisfy the “comparison test” by demonstrating that the economic 	<p>Noted. R.17-06-023 Verified ALJ ruling on 09/26/17.</p>

	<p>interest of its members and constituencies in the instant proceeding is small relative to the cost of effective participation in the proceeding. Greenlining submits that it satisfies this test.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="402 411 857 1377">3. In this proceeding, customers will benefit from increased infrastructure investment, improved service quality and cost containment in wholesale backhaul services because of the pressure on the Joint Applicants to mitigate anti-competitive effects exerted by advocates like Greenlining. Greater infrastructure investment allows for increased access and availability of both wired and wireless telecommunications services. This will result in lower prices for wholesale inputs which results in lower prices for retail customers. Customers who lack the technical and procedural experience to effectively participate at the CPUC are unlikely to do so for their own individual interests, as the cost to do so would be significantly higher than the dollars they would save. These are customers who may otherwise go unrepresented but for Greenlining's participation.<li data-bbox="402 1381 857 1747">4. Because the cost of participation exceeds the financial benefit to be reaped by individual customers, Greenlining satisfies the "comparison test" as described above. In satisfying this test, Greenlining submits that it has successfully demonstrated significant financial hardship as appropriate for a Category 3 customer.<li data-bbox="402 1751 857 1881">5. It may be difficult to quantify exactly what financial benefits consumers might see because of increased investment in	
--	---	--

	<p>infrastructure, reduced service interruptions, and improved service quality. However, as a result of Greenlining’s advocacy in this proceeding, consumers will experience these benefits. It is safe to assume that the “savings” experienced by customers as a result of Greenlining’s advocacy in this proceeding will greatly exceed the amount of Greenlining’s claim.</p> <p>Additionally, in R.17-06-023, the ALJ ruled that Greenlining had made a provisional showing of significant financial hardship, subject to providing additional information and documents (ALJ Ruling, September 26, 2017). Greenlining provided that information on October 25, 2017, and is awaiting a final ruling in that proceeding.</p>	
--	---	--

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION:

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>A. Scope and Jurisdiction</p> <p>1. Jurisdiction</p> <p>Greenlining, as well as other consumer groups, argued that the Commission had jurisdiction to perform a public interest analysis of the Proposed Transaction under §854 (a). Greenlining further argued that the Commission had authority</p>	<p>The Final Decision concluded the Application was governed by § 854 (a). (Final Decision at 36). The Final Decision approved without modification the settlement negotiated by Joint Consumers and the Joint Applicants. (<i>Id.</i> at 23, 27). In doing so, the decision found that the Settlement satisfies any</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>to consider the public interest factors listed in §854 (b) and (c) in its § 854 (a) analysis. (Joint Consumers’ Protest at 2-3, 4, 8; Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement at 7).</p>	<p>applicable public interest standards and concerns identified in the Joint Consumer Groups’ Protest and under applicable law. (<i>Id.</i> at 28, 35, 37). Therefore, the decision did not find it necessary to resolve the question of the specific applicability of the public interest factors in Section 854 (b) and (c). (<i>Id.</i> at 27, 37).</p>	
<p>2. Scope</p> <p>Greenlining, as well as other consumer groups, argued that the Joint Applicant’s no-adverse effect analysis was insufficient under § 854 (a). As a result, Greenlining argued the Commission should examine factors beyond those identified in application. These factors include California-specific effects of the Proposed Transaction on competition, service quality and reliability, network infrastructure investment, consumer protections and California jobs. (Joint Consumers’ Protest at 2-4, 6-8; Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement at 6).</p>	<p>The Final Decision approved without modification the settlement negotiated by Joint Consumers and the Joint Applicants. (Final Decision at 23, 27). The Final Decision notes that the Settlement provides for tangible California-specific commitments on the part of Joint Applicants beyond what the Application offered. (<i>Id.</i> at 27). The Settlement contains commitments to protect existing contracts and dark fiber leasing, \$3 million in service quality upgrades and reporting, \$323 million in network infrastructure investment, consumer complaint reporting, employee retention reporting and diversity hiring goals. (Final Decision, App. 1 at 5-7).</p> <p>Note: As a settlement agreement was adopted, the confidential discussions in reaching the settlement are for the most part not reflected in the final decision.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>B. Competitive Effects</p> <p>1. Greenlining, as well as other consumer groups, argued that the Commission should consider the Application’s competitive</p>	<p>The Final Decision approved without modification the settlement negotiated by Joint Consumers and the Joint Applicants. (Final Decision at 23, 27). The settlement contains a number of provisions meant to</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>effects on California’s broadband market and potential antitrust and anticompetitive behavior especially in regards to wholesale access, unfair business practices and existing contracts. (Joint Consumers’ Protest at 3, 5, 7-8; Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement at 5-7).</p> <p>2. Greenlining argued that the Commission’s evaluation of the Application’s public benefits should consider the impact on California network infrastructure investment, particularly with regards to middle mile infrastructure. (Joint Consumers’ Protest at 3, 5, 7-8; Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement at 5-7).</p>	<p>protect competition, including preserving the terms of existing customer contracts; providing notice to the Commission of any decision to terminate the practice of leasing dark fiber to unaffiliated wholesale and enterprise customers; and providing notice to the Commission if the Joint Applicants are the subject of any formal FCC investigation or complaint alleging switched access arbitrage. (Final Decision at 24, 35-36, App. 1 at 7).</p> <p>The approved settlement includes a number of conditions that will promote infrastructure investment in California. For example, the Settlement requires the Joint Applicants to commit to spending \$323 million in capital expenditures in California. A portion of this capital expenditure will be spent to build new middle mile infrastructure in locations where unserved/underserved communities exist. (Final Decision at 24, 35, App. 1, at 5). These investments also include \$3 million to improve network reliability. (<i>Id.</i> at 35, App. 1 at 6). The Final Decision characterizes these commitments as a “positive public interest benefit.” (<i>Id.</i> at 28).</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>C. Mitigation measures including reporting requirements</p> <p>1. Greenlining, as well as other consumer groups, argued that the Joint</p>	<p>The Final Decision approved without modification the settlement negotiated by Joint Consumers and</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>Applicants would have to increase reliability as well as outage reporting to mitigate customer harms post-merger and to serve the public interest. (Joint Consumers’ Protest at 3, 5-7; Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement at 5, 7).</p>	<p>the Joint Applicants. (Final Decision at 23, 27). The Settlement requires the Joint Applicants to submit granular reports on network outages beyond what the FCC requires in addition to reporting on broadband projects, synergy savings and employment levels. (Final Decision at 36, App. 1 at 5-8). The Final Decision found that these commitments enable the Joint Applicants to continue to provide safe and reliable service. (<i>Id.</i> at 29, 35).</p>	
<p>2. Greenlining, as well as other consumer groups, argued that the Commission must consider and review the effect of the transaction on California jobs, and suggested a commitment to supplier and workforce diversity in assessing the Proposed Transaction’s public benefits. (Joint Consumers’ Protest at 2, 7)</p>	<p>The settlement requires the Joint Applicants to report and strive to reach supplier diversity procurement goals that exceed those set forth in General Order 156, with a goal of 20 percent annual utilization of minority-owned business enterprises. The settlement also includes an agreement by the applicants to meet and discuss its annual supplier diversity reports. (Final Decision at 36; App. 1 at 6-7). The decision found these commitments mitigate considerations related to disadvantaged communities. (<i>Id.</i> at 29, 35).</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>3. Greenlining, as well as other consumer groups, argued that the Commission should ensure the benefits of the Proposed Transaction are distributed fairly and reach unserved and underserved communities. (Joint Consumers’ Protest</p>	<p>The Settlement requires the Joint Applicants to convene a workshop with Greenlining and other consumer groups to identify locations to invest in new middle mile infrastructure. These locations will focus on unserved and underserved communities, ensuring</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>at 4, 5; Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement at 9).</p>	<p>that these communities receive some investment benefits from the transaction. (Final Decision at 36, App. 1 at 5). The Final Decision also found that the supplier diversity commitments address considerations related to disadvantaged communities. (Final Decision at 29, 35).</p>	
--	--	--

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Was the Public Advocate's Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?¹</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN, CETF, Cal Advocates</p>		<p>Verified</p>
<p>d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication:</p> <p>Greenlining's work in this proceeding was different from that of CETF, Cal Advocates and TURN in that it focused on the impacts of the merger on communities of color and low-income communities specifically. This perspective influenced many of the positions Greenlining took in the proceeding and in negotiations. Accordingly, some of the issues, such as supplier diversity, were uniquely championed by Greenlining.</p> <p>Throughout the proceeding, Greenlining remained in regular contact with advocates from Cal Advocates and TURN, to ensure that Greenlining's work was not duplicative. Where parties agreed, they coordinated rather than merely echoing each other. In negotiating the settlement, Greenlining and the other consumer groups shared expertise. This allowed Greenlining to avoid the duplicative need to individually research issues necessary to come up with the protest and negotiating positions that resulted in the approved settlement. When possible, Greenlining coordinated on joint filings and <i>ex parte</i> meetings</p>		<p>Noted</p>

¹ The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) was renamed the Public Advocate's Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates), pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

<p>to avoid duplicative efforts.</p> <p>Throughout this proceeding, Greenlining coordinated closely with other intervenors and parties to avoid or minimize duplication of its work. For example, Greenlining focused on specific areas of expertise, particularly supplier diversity and competitive effects of the merger on communities of color. Greenlining urges the Commission to find that any duplication of effort was minimal and was necessary to ensure effective and efficient representation of a wide variety of consumer interests.</p>	
--	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION:

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

<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>The Commission has long favored settlement of disputes because it reduces litigation costs and conserves scarce resources. The Commission recognized this settlement helped avoid excess expenditure of time and resources and provided tangible public benefits beyond what the Joint Applicants originally offered. (Final Decision at 22-23, 27). The settlement reflects months of discussions and the consistent and regular exchange of information among the Settling parties. This time and effort was necessary to satisfactorily resolve complex issues and ensure the transaction would serve a wide range of public benefits. The Final Decision specifically notes the benefits of the settlement to consumers, stating that it provides “discrete benefits to California consumers including, among other things, improved service quality reporting, funding for facility expansion and certainty for enterprise and wholesale customers with existing contracts.” (<i>Id.</i> at 24). The decision also notes that the settlement commitments ensure safe and reliable service, and brings benefits to disadvantaged communities. (<i>Id.</i> at 29).</p> <p>The settlement ensures a high level of network investment, supplier diversity, granular reporting and greater network reliability. The effect of these commitments is to improve broadband access, increase jobs, and accountability. While these benefits are difficult to quantify, the aggregate economic benefit of the settlement is many times higher than the amount Greenlining claims here. As such, Greenlining asserts that the cost of its participation is reasonable in light of the benefits realized as a result of its participation</p>	<p><u>CPUC Discussion</u></p> <p>Noted</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>Greenlining’s hours were reasonable given the immense volume</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>of information, much of it highly technical or legally complex, that was being considered in this proceeding. Greenlining sought to maintain a streamlined process of work assignments internally, with a clear division of labor.</p> <p>Additionally, Greenlining has recorded a number of hours in the “coordination” category. Greenlining spent substantial time coordinating with parties including ORA and TURN. This time helped avoid duplicative work and improved efficiency among the parties.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>Greenlining’s time is allocated by issue category as follows:</p> <p>A. Jurisdiction and Scope – 3.8% B. Competitive effects – 35.2% C. Mitigation measures including reporting requirements – 20.3% D. Confidential Settlement Discussions – 28.1% E. General – 9.4% F. Coordination among parties – 3.3%</p>	<p>Noted</p>

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Paul Goodman, attorney	2017	48.60	\$370.00	See Comment 1	\$17,982.00	48.60	\$370.00 [A]	\$17,982.00
Vinhcent Le, attorney	2017	49.40	\$200.00	See Comment 2	\$9,880.00	49.60 [B]	\$200.00 [C]	\$9,920.00
<i>Subtotal: \$ 27,862.00</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$27,902.00</i>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Paul Goodman, attorney	2017	2.30	\$175.00	The rate is half of the rate specified above, for more information see Comment A	\$402.50	2.30	\$185.00 [D]	\$425.50

Vinhcent Le, attorney	2017	6.90	\$100	The rate is half of the rate specified above, for more information see Comment B	\$690.00	6.90	\$100.00	\$690.00
<i>Subtotal: \$1,092.50</i>					<i>Subtotal: \$1,115.50</i>			
TOTAL REQUEST: \$28,954.50					TOTAL AWARD: \$29,017.50			
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). 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 are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney			Date Admitted to CA BAR ²		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation	
Paul Goodman			04/24/2002		219086		No	
Vinhcent Le			2/25/2017		314269		No	

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	Certificate of Service
1	<p>Paul Goodman is currently Senior Legal Counsel for The Greenlining Institute, and leads Greenlining's telecommunications advocacy, including proceedings at the Commission and the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Goodman's first Commission approved rate was for work done in 2011. Mr. Goodman is now in his seventh year of practice before the Commission and fifteenth year of practice as an attorney. Resolution ALJ-345 sets the range for work done in 2017 for attorneys with 13+ years of experience at \$325-585. The Commission's IC rate chart's most recent entry for Mr. Goodman sets his rate as \$320 as of 2014. The Commission approved a rate of \$325 for Mr. Goodman in D.17-04-013 for his 2016 intervenor contributions.</p> <p>Resolution ALJ-345 setting rates for 2017 notes: "It is reasonable to allow</p>

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

	<p>individuals an annual “step increase” of five percent, twice within each experience level and capped at the maximum rate for that level, as authorized by D.07-01-009.” Mr. Goodman has yet to receive any “step increase” in rates. Considering Mr. Goodman’s experience and contributions on behalf of consumers, Greenlining respectfully requests a rate of \$370. This figure considers a retroactive step increase of 5% when Mr. Goodman had 12 years of experience in 2014, and two 5% step increases for 2015 and 2016 when he had 13+ years of experience.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Vinhcent Le is currently Legal Counsel for The Greenlining Institute, and handles Greenlining’s telecommunications advocacy, including proceedings at the Commission and the Federal Communications Commission under the supervision of Paul Goodman.</p> <p>Mr. Le was sworn into the California State Bar in 2017. He received his J.D from the University of California Irvine School of Law in 2016 and graduated with Latin honors. While at UC Irvine, Mr. Le worked as a Research Assistant where he co-authored a paper on economic law, and effective regulatory regimes for fisheries, fossil fuels and trade disputes. Mr. Le also has significant administrative law experience from his time clerking with the Small Business Administration and the Office of Medicare Hearings and Appeals.</p> <p>Mr. Le has worked on the Telecommunications Team at the Greenlining Institute since 2016. His telecommunications experience covers a wide range of issues such as broadband deployment, competition, Net Neutrality, the Lifeline program, NTIA metrics and big data regulation. Mr. Le is also a member of the FCC’s Consumer Advisory Committee. In this proceeding, he provided significant input on the legal and policy issues raised during settlement negotiations, and along with Paul Goodman, was Greenlining’s representative for the purposes of settlement negotiations. Mr. Le performed a substantial part of Greenlining’s coordination, research and drafting in this proceeding.</p> <p>This is Mr. Le’s first completed proceeding before the Commission. Mr. Le has over a year of experience before the Commission. Resolution ALJ-345 sets the range for work done in 2017 for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience at \$170-230. \$200 is an appropriate rate for Mr. Le’s work in 2017 in light of his academic record, previous experience and comparable market rates for attorneys with similar experience (the Laffey Matrix, which is used in some jurisdictions to determine the reasonableness of attorney fees, <i>available at https://www.justice.gov/usao-dc/file/796471/download</i>, sets the comparable rate as \$291).</p>

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments (CPUC completes):

Item	Reason
[A]	Commission finds reasonable a rate of \$370.00 per hour for Goodman in 2017.
[B]	Reported hours for Le in 2017 was 49.60 hours.
[C]	Commission finds reasonable a rate of \$200.00 per hour for Le in 2017.
[D]	½ of the regular 2017 rate for Goodman is \$185.00 per hour.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS:

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

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
--	----

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes
--	-----

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Greenlining Institute has made a substantial contribution to D.17-10-003.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Greenlining 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 \$29,017.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Greenlining Institute shall be awarded \$29,017.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, CenturyLink Communications LLC ratepayers, and Level 3 Operating Entities ratepayers shall pay The Greenlining Institute their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional communications revenues for the 2017 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 February 25, 2018, the 75th day after the filing of The Greenlining Institute's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated January 31, 2019, at Sacramento, California.

MICHAEL PICKER

President

LIANE M. RANDOLPH

MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

Commissioners

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D1901042	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1710003		
Proceeding(s):	A1703016		
Author:	ALJ DeAngelis		
Payer(s):	CenturyLink Communications LLC ratepayers, and Level 3 Operating Entities ratepayers.		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier ?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Greenlining Institute	12/11/2017	\$28,954.50	\$29,017.50	N/A	Difference in reported hours and rates.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Paul	Goodman	Attorney	TGI	\$370.00	2017	\$370.00
Vinhcent	Le	Attorney	TGI	\$200.00	2017	\$200.00

(END OF APPENDIX)