Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338 E) to Establish Marginal Costs, Allocate Revenues and Design Rates.	Application 05-05-023 (Filed May 20, 2005)

OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK AND THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 06-06-067

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title **Page**

OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK AND THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS 2
TO DECISION 06-06-067 2
1. Background 2
2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation 3
3. Procedural Issues 4
4. Substantial Contribution 5
4.1 TURN 6
4.2 Inter-Class Revenue Allocation and System Average Percentage Change (SAPC) Cap 6
4.3 Vote Solar 7
5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation 9
5.1 TURN 9
5.2 Hours and Costs Related to and Necessary for Substantial Contribution 11
5.2.1 TURN 11
5.2.2 Vote Solar 11
5.3 Hourly Rates 12
5.3.1 TURN 12
5.3.2 Vote Solar 13
5.4 Productivity 16
5.4.1 TURN 16
5.4.2 Vote Solar 16
5.5 Direct Expenses 17
5.5.1 TURN 17
5.5.2 Vote Solar 17
6. Award 17
7. Waiver of Comment Period 19
8. Assignment of Proceeding 19
Findings of Fact 20
Conclusions of Law 20
Appendix A

OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK AND THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 06-06-067

This decision awards The Utility Reform Network (TURN) $38,269.30 and The Vote Solar Initiative (Vote Solar) $42,821.76 in compensation for their substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 06-06-067. Both awards represent decreases from the amounts requested.

1. Background

Southern California Edison Company (SCE) filed the subject application to establish marginal costs, allocate revenues and design rates for Phase 2 of SCE's 2006 General Rate Case (GRC)[1] (Application). The Commission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA)[2] and the Alliance for Retail Energy Markets protested the application. After DRA served its initial testimony, intervenors including TURN and Vote Solar served testimony in January 2006.

During a March 2006 conference call between all active parties (Settling Parties) and the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), Settling Parties indicated a settlement of all issues was likely. During the next weeks Settling Parties engaged in negotiations, and in April 2006 entered into a Settlement Agreement which resolved all issues in the proceeding. On April 20, 2006, the ALJ held an evidentiary hearing to review the reasonableness of the Settlement Agreement and to identify and receive parties' testimony and exhibits into the record. D.06-06-067 adopted the Settlement Agreement.

---

[1] Phase 1 of SCE's 2006 GRC increased general rates by $333.1 million.

[2] Formerly the "Office of Ratepayer Advocates."

2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, enacted in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,[3] requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if the intervenor makes a substantial contribution to the Commission's proceedings. The statute provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

Specifically, a claim for compensation must address these requirements:

1. The intervenor must satisfy certain procedural requirements including the filing of a sufficient notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days of the prehearing conference (PHC), or in special circumstances at other appropriate times that we specify. (§ 1804(a).)
2. The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction. (§ 1802(b).)
3. The intervenor should file and serve a request for a compensation award within 60 days of our final order or decision in a hearing or proceeding. (§ 1804(c).)
4. The intervenor must demonstrate "significant financial hardship." (§§ 1802(g), 1804(b)(1).)
5. The intervenor's presentation must have made a "substantial contribution" to the proceeding, through the adoption, in whole or in part, of the intervenor's contention or recommendations by a Commission order or decision. (§§ 1802(i), 1803(a).)
6. The claimed fees and costs must be reasonable (§ 1801), necessary for and related to the substantial contribution (D.98-04-059), comparable to the market rates paid to

[3] Subsequent statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

> others with comparable training and experience (§ 1806), and productive (D.98-04-059).

For discussion here, the procedural issues in Items 1-4 above are combined in the next section, followed by separate discussions on Items 5-6.

3. Procedural Issues

The PHC in this matter was held on July 20, 2005. TURN and Vote Solar timely filed their NOIs on August 17, 2005 and August 18, 2005, respectively. TURN and Vote Solar asserted financial hardship in their NOIs.

On September 16, 2005, ALJ DeBerry issued a ruling that found TURN a customer pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C) and Vote Solar a customer pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(B). TURN meets the financial hardship condition through a rebuttable presumption of eligibility pursuant to § 1804(b)(1) by meeting this requirement in another proceeding within one year of the commencement of this proceeding (ALJ Ruling dated July 27, 2004, in Rulemaking (R.) 04-04-003). Vote Solar made an adequate showing of financial hardship pursuant to § 1802(g) by providing the necessary financial information regarding the customer it represents.

TURN and Vote Solar each filed their requests for compensation on September 5, 2006, within 60 days of D.06-06-067 being issued.[4] In view of the above, we affirm the ALJ's ruling and find that TURN and Vote Solar have satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make requests for compensation in this proceeding.

---

[4] No party opposes the requests.

4. Substantial Contribution

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, we consider whether the Commission adopted one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the customer. If the customer's contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, we consider whether the customer's participation materially supplemented, complemented, or contributed to the presentation of the other party in a way that contributed to the Commission's decision. As described in § 1802(i), the assessment of whether the customer made a substantial contribution requires the exercise of judgment.

> In assessing whether the customer meets this standard, the Commission typically reviews the record, composed in part of pleadings of the customer and, in litigated matters, the hearing transcripts, and compares it to the findings, conclusions, and orders in the decision to which the customer asserts it contributed. It is then a matter of judgment as to whether the customer's presentation substantially assisted the Commission.[5]

Should the Commission not adopt any of the customer's recommendations, compensation may be awarded if, in the judgment of the Commission, the customer's participation substantially contributed to the decision or order. For example, if a customer provided a unique perspective that enriched the Commission's deliberations and the record, the Commission could find that the customer made a substantial contribution. With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions TURN and Vote Solar made to the proceeding.

---

[5] D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

4.1 TURN

TURN actively participated in the proceeding, prepared and served testimony, and participated in the mediation process that led to the Settlement Agreement. TURN points out the difficulty in identifying the specific contributions of a particular party to a settled outcome since Rule 12.6[6] precludes disclosure of settlement discussions, and because each settlement term reflects a negotiated compromise among the various parties. Nevertheless, TURN's contributions can readily be inferred by comparing TURN's testimony and recommendations with those of the other parties, as well as the specific provisions of the Settlement Agreement.[7]

4.2 Inter-Class Revenue Allocation and System Average Percentage Change (SAPC) Cap

TURN states that one of the more contentious issues in the proceeding was the inter-class revenue allocation. Revenue allocation determines the revenue requirement that will be borne by each class of customers. A cap on the SAPC minimizes the amount of revenue requirement that can be allocated to a particular customer class.

In this proceeding, SCE recommended that the cap for residential class be 5% above SAPC. TURN, as well as DRA, recommended a 2% maximum cap. However, TURN notes that it also called attention to our ongoing activities in R.02-01-011 regarding the Direct Access (DA) Cost Responsibility Surcharge

---

[6] All references are to the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure unless otherwise noted.

[7] The Settlement Agreement is included as Attachment A to D.06-06-067.

(CRS) that would significantly impact residential rates adopted in this proceeding.

TURN contends that the nexus between the rate changes proposed in this proceeding, and the DA CRS proceeding, were recognized and adopted in the Settlement Agreement.[8] Consequently, the Commission adopted a cap above SAPC of 3%. TURN points out that this reduced cap provides a significant benefit to residential ratepayers. We agree. A reduced cap above SAPC has a significant affect on revenue allocation and ultimately the rate increase borne by residential customers, and thus indicates a substantial contribution.

In addition to work on revenue allocation, TURN states that it prepared testimony for two witnesses addressing other rate design issues, such as marginal costs, and participated throughout the proceeding.

As the settlement negotiations are confidential, it is difficult to fully assess any parties' participation and contribution in this process. However, TURN contributed to a determination of the SAPC cap, pointed out the relevance of the DA CRS to this proceeding, supported the Settlement Agreement and prepared testimony regarding important rate design issues leading to the Settlement Agreement. Thus, we find that TURN provided a substantial contribution to D.06-06-067.

4.3 Vote Solar

Vote Solar states that its primary contribution to this proceeding is the addition of a Time-Of-Use (TOU) Schedule available to GS-2 and TOU-GS-3 customers.[9] Vote Solar contends this additional schedule was proposed by

---

[8] Settlement Agreement, Appendix B, pp. 12-13, and D.06-06-067, p. 7.

[9] D.06-06-067, p. 17.

Vote Solar in its testimony.[10] Vote Solar notes that, while slightly modified during settlement negotiations, the proposed additional TOU schedule adopted by D.06-06-067 is substantially the same as it proposed.

Vote Solar points out that it recommended tariff options with reduced demand charges which will improve financial benefits to all customers by increasing investments in energy efficiency, demand response and customer sited renewable energy. These investments will curb load growth and demand and reduce the need for additional infrastructure improvements.

We note that Vote Solar prepared testimony, and as indicated by the detailed hourly time charges, actively participated in the negotiation process leading to the Settlement Agreement. As discussed above, settlement negotiations are confidential and therefore it is difficult to fully assess any parties' participation and contribution to this process. Nevertheless, we find that Vote Solar's recommendation for the additional TOU schedule, its preparation of testimony (Exhibit 2-17), its participation in the negotiation process, and its support for the Settlement Agreement provided a substantial contribution to D.06-06-067.

After we have determined the scope of a customer's substantial contribution, we then look at whether the compensation requested is reasonable.

---

[10] Exhibit 2-17, pp. 16-19.

5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

5.1 TURN

TURN requests $38,464.33 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

Attorney Fees	Year[11]	Hours	Hourly Rate	Subtotal ($)
Michel Florio	2006	30.5	$490	$14,945.00
Michel Florio	2006	2.0	$245[12]	490.00
Marcel Hawiger	2005	6.0	$270	1,620.00
Marcel Hawiger	2006	22.0	$280	6,160.00
Marcel Hawiger	2006	6.5	$140[13]	910.00
Nina Suetake	2005	0.25	$190	47.50
Nina Suetake	2006	7.50	$200	1,500.00
			Subtotal: =	**$25,672.50**

Professional Fees	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Subtotal ($)
William Marcus	2005	1.0	$210	$210.00
William Marcus	2006	51.83	$210	10,884.30
Jeffrey Nahigian	2005	8.5	$155	1,317.50
Jeffrey Nahigian	2006	2.0	$155	310.00
			Subtotal: =	**$12,721.80**

Other Reasonable Costs	
Photocopying	$42.60
Express Delivery	13.10
Parking and Tolls	10.00
Telephone Expenses	4.33
	Subtotal: = $70.00
	Total: = $38,464.33

[11] Year work was performed.

[12] Preparation of the compensation request at one-half the normal hourly rate.

[13] *Id.*

Vote Solar requests $77,348.18[14] for its participation in this proceeding as follows:

Attorney Fees	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Subtotal ($)
Gregg Wheatland	2005	30.1	$470	$14,147.00
Gregg Wheatland	2005	4.1	$235[15]	963.50
Gregg Wheatland	2006	40.4	$495	19,998.00
Gregg Wheatland	2006	6.7	$247.50[16]	1,658.25
				Subtotal: = $36,766.75

Professional Fees	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Subtotal ($)
JP Ross	2005	67.15	$120	$8,058.00
JP Ross	2006	127.35	$140	17,829.00
JP Ross	2006	6.7	$70[17]	469.00[18]
Adam Browning	2005	9.2	$60[19]	552.00
Ed Smeloff	2006	37.1	$300	11,130.00
Tom Baker	2006	12.7	$180	2,286.00
			Subtotal: =	**$40,324.00**

Other Reasonable Costs	
Postage	$10.46
Telephone Expenses	0.71
Lexis Lexis	230.06
Photocopies	16.20
	Subtotal: = $257.43
	Total: = $77,348.18

In general, the components of these requests must constitute reasonable fees and costs of the customer's preparation for and participation in a proceeding

---

[14] Corrected total, as discussed in following footnotes.

[15] Preparation of the compensation request at one-half normal hourly rate. Hourly rate is corrected from Vote Solar requested rate of $234 per hour.

[16] Preparation of the compensation request at one-half normal hourly rate. Hourly rate is corrected from Vote Solar requested rate of $247 per hour.

[17] Preparation of the compensation request at one-half normal hourly rate.

[18] Corrected from $784.00 due to arithmetic error.

[19] Preparation of the compensation request at one-half normal hourly rate.

that resulted in a substantial contribution. The issues we consider to determine reasonableness are discussed below.

5.2 Hours and Costs Related to and Necessary for Substantial Contribution

We first assess whether the hours claimed for the customer's efforts that resulted in substantial contributions to Commission decisions are reasonable by determining to what degree the hours and costs are related to the work performed and necessary for the substantial contribution.

5.2.1 TURN

TURN documented its claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of its attorneys and professional staff, accompanied by a brief description of each activity.

5.2.2 Vote Solar

Vote Solar documented its claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of its attorney and professional staff, accompanied by a brief description of each activity. We are concerned that, in this proceeding, Vote Solar has failed to work in an efficient manner as required by Section 1801.3. As we stated in D.98-04-059 and more recently in D.06-09-011, the cost of an intervenor's participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the work performed in its participation.

Based on our detailed review of Vote Solar's time entries, Vote Solar has failed to justify why it is reasonable to compensate Vote Solar $77,348.18 for its work on a single issue when, by comparison, TURN completed a comprehensive review of this proceeding and seeks $38,464.33. TURN actively participated in the broad issues of revenue allocation, rate design, and marginal costs. Vote Solar worked only on TOU tariff. TURN claimed a total of 138 hours, compared to Vote Solar's total claimed hours of 341.50. Moreover, although

Vote Solar and TURN focused on different issues, we are not persuaded that, in terms of overall hours, Vote Solar's contribution was more significant TURN.

Accordingly, we conclude Vote Solar is requesting an excessive number of hours that do not appear productive in comparison to the showing by TURN. To account for Vote Solar's excessive number of hours, we will reduce Vote Solar's final award to ensure a reasonable relationship between the cost of Vote Solar's participation and the work Vote Solar performed. As a fair approximation of a reasonable number of hours for Vote Solar, we shall use TURN's number of hours as a benchmark. Vote Solar claims approximately 2/3 more hours than TURN. We will reduce Vote Solar's claim, however, only by 1/3. Even with this reduction, Vote Solar's award is significantly higher than TURN's.

5.3 Hourly Rates

We next take into consideration whether the claimed fees and costs are comparable to the market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

5.3.1 TURN

TURN seeks an hourly rate of $490 for work performed by Florio in 2006. In D.06-11-032, we previously approved an hourly rate of $485 for Florio for work performed in 2006, and adopt that rate here.

TURN seeks hourly rates of $270 and $280 for work performed by Hawiger in 2005 and 2006, respectively. In D.06-11-039, we previously approved hourly rates of $270 and $280 for Hawiger for work performed in 2005 and 2006, respectively, and adopt these rates here.

TURN seeks hourly rates of $190 and $200 for work performed by Suetake in 2005 and 2006, respectively. In D.06-10-018, we previously approved

hourly rates of $190 and $195 for Suetake for work performed in 2005 and 2006, respectively, and adopt these rates here.

TURN seeks hourly rates of $210 for Marcus and $155 for Nahigian for work performed in 2005 and 2006. We previously approved these same rates in D.06-10-018 and adopt them here.

5.3.2 Vote Solar

Vote Solar seeks an hourly rate of $120 for work performed by expert Browning in 2005. In D.06-09-004 we previously approved an hourly rate of $100 for Browning for work performed in 2004. D.05-11-031 established guidelines for 2005 work that generally do not authorize increases in rates for 2005 above rates adopted for 2004, except in specific circumstances. Therefore, we adopt a rate of $100 for Browning for work performed in 2005.

Vote Solar seeks hourly rates of $120 and $140 for work performed by expert Ross in 2005, and 2006, respectively. In D.06-09-004 we previously approved these rates. However, in D.07-01-009, we adopted measures relating to intervenor hourly rates, and cost-of-living adjustments (COLA) that provide a 3% increase above rates previously authorized for 2005. We will apply a 3% COLA to Ross' previously approved 2005 hourly rate of $120 and adopt an hourly rate of $125 for work performed by Ross in 2006.

Vote Solar seeks an hourly rate of $300 for expert Smeloff in 2005. In D.06-09-004 we previously approved this same rate and adopt it here.

Vote Solar seeks an hourly rate of $180 for expert Baker for work performed in 2005 and 2006. Vote Solar points out that Baker has been a registered professional engineer for approximately 25 years, with many years of experience installing solar energy systems. Vote Solar also notes that Baker

prepared the testimony explaining how rate design can affect the economic payback of solar installations.

Vote Solar compares Baker to William Steinhurst, an expert who has appeared for TURN with an adopted hourly rate of $150 for 2004 work.[20] Steinhurst has various degrees including a PhD in Mechanical Engineering, and 20 years experience as a Planning Econometrician. As a director for regulated utility planning, he also has presented testimony in more than 30 cases before regulatory agencies. We have not previously established an hourly rate for Baker. Although we agree with Vote Solar that Steinhurst has comparable training and experience to Baker, this is the first time Baker has appeared as an intervenor expert. Given his education and experience, and as this is his first experience as an expert, we find a rate of $150 reasonable for Baker for 2006.

Vote Solar seeks hourly rates of $470 and $495 for attorney Wheatland for work performed in 2005 and 2006, respectively. Vote Solar states that Wheatland was admitted to the California State Bar in 1976, has been practicing law before California agencies for nearly thirty years, served as Staff Counsel and Assistant Chief ALJ at the Commission, served as Deputy City Attorney for the City of San Francisco, and has represented clients before the Commission and other agencies. Vote Solar contends that Wheatland's experience qualifies him as equivalent to those attorneys receiving the highest rate of compensation before the Commission.[21]

---

[20] D.06-06-057, p. 17.

[21] D.07-01-009 sets an hourly range of $270-$490 for intervenor attorneys with 13 plus years of experience.

We have not previously established an hourly rate for Wheatland as this is the first time he has appeared before the Commission representing an intervenor. In D.05-11-031 (p. 16) we stated that first-time representatives must make a showing in the compensation request to justify their proposed hourly rate, taking into consideration rates previously awarded to representatives with comparable training and experience. Vote Solar did not make a comparability showing for Wheatland in its request. However, we note that in its Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation, filed August 17, 2005, Vote Solar estimated a legal counsel hourly rate of $325, significantly less than the rate now requested. We also note that Wheatland's experience and background are similar to Ed O'Neill, an attorney who has appeared previously before the Commission as an intervenor. O'Neill graduated from law school in 1976, now with 30 years experience. O'Neill also served as an assistant general counsel, an ALJ, and a Commissioner's Legal Advisor at the Commission. In D.02-11-024 we established an hourly rate for O'Neill of $295 for work performed in 2000, and $315 per hour for 2001.[22] O'Neill's hourly rate has substantially increased after several years of observing the quality of his work. In consideration of our relative lack of knowledge regarding Wheatland's productivity and expertise as an intervenor attorney, and as Vote Solar estimated an hourly counsel rate of $325, we adopt a rate of $335 for Wheatland for work performed in 2005, and a rate of $345 for work performed in 2006.[23]

---

[22] *Mimeo.*, p. 19.

[23] We will apply 3% COLA to adopted 2005 rates rounded to the nearest $5 to determine 2006 rates.

5.4 Productivity

D.98-04-059 directed customers to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. The costs of a customer's participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through their participation. This showing assists us in determining the overall reasonableness of the request.

5.4.1 TURN

It is difficult to calculate a reasonable dollar value for TURN's participation. However, the reduction in the SAPC cap from 5% to 3% allows for one measure of productivity. In view of the substantial value of the 2% differential applied to the millions of dollars in allocated revenue requirement by comparison to TURN's request, we find that TURN's efforts have been productive.

5.4.2 Vote Solar

Vote Solar states that the additional TOU schedule adopted in D.06-06-067 will result in benefits to ratepayers that exceed the costs of participation. Vote Solar explains that the additional TOU schedule will provide additional tariff options with reduced demand charges, which will improve financial benefits and decrease load and demand growth by reducing future infrastructure investment.

It is difficult to quantify the productivity of Vote Solar in this instance as the effects of Vote Solar's recommended TOU schedules will be in the future. Nevertheless, we expect that the new TOU tariffs will have their intended effects of reducing energy demand, reducing infrastructure investment, and increasing energy efficiency. As these worthwhile goals should provide

monetary benefits to all customers, we find that Vote Solar's efforts have been productive.

5.5 Direct Expenses

5.5.1 TURN

The itemized direct expenses submitted by TURN include costs for photocopying, express delivery, parking, tolls, and telephone expense and total $70.03. While the parking and tolls are *de minimis* in this case, we take this opportunity to advise intervenors that we will not award compensation in the future for an individual's time and expense for routine commuting from home to attend Commission hearings or for associating parking and tolls. The cost breakdown included with the request shows the miscellaneous expenses to be commensurate with the work performed. We find these costs reasonable.

5.5.2 Vote Solar

The itemized direct expenses submitted by Vote Solar include costs for postage, photocopying, telephone, and Lexis Nexis and total $257.43. The cost breakdown included with the request shows the miscellaneous expenses to be commensurate with the work performed. We find these costs reasonable.

6. Award

As set forth in the table below, we award TURN $38,269.30.

Attorney Fees	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Subtotal ($)
Michel Florio	2006	30.5	$485	$14,792.50
Michel Florio	2006	2.0	$242.50[24]	485.00
Marcel Hawiger	2005	6.0	$270	1,620.00
Marcel Hawiger	2006	22.0	$280	6,160.00
Marcel Hawiger	2006	6.5	$140[25]	910.00

[24] Preparation of the compensation request at one-half normal hourly rate.

[25] *Id.*

Nina Suetake	2005	0.25	$190	47.50
Nina Suetake	2006	7.50	$195	1,462.50
				Subtotal: = $25,447.50

Professional Fees	**Year**	**Hours**	**Hourly Rate**	**Subtotal ($)**
William Marcus	2005	1.0	$210	$210.00
William Marcus	2006	51.83	$210	10,884.30
Jeffrey Nahigian	2005	8.5	$155	1,317.50
Jeffrey Nahigian	2006	2.0	$155	310.00
				Subtotal: = $12,721.80

Other Reasonable Costs

Photocopying	$42.60
Express Delivery	13.10
Parking and Tolls	10.00
Telephone Expenses	4.33
	Subtotal: = $70.03
	Total: = $38,269.30

As set forth in the table below, we award Vote Solar $42,821.76

Attorney Fees	**Year**	**Hours**	**Hourly Rate**	**Subtotal ($)**
Gregg Wheatland	2005	30.1	$335	$10,083.50
Gregg Wheatland	2005	4.1	$167.50[26]	686.75
Gregg Wheatland	2006	40.4	$345	13,938.00
Gregg Wheatland	2006	6.7	$172.50[27]	1,155.75
				Subtotal: = $25,864.00

Professional Fees	**Year**	**Hours**	**Hourly Rate**	**Subtotal ($)**
JP Ross	2005	67.15	$120	$8,058.00
JP Ross	2006	127.35	$125	15,918.75
JP Ross	2006	6.7	$62.50[28]	418.75
Adam Browning	2005	9.2	$60[29]	552.00
Ed Smeloff	2006	37.1	$300	11,130.00
Tom baker	2006	12.7	$150	1,905.00
				Subtotal: = $37,982.50

[26] *Id.*

[27] *Id.*

[28] *Id.*

[29] *Id.*

	Fee Total = $63,846.50
	33% reduction = $21,282.17
	$42,564.33

Other Reasonable Costs

Postage	
Telephone Expense	$10.46
Lexis	0.71
Photocopies	230.06
	Cost Subtotal = $257.43
	Total = $42,821.76

Consistent with previous Commission decisions, we order that interest be paid on the award amount (at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15) commencing on November 19, 2006, the 75th day after TURN and Vote Solar filed their compensation requests, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

The award is to be paid by SCE as the regulated entity in this proceeding.

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. TURN's and Vote Solar's records should identify specific issues for which each requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rate, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed.

7. Waiver of Comment Period

This is an intervenor compensation matter. Accordingly, as provided by Rule 14.6(c)(6) of our Rules of Practice and Procedure, we waive the otherwise applicable 30-day comment period for this decision.

8. Assignment of Proceeding

John A. Bohn is the assigned Commissioner, and Bruce DeBerry is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. TURN and Vote Solar have satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.

2. TURN and Vote Solar made substantial contributions to D.06-06-067 as described herein.

3. TURN and Vote Solar requested hourly rates for its representatives that, as adjusted here in, are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.

4. TURN and Vote Solar requested related expenses that are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

5. The total of the reasonable compensation for TURN is $38,269.30.

6. The total of the reasonable compensation for Vote Solar is $42,821.76.

Conclusions of Law

1. TURN and Vote Solar have fulfilled the requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and are entitled to intervenor compensation for their claimed compensation, as adjusted herein, incurred in making substantial contributions to D.06-06-067.

2. TURN should be awarded $38,269.30 for its contribution to D.06-06-067.

3. Vote Solar should be awarded $42,821.76 for its contribution to D.06-06-067.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Utility Reform Network is awarded $38,269.30 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 06-06-067.

2. The Vote Solar Initiative (Vote Solar) is awarded $42,821.76 as compensation for its substantial contribution to D.06-06-067.

3. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison Company shall pay TURN and Vote Solar their total awards. Payment of the awards shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning November 19, 2006, the 75th day after the filing date of TURN's and Vote Solar's requests for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

4. Application 05-05-023 is closed.

   This order is effective today.

   Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX A

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		**Modifies Decision?**
Contribution Decision(s):	D0606067	
Proceeding(s):	A0505023	
Author:	ALJ DeBerry	
Payer:	Southern California Edison Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
TURN	9/5/06	$38,426.83	$38,269.30	No	Reduced 2006 hourly rates
Vote Solar	9/5/06	$77,348.18	$42,821.76	No	Reduction in hourly rates; excessive hours

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Michel	Florio	Attorney	TURN	$490	2006	$485
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	$270	2005	$270
"	"	"	"	280	2006	$280
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	TURN	$190	2005	$190
"	"	"	"	$200	2006	$195
William	Marcus	Expert	TURN	$210	2005	$210
"	"	"	"	$210	2006	$210
Jeffrey	Nahigian	Expert	TURN	$155	2005	$155
"	"	"	"	$155	2006	$155
Gregg	Wheatland	Attorney	Vote Solar	$470	2005	$335
"	"	"	"	$495	2006	$345
JP	Ross	Expert	Vote Solar	$120	2005	$120
"	"	Expert	"	$140	2006	$125
Adam	Browning	Expert	Vote Solar	$120	2005	$100
Ed	Smeloff	Expert	Vote Solar	$300	2006	$300
Tom	Baker	Expert	Vote Solar	$180	2006	$150

(END OF APPENDIX A)