

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U-902) authority to update its gas and electric revenue requirement and base rates effective on January 1, 2008.

Application 06-12-009  
(Filed December 8, 2006)

And Related Matters.

Application 06-12-010  
(Filed December 8, 2006)  
Investigation 07-02-013  
(Filed February 15, 2007)

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION  
TO UTILITY CONSUMERS' ACTION NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL  
CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 08-07-046**

This decision awards Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN) \$586,488.00 in compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision (D.)08-07-046. This award represents a reduction of \$24,113.61 from the amount requested due to miscalculations by UCAN, an adjustment in the hourly rate for one of its experts, and reductions for excess hours. Today's award payment will be paid by San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company.

**1. Background**

San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) filed Application (A.) 06-12-009, a general rate case (GRC) application, and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) filed A.06-12-010, also a GRC application. They are

related companies with some shared services. This decision adopts for each company a Test Year 2008 revenue requirement, a mechanism for attrition adjustments until the next GRC, and performance and safety incentive mechanisms, which are reasonable and necessary to provide safe and reliable service to ratepayers.

The Test Year 2008 settlements adopted in this decision provide a gas and electric revenue requirement of \$1.361 billion for SDG&E and a gas revenue requirement of \$1.685 billion for SoCalGas. This proceeding remains open to address intervenor compensation matters.

## **2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation**

The intervenor compensation program, set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,<sup>1</sup> requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if that party 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.

All of the following procedures and criteria must be satisfied for an intervenor to obtain a compensation award:

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), pursuant to Rule 17.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), or at another appropriate time that we specify. (§ 1804(a).)

---

<sup>1</sup> All subsequent statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

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 must 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) and 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 or as otherwise found by the Commission. (§§ 1802(i) and 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 others with comparable training and experience (§ 1806), and productive (D.98-04-059).

In the discussion below, the procedural issues in Items 1-4 above are combined and a separate discussion of Items 5-6 follows.

### **2.1. Preliminary Procedural Issues**

Under § 1804(a)(1) and Rule 17.1(a)(1), a customer who intends to seek an award of intervenor compensation must file an NOI before certain dates.

Section 1804 (a)(1) requires an intervenor who intends to seek a compensation award to file a NOI within thirty days after the PHC, if any is held. In accordance with D.06-12-041, which adopted amendments to Rule 17.1 of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, the intervenor is also allowed to seek an earlier determination of eligibility (D.06-12-041, p. 3.) An intervenor can file a NOI any time after the start of the proceeding until thirty days after the PHC.

UCAN filed its timely notice on December 20, 2006, prior to the February 9, 2007 PHC.

Section 1802(b)(1) defines a “customer” as: (A) a participant representing consumers, customers or subscribers of a utility; (B) a representative who has been authorized by a customer; or (C) a representative of a group or organization authorized pursuant to its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential or small business customers. (§ 1802(b)(1)(A) through (C).) On March 13, 2007, ALJ Long issued a ruling that found UCAN is a customer pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C), because its status as an organization authorizes UCAN pursuant to its articles of incorporation to represent the interests of residential customers.

Regarding the timeliness of the request for compensation, UCAN filed its request for compensation on September 4, 2008, within 60 days of D.08-07-046 being issued. No party opposed the request. In view of the above, we affirm the ALJ’s ruling and find that UCAN has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make its request for compensation in this proceeding.

### **2.1. Financial Hardship**

UCAN makes its showing of significant financial hardship pursuant to Section 1804(b)(1), which states in part:

A finding of significant financial hardship shall create a rebuttable presumption of eligibility for compensation in other commission proceedings commencing within one year of the date of that finding.

UCAN states the Commission recently determined that UCAN would experience significant financial hardship if it were to participate in a Commission proceeding and that finding creates a rebuttable presumption in this proceeding Pursuant to Section 1804(b)(1). The Commission granted UCAN a finding of

significant financial hardship in a ruling issued on May 31, 2006, in C.05-07-022. Because this proceeding commenced within one year of the date of our prior finding of significant financial hardship regarding UCAN, we extend that finding to UCAN's participation in this proceeding pursuant to Section 1804(b)(1).

### **3. Substantial Contribution**

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, we look at several things. First, we look at whether the Commission adopted one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the customer. (§ 1802(i).) Second, if the customer's contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, we look at whether the customer's participation unnecessarily duplicated or materially supplemented, complemented, or contributed to the presentation of the other party. (§§ 1801.3(f) and 1802.5.)

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.<sup>2</sup>

With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions UCAN made to the proceeding.

---

<sup>2</sup> D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

In this proceeding, UCAN's testimony in this case was presented by two consulting groups: JBS Energy and Overland Consulting. UCAN sought a reduction of operational costs as described in the JBS Energy Inc. testimonies commissioned by UCAN. It also sought \$19 million in reductions to Sempra Corporate Center costs as set forth by Overland Consulting's audit performed on behalf of both UCAN and TURN. In these proceedings, UCAN focused its showing on: (1) SDG&E operations; (2) Sempra/Sempra Utilities shared services; and (3) the impact of a collection of utility initiatives known as the Utility of the Future (UoF) on post-test year ratemaking. UCAN also participated with other intervenors in pleadings addressing the effective date of revenue requirements authorized in D.08-07-046.

**Results of Operations:**

SDG&E identified several UCAN proposed adjustments which were adopted in the settlement agreement with DRA. SDG&E wrote in its December 21, 2007 joint motion for the adoption of a settlement:

SDG&E's combined electric and gas authorized revenue requirement for 2008 will be 1,349,000,000. As shown in the Comparison exhibit (Exh. SDG&E-276), SDG&E's final litigation position on revenue requirement was \$1,425,238,000. For SDG&E, DRA proposed combined electric and gas authorized revenue requirement for 2008 was \$1,300,322,000. UCAN proposed an amount substantially lower than proposed by DRA. The Settlement Agreement thus provides for a 2008 revenue requirement for SDG&E which is more than half way toward DRA's position. This revenue requirement is adjusted for miscellaneous revenues. The Joint Parties agree to a miscellaneous revenues forecast of \$28.045 million (in 2008), which recognizes the UCAN proposed adjustments and represents a compromise between the end-of-hearings positions of SDG&E and DRA, rather than an agreement to either party's position. Additional reductions in other areas also

specifically recognize positions taken by UCAN and those areas are described in the detailed Joint Settlement Comparison Exhibit.

In relation to tax issues, it acknowledged:

The Taxes on Income level of expense shall be \$143.866 million, which reflects a compromise between the end-of-hearings positions of SDG&E and DRA. Also, this amount includes using the UCAN forecast of repair deduction for state tax. The Taxes (Other than Income) level of expense shall be \$59.640 million, which reflects a compromise between the end-of-hearings positions of SDG&E and DRA. (Emphasis added: Joint Motion, p. 8.)

And as pointed out above, in the settlement, SDG&E and DRA outline the various O&M areas in which they incorporated UCAN's suggestions.<sup>3</sup>

**Corporate Center Costs:**

SDG&E argued in its February 15, 2008 comments that as shown in the SDG&E Settlement Comparison Exhibit, the SDG&E Settlement did make large adjustments in its Corporate Center costs. (See SDG&E comments, p. 4, see also *e.g.*, pp. 141-42 of Exh. SDG&E-301). The company also conceded in its testimony and its briefs how it had made yet other concessions to the findings of Overland Consulting.

**Prehearing Motion and Discovery:**

Intervenors representing customer interests, including TURN and UCAN, argued that procedural delays caused by SDG&E and SoCalGas, specifically related to late disclosure of UoF evidence, justified a delay in the effective date of revenue requirement changes. The Proposed Decision of ALJ Long found for customers on the issue. ALJ Long recommended that revenue requirement

---

<sup>3</sup> These descriptions can be found on the following pages of Exhibit 301: pp. 15, 23, 25, 51, 53, 54, 65, 66, 73, 75, 83, 142, and 230.

changes should become effective February 1, 2008. (Proposed Decision, pp. 80-86, Findings of Fact 71-74 at p. 95, Conclusions of Law 20-22 at p. 97.) In discussion, ALJ Long noted, “Intervenors argue there was harm” and “intervenors were delayed and distracted by the applicants’ omission of Utility of the Future information from the rate case,” and he quoted an excerpt from TURN and UCAN comments.

Most of the attorney (and consultant) hours in this area were taken up by discovery.

Discovery was extensive and complex, as seen in the submitted time sheets. The discovery hours could not be allocated by topic given the comprehensive nature of the process. However, most of it resulted in expert findings that contributed to the approximately \$130 million in recognized savings attributable to UCAN.

Based on a review of UCAN’s participation, the settlement, and D.08-07-046, it is clear that the Settling Parties believed it was necessary to demonstrate that UCAN’s concerns were adequately addressed. Thus, we find that UCAN made a substantial contribution to this proceeding and the decision reflects the impacts of UCAN’s advocacy.

#### **4. Contributions of Other Parties**

Section 1801.3(f) requires an intervenor to avoid participation that duplicates that of similar interests otherwise adequately represented by another party, or participation unnecessary for a fair determination of the proceeding. Section 1802.5, however, allows an intervenor to be eligible for full compensation where its participation materially supplements, complements, or contributes to the presentation of another party if that participation makes a substantial contribution to the Commission order.

In ALJ Long's April 24, 2007 ruling, he directed that eligible intervenors "must avoid unnecessary duplication of efforts between themselves and other parties", and "must include in their requests for intervenor compensation a showing and accounting reflecting that the participation was efficiently coordinated with the participation of any other party with similar interests." (Ruling Paragraphs 7 and 8.) UCAN coordinated its efforts with the DRA, TURN and Aglet. The final decision comments that "TURN, UCAN and Aglet appeared to have coordinated on many issues."<sup>4</sup> UCAN also participated in settlement negotiations. In support of this argument, UCAN's timesheets show coordination efforts consistent with ALJ Long's direction to intervenors. Additionally, UCAN, TURN, and Aglet agreed that UCAN would focus on SDG&E operations, Aglet would focus on attrition issues, and TURN focused upon SoCalGas operations. Lastly, UCAN's showing concentrated on representing customer interests that would otherwise be underrepresented in this proceeding. In this case, UCAN was the sole intervenor apart from DRA that focused on SDG&E's operations.

The Commission affirms UCAN's assertion that it made significant efforts to avoid duplication in this proceeding.

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

---

<sup>4</sup> D.08-07-046, p. 12.

**5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation**

UCAN requested \$610,601.61<sup>5</sup> for its participation in this proceeding.

Included in the request was the following breakdown:

**BILLING SUMMARY**

	<b>Year</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Hours Billed</b>	<b>Total Fees</b>
Shames	2006-8	\$310	630.80 <sup>6</sup>	\$195,548.00
Neill	2007	\$155	155.90	\$ 24,164.50
JBS Energy- Marcus	2006	\$220	20.34	\$ 4,474.80
JBS Energy- Marcus	2007	\$235	145.55	\$ 34,204.25
JBS Energy- Marcus	2008	\$250	2.75	\$ 687.50
JBS Energy- Nahigian	2006	\$165	29.50	\$ 4,867.50
JBS Energy- Nahigian	2007	\$175	186.25	\$ 32,593.75
JBS Energy- Schilberg	2007	\$185	.35	\$ 64.75
Overland- Welchlin	2007	\$190	859.75	\$163,352.50
Overland- Oetting	2007	\$150	720.00	\$108,000.00
Overland- Townley	2007	\$ 90	264.5	\$ 23,805.00

<b>Cost Categories</b>	<b>Total Fees</b>
Attorneys Fees	\$219,712.50
Experts Costs	\$372,050.05
Miscellaneous	\$ 3,337.13
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$595,099.68</b>

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

<sup>5</sup> UCAN's requested \$610,601.61 for their participation; however the breakdown of its costs actually totals \$595,099.68. We use the corrected amount for purposes of calculating this award.

<sup>6</sup> These hours include 2.80 hours, billed at full hourly rate, spent on NOI and 11.00 hours, billed at half-rate which were spent on the request for compensation. In our award, and consistent with our practice, we separate these hours which pertain to intervenor compensation matters (at half hourly rate) from the time spent on issues of this proceeding.

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

### **5.1. 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.

UCAN documented its claim by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours for its attorneys with a brief description of each activity, and a list of its consultant fees which were billed monthly. The detailed explanation of the hours UCAN spent on the proceeding is thorough and consistent with the scope and the complexity of the issues considered in the proceeding. Therefore, the hourly breakdown reasonably supports the claim for total hours. Since we found that UCAN's efforts made a substantial contribution to the decision, we need not exclude from UCAN's award compensation for certain issues.

### **5.2. Intervenor Hourly Rates**

In determining compensation, we take into consideration the market rates for similar services from comparably qualified persons. Several of the experts and the attorneys for UCAN have existing rates approved by the Commission for work performed. We use those rates without further discussion:

<b>Rates as Requested by UCAN<sup>7</sup></b>
---

---

<sup>7</sup> For UCAN participants Nahigian, Schilberg, Welchin, Oetting, and Townley, UCAN fails to provide the first names for these individuals. We attempt to correct this omission in this award. Please ensure that future request for an award includes this information.

<b>Rates as Requested by UCAN<sup>7</sup></b>			
<b>Name</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Cites in Request</b>
Shames	2006-8	\$310	D0802034
Neill	2007	\$155	
Marcus	2006	\$220	D0705018
Marcus	2007	\$235	D0805033
Marcus	2008	\$250	3% COLA + Step
Nahigian	2006	\$165 <sup>8</sup>	D0610018
Nahigian	2007	\$175	D0808024
Schilberg	2007	\$185	D0808024
Welchin	2007	\$190	
Oetting	2007	\$150	
Townley	2007	\$ 90	

UCAN requests 2007 hourly rates of \$155 for Neill who acted as assistant counsel in this proceeding. This is the third case where Neill has appeared before the Commission. UCAN made a showing for the reasonableness of his hours in its compensation request in C.06-10-023 and is still awaiting a decision for that request. The \$5 adder represents an annual 3% cost-of-living increased on his previously requested rate. This amount is reasonable and we adopt it here. UCAN requests 2007 compensation rates of \$190 for Welchlin, who is an expert for Overland Consulting. Welchlin has appeared before the Commission in 2004 and received hourly compensation of \$175 in D.05-08-014. UCAN's 2007 hourly request of \$190 is reasonable and is adopted here. Oetting has appeared before the Commission in R.01-09-001 and has 14 years of experience as an accountant in public and private industry. The request for 2007 hourly compensation of \$150 is reasonable and is adopted here. Townley provided

---

<sup>8</sup> Hourly compensation is awarded at \$155, a rate previously adopted in D.06-10-018.

paralegal work for Overland Consulting. The 2007 hourly request of \$90 is reasonable for individuals performing paralegal services and is adopted here.

### **5.3. Direct Expenses**

The itemized direct expenses submitted by UCAN include the following:

Photocopying	\$ 194.48
Postage	\$ 65.65
Lodging	\$ 1,750
Travel (airfare and parking)	\$ 1,327
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 3,337.13</b>

The cost breakdown included with the request shows the miscellaneous expenses to be commensurate with the work performed. Travel expenses were not incurred during routine commuting. We find these costs reasonable.

## **6. Productivity**

UCAN contributed to the proceeding in a manner that was productive and will result in benefits to ratepayers that exceed the costs of participation.

The most observable benefits of UCANs participation are the \$32+ million in reduced requirements which, over the 4-year term of this rate case, amounts to almost \$130 million in documented ratepayer savings. Moreover, SDG&E conceded multiple adjustments to its calculations in its testimony and data requests responses. It is unclear to what extent these additional adjustments were reflected in the \$32 million quantified in the settlement discussions.

Additionally, UCAN joined with TURN to compel some policy changes, including the changes in the utilities' use of payday check-cashing service offices.

Overall, the almost \$130 million in identified benefits of UCAN's contributions to D.08-07-046 support its claim of having made a substantial contribution. While UCAN's participation was important, we discount its request for hourly compensation as follows:

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Hours Requested</b>	<b>Approved hours</b>	<b>Justification</b>
M. Shames	TC re: details of retainer 11/6/06 Complete retainer letter 11/17/06	.80 .90	0 0	Irrelevant to issues of proceeding.
M. Shames	Draft opening brief 2007	122.68	110.42	Excessive reduced by 10%
M. Shames	Draft reply brief 2007	31.5	15.75	Excessive reduced by 50%
A. Neill	Draft opening brief 2007	24.25	21.83	Excessive reduced by 10%

While UCAN's award has not been reduced further, there are many incidences where attorneys are performing clerical and administrative work. UCAN's claim includes many of the following tasks: "complete and file," "draft and file," "draft and send," "draft and mail." The Commission does not compensate for clerical time and future claims may be reduced accordingly to disallow this type of work. Additionally, UCAN requests compensation for its experts in the amount of \$387,256.98, yet did not include timesheets for these individuals, in violation of Rule 17.4, which states that the request for compensation shall include time records of hours worked that identify: the name of the perform performing the task; the specific task performed; the issue that the task addresses, as identified by the intervenor; and the issue that the task addresses, as identified by the scoping memo. Future requests for intervenor compensation must include this information, or will not be compensated.

## **7. Award**

As set forth in the table below, we award UCAN \$586,488.00:

**CALCULATION OF FINAL AWARD**

	<b>Year</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Hours Billed</b>	<b>Total Fees</b>
Shames	2006-8	\$310	598.28	\$185,467.42
Neill	2007	\$155	153.48	\$ 23,789.40
JBS Energy- Marcus	2006	\$220	20.34	\$ 4,474.80
JBS Energy- Marcus	2007	\$235	145.55	\$ 34,204.25
JBS Energy- Marcus	2008	\$250	2.75	\$ 687.50
JBS Energy- Nahigian	2006	\$155	29.50	\$ 4,572.50
JBS Energy- Nahigian	2007	\$175	186.25	\$ 32,593.75
JBS Energy- Schilberg	2007	\$185	.35	\$ 64.75
Overland- Welchlin	2007	\$190	859.75	\$163,352.50
Overland- Oetting	2007	\$150	720.00	\$108,000.00
Overland- Townley	2007	\$ 90	264.5	\$ 23,805.00

<b>Intervenor Compensation Preparation</b>				
Michael Shames	2006-2008	\$155	13.80	\$ 2,139.00

**BILLING SUMMARY**

<b>Cost Categories</b>	<b>Total Fees</b>
Attorneys Fees	\$211,395.82
Experts Costs	\$371,755.05
Miscellaneous	\$ 3,337.13
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$586,488.08</b>

Work on Proceeding	\$581,011.87
NOI and Compensation Request Preparation	\$ 2,139.00
Expenses	\$ 3,337.13
<b>TOTAL AWARD</b>	<b>\$586,488.00</b>

We direct San Diego Gas & Electric Company to pay UCAN \$400,610.48 and Southern California Gas Company to pay UCAN \$185,877.52, as required under §1807.

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

December 13, 2008, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after UCAN filed its compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

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. UCAN's records should identify specific issues for which it requested 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.

#### **8. 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.

#### **9. Assignment of Proceeding**

John A. Bohn is the assigned Commissioner, and Douglas M. Long is the assigned ALJ in the proceedings.

#### **Findings of Fact**

1. UCAN has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding. UCAN made a substantial contribution to D.08-07-046 as described herein.
2. UCAN requested hourly rates for its representatives, as adjusted herein, that are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.

3. UCAN's direct expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

4. The total of the reasonable compensation is \$586,488.00.

5. Appendix to this decision summarizes today's award.

**Conclusions of Law**

1. UCAN has fulfilled the requirements of §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and is entitled to intervenor compensation for its claimed expenses, as adjusted herein, incurred in making substantial contributions to D.08-07-046.

2. UCAN should be awarded \$586,488.00 for its contribution to D.08-07-046.

3. This order should be effective today so that UCAN may be compensated without further delay.

4. The proceedings remain open to address other requests for intervenor compensation.

**O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN) is awarded \$586,488.00 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 08-07-046.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay UCAN \$400,610.48 and Southern California Gas Company shall pay UCAN \$186,878.40.

3. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning December 13, 2008, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing date of UCAN's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

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

5. Application (A.) 06-12-009, A.06-12-010, and Investigation 07-02-013 remain open.

This order is effective today.

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

## APPENDIX

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b> No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D0807046	
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A0612009, A0612010 and I0702013	
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Long	
<b>Payer(s):</b>	San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company	

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Utility Consumers' Action Network	08-18-08	\$610,601.61	\$586,488.00	No	miscalculations; incorrect hourly rate; excessive hours

## Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Michael	Shames	Attorney	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$310	2006-2008	\$310
Art	Neill	Attorney	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$155	2007	\$155
Jeffrey	Nahigian	Expert	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$165	2007	\$155
Jeffrey	Nahigian	Expert	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$175	2007	\$175
William	Marcus	Expert	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$220	2006	\$220
William	Marcus	Expert	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$235	2007	\$235
William	Marcus	Expert	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$250	2008	\$250
Robert	Welchin	Expert	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$190	2007	\$190
Greg	Oetting	Accountant	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$150	2007	\$150
Teri	Townley	Paralegal	Utility Consumers' Action Network	\$90	2007	\$ 90

(END OF APPENDIX)