Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Southern California Edison Company's (U338E) Application for Approval of Advanced Metering Infrastructure Deployment Activities and Cost Recovery Mechanism.	Application 07-07-026 (Filed September 18, 2008)

DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 08-09-039

Claimant: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	**For contribution to D.08-09-039**
Claimed ($): $145,400.31	**Awarded ($): $125,980.96 (13% reduction)**
Assigned Commissioner: Dian Grueneich	**Assigned ALJ:** Jessica Hecht

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES:

A. Brief Description of Decision:

Decision (D.) 08-09-039 adopts a settlement proposed by Southern California Edison Company (SCE) and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) to allow $1.63 billion in ratepayer funding for SCE's proposed Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) Project from 2008 through 2012 (Settlement Agreement). The Decision found the Settlement Agreement to be reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law, and in the public interest.

B. Claimant Must Satisfy Intervenor Compensation Requirements Set Forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference	September 26, 2007	**Yes**
2. Other Specified Date for NOI		
3. Date NOI Filed	October 26, 2007	**Yes**
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		**Yes**
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number	A.07-07-026	**Yes**
6. Date of ALJ ruling	November 21, 2007	**Yes**
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
7. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number	I.06-06-014	**Yes**
8. Date of ALJ ruling	November 15, 2006	**Yes**
9. Based on another CPUC determination (specify)		
10. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		**Yes**
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
11. Identify Final Decision	D.08-09-039	**Yes**
12. Date of Issuance of Final Decision	September 22, 2008	**Yes**
13. File date of compensation request	November 21, 2008	**Yes**
14. Was the request for compensation timely?		**Yes**

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant's contribution to the final decision (*see* § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059) (For each contribution, support with <u>specific reference</u> to final or record.)

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
1. (Sett) TURN actively attempted to reach a settlement with SCE and DRA, and the stipulations between TURN and SCE were the product of these negotiations. Although TURN did not enter into an all-party settlement, the stipulations significantly reduced the scope of issues to litigate, shortening the time spent in hearings and focusing litigation upon the remaining issues.	*See* D.08-09-023, pp. 19-20. "However, SCE and TURN filed a motion for adoption of a set of stipulations that comprise a subset of the complete settlement agreement. (Citation omitted.) Many of the stipulations echo specific language included in the settlement agreement; others reflect either TURN's agreement to a provision previously contested by TURN and reflected in the full settlement agreement, or SCE's explicit agreement to a modification that is reflected in the settlement agreement business case but not specifically enumerated in the settlement." *See also* D.08-09-023, pp. 34-41 wherein the uncontested issues are compared to the litigation positions of TURN and the other the parties.	**Yes**
2. (DR) TURN argued that SCE underestimated the costs of the PCTs and overestimated the benefits from the PCT program. TURN's opposition required SCE to support its cost estimates with additional evidence. TURN's objection to the purported benefits of the PCT program resulted in a thorough analysis of the participation rates and the effects of customer overrides, A/C tonnage and inoperative A/C units on expected DR.	*See* TURN Opening Brief, pp. 25-32. Cost of PCTs - *See* D.08-09-039, p. 24; *see* also SCE Exhibit 14. Benefits of PCT program – *See* D.08-09-039 pp. 25-26.	**Yes**

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
3. (DR) TURN argued that it is inappropriate to use the customer elasticity of demand results from the SPP in evaluating the PTR, because the SPP study did not test a PTR rate. TURN also argued that the participation rates would be lower than expected. TURN's objection resulted in a very thorough discussion of customer participation and elasticities. This discussion resulted in the Commission concluding that, based on the evidence, the elasticities used in the settlement agreement business case, which were based on elasticities calculated from CPP rates, are reasonable for the purposes of estimating future energy savings from PTR rates and their associated benefits.	*See* TURN Opening Brief, pp. 10-17. *See* D.08-09-039, pp. 28-30. *See also* 1 RT 45-56 and 2 RT 155-166 for cross-examination on PTR elasticities.	**Yes** TURN did not prevail on this issue, but contributed to the inclusion of these issues in the Commission's deliberation.
4. (NQ) TURN argued that there was no evidence in the record to support the $256 million estimate for increased meter accuracy. TURN's objection to this eleventh hour inclusion of benefits resulted in the Commission modifying the proposed decision to include further discussion on the matter in the final decision. The final decision acknowledges the lack of information regarding this benefit but finds further evidence in the record to support the inclusion of these benefits.	*See* TURN Opening Brief, pp. 39-42; *see also* TURN Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 1-3. *See* Proposed Decision, p. 32. *Compare* D.08-09-039, p. 33.	TURN did not prevail on this point; however, the final decision did add more discussion on the issue, in part to address TURN's comments. The PD acknowledges the relative lack of information in the record and the final decision does not change the

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
		outcome.
5. (Q) ALJ Hecht requested parties to answer specific questions in opening and reply briefs related to the provision of meter reading and support services to other gas and water utilities in SCE's service territory. TURN was the only party to raise the issues of monitoring and regulation of third party meter reading services and the appropriate treatment of revenues related to the services. In response to TURN's concerns, the Commission required SCE to submit any contract it negotiates to provide metering services to the Commission for approval by application.	*See* TURN Opening Brief, p. 45-47. D.08-09-039, p. 51 "TURN's main argument for tariffing meter-reading services is that the Commission should actively monitor and regulate these services. In addition, TURN expresses concern over the appropriate treatment of revenues SCE receives through meter-reading contracts. To address these concerns, SCE should submit any contract it negotiates to provide metering services for other Commission-jurisdictional utilities to the Commission for approval by application, so the costs and appropriate rate treatment, including the treatment of revenues, can be determined based on the specifics of the case."	**Yes**
6. (PD) TURN objected to the inclusion of confusing and logically flawed language in the PD in the discussion regarding TURN's penalty proposal that would effectively create policy that goes beyond the scope of the Commission's inquiry on SCE's AMI program. As a result, the final decision removed this objectionable language.	*See* TURN Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 1-3. *See* Proposed Decision, p. 51. *Compare* D.08-09-039, pp. 52-53.	**No** This did not change the substance of the decision.

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)	**Yes**	**Yes**
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)	**Yes**	**Yes**
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Southern California Gas Company, Alliance for Retail Energy Markets (AReM), and Trilliant Networks		**Yes**
d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: In this proceeding, TURN and DRA coordinated as much as possible to avoid duplication of effort by actively discussing the issues together and agreeing to share discovery responses. In the end, however, TURN's overall position differed significantly from DRA's and, during settlement negotiations, TURN and DRA focused on their separate litigation positions. As noted by the final decision, the stipulations between TURN and SCE included specific provisions that were not enumerated in the settlement agreement between DRA and SCE (*see* D.08-09-039, pp. 19-21). TURN's position on demand response benefits also clearly differed from DRA's position, and TURN was unable to reach a settlement on DR related issues. TURN also raised issues that DRA did not address, including the DR penalty provision and treatment of revenues related to third party metering services.		**Yes**

C. Additional Comments on Part II (use line reference # or letter as appropriate):

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
II.A.	TURN		TURN's active participation in this proceeding substantially contributed to the decision-making process and resulted in a more thorough analysis of SCE's AMI proposal than would have occurred had TURN not been a party to the proceeding. TURN's participation in this proceeding assisted the Commission in its analysis of the central issue in this case - whether SCE's AMI proposal is cost-effective. The issues raised by TURN regarding the expected demand response benefits were directly related to the determination of whether SCE's proposed project was cost-effective, and, had the Commission agreed with any one of TURN's arguments, SCE's

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
			project would not have been found to be cost-effective. Given the critical nature of these issues, the development of a comprehensive record on the implications of these conflicts was incredibly important. TURN's involvement forced SCE to fully defend its showing as to the costs of the PCTs and the demand response benefits of the PCT and PTR programs. Such deliberations were vital to the final decision as it increased the Commission's certainty and confidence that its decision was the correct one.
II.A. and Attach. 2	TURN		TURN has grouped our contributions to D.08-09-039 into issue categories and indicated the category to which each contribution described in Table II.A and shown in TURN's hourly breakdown of activities in Attachment 2. These categories include settlement related activities (Sett), demand response related costs and benefits (DR), cost-effectiveness issues related the analytical framework used to evaluate the business case (C/E), non-quantifiable societal benefits (NQ), time spent answering specific questions posed by the ALJ regarding third party metering issues (Q), contributions commenting on and correcting miscellaneous errors in the Proposed Decision (PD), time spent on tasks that were fundamental to participation in this proceeding that cannot be allocated to specific issues (GP), and time spent participating in hearings that was not allocable to specific issues (GH).

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

Concise explanation as to how the cost of claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)	CPUC Verified
TURN's participation in settlement discussions resulted in negotiated stipulations between SCE and TURN over several issues. After TURN and SCE reached agreement on these issues they were considered "uncontested" and removed from the litigation positions of the parties. Some of the monetary benefits of these stipulations include the removal of $2.17 million (nominal) in estimated costs for power purchases from the deployment period costs, the removal of $5.7 million in increased field supervisor and analyst costs, the reduction of meter panel repair	**Yes**

Concise explanation as to how the cost of claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)	**CPUC Verified**
costs from $29.7 million to $11.1 million, and the inclusion of a $1.4246 per-meter O&M operational benefit per month during the deployment period to be credited to ratepayers. These stipulations on operational cost-effectiveness are clearly beneficial to ratepayers. The remainder of the litigation largely revolved around the expected demand response benefits. The demand response benefits were absolutely critical to the cost-effectiveness of the program and, as such, it was important that the Commission obtain a full and complete record on the demand response issues in order to justify its authorization of the SCE/DRA settlement. Although TURN did not prevail in blocking the authorization of the settlement between DRA and SCE, TURN's participation did ensure that the Commission's record on the expected demand response benefits was full and complete, to the benefit of ratepayers. The Commission should treat TURN's contributions to D.08-09-039 as it treated TURN's participation in PG&E's AMI deployment proceeding (D.07-01-012, p. 13). In awarding TURN intervenor compensation for its work in A.05-06-028, the Commission noted that the cost of TURN's participation in that proceeding was minor in comparison to the investment contemplated by PG&E. The Commission also acknowledged that until the parties analyzed the issues raised by TURN, it was not certain that PG&E's AMI proposal was reasonable. The Commission concluded that TURN's analysis of the AMI deployment and related business cases resulted in benefits to ratepayers and therefore found TURN's participation to be productive. In this case, the cost of TURN's participation is minor compared to the enormous investment contemplated by SCE ($1.981 billion NPVV). TURN's involvement in this proceeding led to the above-mentioned stipulations on operational cost-effectiveness and enriched the record on demand response benefits. Both results are beneficial to ratepayers, and the Commission should therefore find TURN's participation in this proceeding to be productive.	**Yes** **The reasoning used in PG&E's AMI case is reasonable to apply here also.**

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Robert Finkelstein	2008	0.75	$470	D.08-08-027, p. 5	$352.50	2008	.75	$470	$352.50
Marcel Hawiger	2007	0.25	$300	D.07-12-026, p. 24	$ 75.00	2007	.25	$300	$ 75.00
Marcel Hawiger	2008 [1]	1.25	$325	*See* Comment 1 in Part III.C below for rationale	$ 406.25	2008	1.25	$325	$ 406.25
Nina Suetake	2007	12.00	$210	D.07-12-026, p.4	$ 2,364.60	2007	11.26[2]	$210	$ 2,364.60
Nina Suetake	2008 [3]	108.50	$225	*See* Comment 2 in Part III.C below for rationale	$24,412.50	2008	108.50	$225	$24,412.50
	Subtotal:				***$27,610.85***			***Subtotal:***	***$27,610.85***
EXPERT FEES									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Garrick Jones	2007	1.40	$110	D.08-11-053	$ 154.00	2007	1.40	$110	$ 154.00
Garrick Jones	2008	13.40	$130	*See* Comment 3 in Part III.C below for rationale	$1,742.00	2008	13.40	$120	$1,608.00
Jim Helmich	2007	10.50	$175	*See* Comment 4 in Part III.C below for rationale	$ 1,837.50	2007	10.50	$175	$1,837.50
Bill Marcus	2007	2.00	$235	*See* Comment 5 in Part III.C below for	$ 470.00	2007	2.00	$235	$ 470.00

[1] First step increase in range.

[2] Due to a miscalculation, Suetake's hours were adjusted (.74) to equal the amount requested.

[3] Second step increase within range.

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
				rationale					
Bill Marcus	2008	44.58	$250	*See* Comment 5 in Part III.C below for rationale	$ 11,145.00	2008	42.58	$250	$10,645.00
Jeff Nahigian	2007	63.75	$175	D.08-08-024, p. 10.	$ 11,156.25	2007	56.37	$175	$ 9,864.75
Jeff Nahigian	2008	145.25	$195	*See* Comment 6 in Part III.C below for rationale	$ 28,323.75	2008	117.62	$190	$22,347.80
Greg Ruszovan	2008	5.25	$195	*See* Comment 7 in Part III.C below for rationale	$ 1,023.75	2008	5.25	$180	$ 945.00
Gayatri Schilberg	2007	94.79	$185	D.08-08-024, p.10	$ 17,536.15	2007	87.20	$185	$16,132.00
Gayatri Schilberg	2008	210.26	$200	*See* Comment 8 in Part III.C for rationale	$ 42,052.00	2008	161.06	$200	$32,212.00
	Subtotal:				***$115,440.40***	***Subtotal:***			***$96,216.05***

OTHER FEES

Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are claiming (paralegal, travel, etc.):

Item	Year	Hours	Rate $	Basis for Rate*	Total $	Year	Hours	Rate $	Total $
N/A									
N/A									
				Subtotal:				***Subtotal:***	

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **

Item	Year	Hours	Rate $	Basis for Rate*	Total $	Year	Hours	Rate $	Total $
Nina Suetake	2007	0.75	$105	D.07-12-026, p. 24	$ 78.75	2007	.75	$105.00	$ 78.75

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Nina Suetake	2008	12.00	$112.50	*See* Comment 2 in Part III.C below for rationale	$1,350.00	2008	12.00	$112.50	$ 1,350.00
				Subtotal:	***$1,428.75***			***Subtotal:***	***$1,428.75***
COSTS									
#	**Item**		**Detail**		**Amount**	**Amount**			
	Travel		Expert witness travel expenses		$ 185.00	.0			
	Parking		Expert witness parking expenses		$ 10.00	.0			
	Photocopying		Photocopies of pleadings		$ 594.80	$594.80			
	Lexis		Research		$ 52.82	$ 52.82			
	Other Research		Research related to DR		$ 32.00	$ 32.00			
	Phone/Fax		Calls related to case development and settlement discussions		$ 45.69	$ 45.69			
				Subtotal:	***$ 920.31***			***Subtotal:***	***$ 725.31***
				TOTAL REQUEST $:	**$145,400.31**			**TOTAL AWARD $:**	**$125,980.96**

When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows as necessary.

*If hourly rate based on CPUC decision, provide decision number; otherwise, attach rationale.

**Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.

C. Attachments or Comments Documenting Specific Claim:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	TURN Hours related to D.08-09-039 (including TURN attorney and expert consultant hours)
Attachment 3	TURN Expenses related to D.08-09-039

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Comment 1	**Rationale for Marcel Hawiger's 2008 rate** In D.08-04-010, the Commission adopted a 2008 range of $300-355 for attorneys with 8-12 years of experience; the requested rate for Mr. Hawiger would place him within the middle of that range. The $15 increase requested for his 2008 rate is the 8% step increase provided for in D.08-04-010, rounded to the nearest $5 increment. The Commission should therefore find this rate increase reasonable.
Comment 2	**Rationale for Nina Suetake's 2008 rate** In D.08-04-010, the Commission adopted a 2008 range of $200-235 for attorneys with 3-4 years of experience; the requested rate for Ms. Suetake would place her within the middle of that range. The $15 increase requested for her 2008 rate is the 8% step increase provided for in D.08-04-010, rounded to the nearest $5 increment. The Commission should therefore find this rate increase reasonable.
Comment 3	**Rationale for Garrick Jones's 2007 and 2008 rate** Mr. Jones's 2007 rate was authorized in the Commission's decision on TURN's intervenor compensation request for its work in A.06-12-009/010, which was voted out today, Friday, November 21, 2008. No number has yet been assigned to that decision, however, as the decision was just reached this morning. In D.08-04-010, the Commission adopted a 2008 range of $125-185 for experts with 0-6 years of experience; the requested rate for Mr. Jones's 2008 hours would place him just above the lower end of that range. In 2007, first year Mr. Jones worked on PUC matters, his billed rate was below the low end for 2007 rates. $130 reflects the greater responsibility Mr. Jones bears for work in CPUC-related matters.
Comment 4	**Rationale for Jim Hemlich's 2007 rate** In D.05-06-049, the Commission approved an hourly rate of $160 for Mr. Helmich's work in 2004. This was a $10 increase over the hourly rate sought for his work in 2002 and 2003. JBS Energy continued billing Mr. Helmich's time at that rate in 2005. In 2006, JBS Energy increased Mr. Helmich's hourly rate to $175, and continued to use that rate for his work in 2007. In light of the firm having left his 2004 rate in place for 2005, and his three decades of involvement in energy and utility matters, the Commission should find the $175 rate reasonable for work performed in 2006 and 2007. A statement of Mr. Helmich's qualifications may be found at http://jbsenergy.com/Energy/Associates/Jim_Helmich/jim_helmich.htm. In D.07-01-009, the Commission adopted a 2006 range of $115-$370 for experts, and a 2007 range of $150-$380 for experts with 13 or more years of experience; the requested rate for Mr. Helmich would place him just above the lower end of that

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	range.
Comment 5	**Rationale for Bill Marcus's 2007 and 2008 rate** Mr. Marcus's 2007 and 2008 rates were both authorized in the Commission's decision on TURN's intervenor compensation request for its work in A.06-12-009/010 which was voted out today, Friday, November 21, 2008. No number has yet been assigned to that decision, however, as the decision was just reached this morning.
Comment 6	**Rational for Jeff Nahigian's 2008 rate** In D.08-04-010, the Commission adopted a 2008 range of $155-390 for experts with 13 or more years of experience; the requested rate for Mr. Nahigian would place him just above the lower end of that range. In D.05-11-031 (p. 18, fn. 7), the Commission noted that Bill Marcus of JBS Energy had consistently requested small rate increases at rates below those of his peers. This is equally true for other members of the JBS Energy firm such as Mr. Nahigian. While the $20 increase the firm adopted for his 2008 rate is slightly greater than the 8% provided for in D.08-04-010, the Commission should still find it reasonable in light of previous acknowledgment that JBS Energy's past rates consistently reflected smaller increases than others in the market imposed.
Comment 7	**Rationale for Greg Ruszovan's 2008 rate** TURN requests an hourly rate of $195 for work Mr. Ruszovan performed in 2008. This is the same rate that JBS Energy billed TURN for his work during this period. JBS Energy only rarely bills TURN for the time Greg Ruszovan devotes to CPUC-related work, since his work is typically for other clients of the firm. Prior to 2006, the last award of intervenor compensation that addressed his hourly rate covered 2001 work (and awarded a $115 rate). In D.06-10-018, the Commission approved the requested hourly rate of $155 for work performed in 2005, and in D.07-01-012 the Commission applied the same 2005 rate to work performed in early 2006 (since JBS Energy did not implement its 2006 rate increase until mid-year). Since then, TURN is aware of no other request for compensation that included his work in 2006, 2007 or 2008 until this one. Mr. Ruszovan is the firm's Senior Energy Analyst, with nearly two decades of experience in energy conservation, advanced computer analysis, database programming and utility production simulation modeling. Since joining JBS Energy in 1989, Mr. Ruszovan has performed energy-related computer analysis of utility operations, energy data analysis, and major utility customer data base design and development. He has designed and developed a multi-relational database, including a customized data entry program for each major utility, to process and analyze individual facility energy use data. He has built models to integrate analysis of hourly market pricing data and hourly load data for individual

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	customers or customer classes. He has provided consulting services on computer systems, both in hardware design and software operation, for a variety of clients and for the internal operations of JBS. The requested rate is slightly higher than $155, the low end of the range approved in D.08-04-010 for experts with 13 or more year's experience. In light of Mr. Ruszovan's experience and training, the Commission should find that $195 is a very reasonable hourly rate for Mr. Ruszovan's work in 2008.
Comment 8	**Rationale for Gayatri Schilberg's 2008 rate** In D.08-04-010, the Commission adopted a 2008 range of $155-390 for experts with 13 or more years of experience; the requested rate for Ms. Schilberg would place her just above the lower end of that range. In D.05-11-031 (p. 18, fn. 7), the Commission noted that Bill Marcus of JBS Energy had consistently requested small rate increases at rates below those of his peers. This is equally true for other members of the JBS Energy firm such as Ms. Schilberg. The $15 increase the firm adopted for her 2008 rate is the 8% increase provided for in D.08-04-010, rounded to the nearest $5 increment. The Commission should therefore find this rate increase reasonable, especially in light of previous acknowledgment that JBS Energy's past rates consistently reflected smaller increases than others in the market imposed.

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):

Item	Reason(s)
Nahigian - 2007	Excessive hours, duplication (reduced 7.38 hrs).
Nahigian - 2008	Excessive hours, duplication, unrelated task "remove sharp objects from room" on 08-21-08 (reduced 27.63 hrs).
Marcus - 2008	Disallowance of routine travel (reduced 2 hrs).
Schilberg - 2007	Excessive hours, duplication (reduced 7.59 hrs).
Schilberg - 2008	Lack of substantial contribution, excessive hours, duplication, and disallow routine travel (reduced 49.2 hrs).
Jones - 2008 Nahigian - 2008 Ruszovan - 2008	Adjusted hourly rates.
Expenses	Disallow routine travel related expenses ($195.00).

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)

(CPUC completes the remainder of this form)

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim (Y/N)?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (*see* Rule 14.6(c)(6)) (Y/N)?	Yes

Findings of Fact

1. Claimant has made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) 08-09-039.

2. The claimed fees and costs, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.

3. The total of reasonable contribution is $125,980.96.

Conclusion of Law

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

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Claimant is awarded $125,980.96.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Southern California Edison shall pay claimant the total award. 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 February 4, 2009, the 75th day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.
4. Application 07-07-026 is closed.
5. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		**Modifies Decision?** No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0809039	
Proceeding(s):	A0707026	
Author:	ALJ Hecht	
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	11-21-08	$145,400.31	$125,980.96	No	disallow routine travel and related expenses, adjusted hourly rates, excessive hours, duplication, lack of substantial contribution, unrelated task.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	$470	2008	$470
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	$300	2007	$300
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	$325	2008	$325*
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	$210	2007	$210
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	$225	2008	$225**
Garrick	Jones	Economist	The Utility Reform Network	$110	2007	$110
Garrick	Jones	Economist	The Utility Reform Network	$130	2008	$120
Jim	Helmich	Expert	The Utility Reform	$175	2007	$175

			Network			
Bill	Marcus	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$235	2007	$235
Bill	Marcus	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$250	2008	$250
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$175	2007	$175
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$195	2008	$190
Greg	Ruszovan	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$195	2008	$180
Gayatri	Schilberg	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$185	2007	$185
Gayatri	Schilberg	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	$200	2008	$200

*** 1st step request within range**

**** 2nd step request within range**

(END OF APPENDIX)