

Decision 09-04-029 April 16, 2009

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Into Implementation
Of Federal Communications Commission Report and
Order 04-87, as it Affects the Universal Lifeline
Telephone Service Program.

Rulemaking 04-12-001
(Filed December 2, 2004)

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR ITS SUBSTANTIAL
CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION (D.) 07-05-030 AND D.08-08-029**

Claimant: The Utility Reform Network	For contribution to D.07-05-030 and D.08-08-029
Claimed (\$): \$50,898.00	Awarded (\$): \$49,194 (reduced 3%)
Assigned Commissioner: Grueneich	Assigned ALJ: Karen Jones

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- A. Brief Description of Decision:** In this docket the Commission has been reviewing and revising operating and marketing procedures for the California LifeLine Program. D.07-05-030 revised G.O. 153 to correct problems with the LifeLine program through short-term and long-term strategies and to improve outreach and education on new eligibility criteria. D.08-08-029 follows up on changes implemented in 2007 and revises the program to adopt a pre-qualification standard for LifeLine benefits.

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:		None
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	02-14-05 per ALJ ruling	Yes
3. Date NOI Filed:	February 11, 2005	Yes
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.04-12-001	Yes
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 8, 2005	Yes
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.04-12-001	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 8, 2005	Yes
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	ALJ Ruling cited ruling in R.04-04-003 (on 7/27/2004) for rebuttable presumption of eligibility	
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision(s):	D.07-05-030 D.08-08-029	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision(s):	May 7, 2007 August 25, 2008	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	October 24, 2008	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
16	TURN		This docket consists of several interrelated phases addressing problems with the LifeLine program as they have arisen. TURN previously filed a compensation request in this docket covering two decisions for work performed in 2005. (Filed January 31, 2006; granted D.06-04-012.) D.07-05-030 addressed issues arising as a result of the suspension of the LifeLine rules in November 2006 and imposed a series of short-term remedies. That Decision also created a subsequent phase of this docket to implement “long term” solutions identified by Staff. D.08-08-029 represents the culmination of this subsequent phase. Consistent with the longstanding practice of TURN and the Commission, TURN did not file a compensation request for work related to D.07-05-030 because it planned to be involved in the subsequent phase, and the issues in the two phases were substantially interrelated. It now files this compensation request, for hours and costs related to both decisions, 60 days after the issuance of D.08-08-029.
9	TURN		TURN’s NOI was found timely in ALJ Jones’ March 8, 2005 ruling. Under Rule 17.2, the finding of eligibility in the earlier phase of the proceeding means TURN remained eligible in this later phase of the same proceeding.

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 specific reference to final or record.)

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
1. One consequence of changes to the LifeLine program is an increased incidence of back billing for those customers provided the discount on first contact, but subsequently found ineligible for the program. Throughout 2007 and 2008, TURN, along with other consumer groups, urged the Commission to collect additional data to assess the severity of the problem and to determine whether it was necessary to change the program to mitigate the problem. The Commission notes the carriers’ concerns and calls for immediate action regarding back	Opening Comments of Joint Consumers ¹ on Proposed Decision (filed April 24, 2007) at pp. 7-8; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 30, 2007) pp. 1-3. D.07-05-030 at p. 13.	Yes

¹ Disability Rights Advocates, TURN, National Consumer Law Center and Latino Issues Forum.

<p>billing but states, “At the Joint Consumers suggestion, we will review this issue further in Phase II of this proceeding.”</p>		
<p>2. In the face of proposals to allow Staff to quickly and easily make changes to the G.O. and to procedures for the LifeLine process, TURN raised due process concerns over use of the Resolution process and the opportunity to comment. The Commission cites to the Joint Consumer concerns and then says, “We see the value in providing the same timeline as for a proposed decision so stakeholders have an adequate opportunity to review the draft resolution.” The Commission set a revised comments period for resolutions and agreed with TURN that draft resolutions should be served on the service list of this docket.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 23, 2007) at pp. 9-10; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 30, 2007) pp. 4-5. D.07-07-030 at p. 16.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>3. The Communications Division worked with carriers, Solix and consumer groups to suspend the program, and identify and design remedies to the problems with the LifeLine enrollment process. TURN and other consumer groups participated in and closely monitored that process through workshops and participation in the Working Groups. The Commission approved several changes to the process proposed by Staff after this collaborative process including 1) changes to the application deadlines; 2) switching to first class mail; 3) additional reminders to applicants; 4) changes to the envelope. Although not explicitly acknowledged in the decision, TURN and other groups advocated for those changes during the Workshops, Working Group process and in comments on the suspension ACR and the Proposed Decision.</p>	<p>Comments of Joint Consumers on November 2006 ACR (filed November 6, 2006) at pp. 3-4; Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 23, 2007) at pp. 2, 4-5; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 30, 2007) p. 1. D.07-05-030 at pp. 18-20, 24-25.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>4. TURN worked with Commissioner Grueneich’s office and the Marketing Working Group on enhancing consumer outreach and education, including a broader base of CBOs and other efforts to ensure participants understood the changes to the program. The Decision discusses the increased outreach efforts undertaken by the Commission. Some of TURN’s work was informal lobbying, participation in Workshops and the Working Group, as well as submission of written comments.</p>	<p>Comments of Joint Consumers on November 2006 ACR (filed November 6, 2006) at pp. 3-5; Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 23, 2007) at pp. 4-6 D.07-05-030 at pp. 22-25</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>5. In part at TURN’s urging, the Commission maintained the Implementation and Marketing Working Group process as part of the long term remedies calling them an “invaluable tool.” Despite calls by carriers and others to minimize that process. At the same time, the Commission explicitly reserved a role for the consumer groups so that “staff has the benefit of their viewpoints and expertise.” To that point, TURN had been participating in both Working Groups in a coordinated effort with other consumer representatives.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 23, 2007) at p. 3; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 30, 2007) p. 5. D.07-05-030 at p. 35.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>6. Throughout this docket TURN, along with other consumer groups, has advocated for the development of a web-based application system. However, the Commission had not prioritized this issue and TURN pointed out that the Proposed Decision in 2007 still did not list the web system as a remedy. The Decision, citing to the Joint Consumer comments, corrects this omission and states that the web-based system is a “critical way to expedite the certification and verification processes.” During the Implementation Working Group, Joint Consumers</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 23, 2007) at p. 6; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision (filed April 30, 2007) p. 4. D.07-05-030 at pp. 33-34.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>provided input on the design and function of the web-based system.</p>		
<p>7. The Assigned Commissioner requested comment on back billing issues in Phase 2. At the urging of Joint Consumers, Staff gathered data on back billing issues. “Joint Consumers encourage the Commission to gather data on the prevalence and the extent of the back-billing problem. . . In response to these comments, the CD sent an information request to all LifeLine carriers on January 30, 2008.” Still, once Joint Consumers analyzed and criticized the Staff data, the Commission determined that the data was “problematic” and the Joint Consumers’ criticism pushed Solix and AT&T to place more data in the record.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues, (filed December 14, 2007) at pp. 4-5; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues (filed January 18, 2008) at p. 3; Comments of Joint Consumers on Prequalification ACR (filed May 19, 2008) at pp. 8-10. D.08-08-029 at pp. 11-12, 22.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>8. While the Joint Consumers opposed a move to prequalification, they also provided mitigation measures that the Commission should adopt if it subjected applicants to prequalification. The Commission ultimately adopted a prequalification system, including many of the mitigation factors advocated by Joint Consumers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Clarification that requiring payment plans is not a violation of URF in response to AT&T opposition, “We agree with Joint Consumers that payment plans would not be a part of ‘rate regulation.’” D.08-08-029 at p. 28 (Joint Consumer Comments on May 7, 2008 ALJ Ruling (filed May 19, 2008) at p. 16. b. Requiring carriers to offer payment plans to LifeLine customers and to disclose existence of payment plans. D.08-08-029 at p. 29. c. Clarification of the credit start date -- “We agree with Joint Consumers 	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues, (filed December 14, 2007) at pp. 7-8; Comments of Joint Consumers on Prequalification ACR (filed May 19, 2008) at pp. 12-16; Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision of Commissioner Grueneich (filed August 11, 2008) at pp. 6-12. D.08-08-029, pp. 28-32</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>that once a customer successfully completes the LifeLine application process, the customer should be credited for the difference between LifeLine rates and charges and the regular recurring rates and non-recurring charges the customer has been paying.” D.08-08-029 at p. 30.</p> <p>d. Customer choice of bill credit or rebate check and disclosure of choice -- “We find there are good reasons why refund checks should not be the default option.” D.08-08-029 at p. 32.</p>		
<p>9. The Phase 2 Scoping Memo asked for comments on eliminating the income eligibility element of the LifeLine program and relying solely on program based eligibility. TURN, along with other parties, strongly opposed the elimination of income eligibility while AT&T and Verizon offered evidence to support elimination. The Commission elected to keep the income eligibility element of the program and stated, “The Legislative mandate cited by the Joint Consumers in [statute] gives us the clear mandate to maximize participation of those eligible for the program.” D.08-08-029 at p. 49.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues, (filed December 14, 2007) at pp. 9-11; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues (filed January 18, 2008) at pp. 8-13; Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision of Commissioner Grueneich (filed August 11, 2008) at p. 1.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>10. Throughout these phases, TURN and others advocated for robust data collection to evaluate the impact of the rule changes on program participants. In Phase 2 the issue was whether return rate data should be broken down into further categories. TURN advocated for data broken down by language group and by carrier so that the CertA and Staff can more easily identify potential problems. The Commission ordered that the data be reported broken down by language groups.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues, (filed December 14, 2007) at p. 12; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues (filed January 18, 2008) at pp. 8-13; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision of Commissioner Grueneich (filed August 18, 2008) at p. 1.</p> <p>D.08-08-029 at p. 53.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>11. In Phase 2, parties were asked to comment on taking advantage of synergies with other low-income programs. Joint Consumers included several suggestions and the Commission agreed with many of them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. create a brochure describing all low income programs for distribution through outreach and websites b. direct the Communications Division to work with the Cert A to include information on other low income programs on LifeLine forms c. enhance participation by CBOs in the outreach effort through the new marketing contractor 	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues, (filed December 14, 2007) at pp. 13-18; Reply Comments of Joint Consumers on Phase 2 Issues (filed January 18, 2008) at pp.13-19; Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision of Commissioner Grueneich (filed August 11, 2008) at pp.13-14.</p> <p>D.08-08-029 at pp. 55-56.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>12. The Proposed Decision included language that would have closed the docket upon the adoption of D.08-08-029. Joint Consumers filed comments urging the Commission to keep the docket open in light of major changes to the program that still must be implemented. The Commission agreed and kept the docket open.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Joint Consumers on Proposed Decision of Commissioner Grueneich (filed August 11, 2008) at p. 15.</p> <p>D.08-08-029 at p. 43.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Y	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Y	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Several telecommunications carriers, National Consumer Law Center, Disability Rights Advocates, and Latino Issues Forum. Greenlining Institute also participated in Phase I of this proceeding.		Yes
<p>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:</p> <p>TURN coordinated very closely with DRA and the other intervenor groups. DRA was not an active party in the case leading up to D.07-05-030; however, it became increasingly more active in Phase 2 of the docket. DRA did not participate in the workshops or in the</p>		Yes

<p>Working Groups. In Phase 2, TURN coordinated its efforts with DRA wherever possible to avoid duplication.</p> <p>TURN also worked with the other intervenor groups in a coalition often referred to as the Joint Consumers. TURN participated in strategy calls and in joint efforts to draft pleadings. Each intervenor would take the lead on a particular issue and draft that section of the pleading. The group would discuss strategy and provide edits to the whole document. During workshops, the intervenors would coordinate strategy. NCLC has taken the lead in attending the Implementation Working Group meetings and other parties attend those meetings only if a critical issue is being discussed or as back up for the NCLC representative.</p> <p>Each intervenor brought its own expertise to the coalition; NCLC’s familiarity with national issues and its work on federal LifeLine issues, DisabRA’s knowledge of outreach methods to the disability community, Latino Issues Forum’s greater familiarity with issues concerning limited English proficiency customers, and TURN’s California regulatory experience and detailed knowledge of the history of the LifeLine program. TURN’s work with the other intervenors allowed TURN’s advocates to be very effective and efficient. As a result, TURN’s hours are extremely reasonable considering the large presence TURN and the other intervenors had in this proceeding.</p>	
---	--

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

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
<p>This rulemaking is similar to previous proceedings (such as the Telecommunications Bill of Rights proceeding, R.00-02-004) where the overall benefits are difficult to qualify, yet the Commission should not hesitate to conclude that they exceed the aggregate amount of all intervenor compensation by a wide margin. (D.04-12-054 (issued in R.00-02-004), pp. 23-25; D.06-11-009 (issued in R.00-02-004), pp. 31-32.) As in those proceedings, the Commission should find TURN’s costs bore a reasonable relationship to the realized benefits, even though it is difficult to assign a dollar value to those benefits.</p> <p>As discussed above, TURN’s work in the Joint Consumer’s coalition allowed its advocates to be extremely effective, resulting in a reasonable number of hours considering the significant substantial contribution made to the two final decisions in this docket. The issues in this docket are extremely important not just for low income California consumers, but all ratepayers. The Commission must ensure that the surcharge money collected from all ratepayers, including surcharges on</p>	Yes

<p>interstate services, is spent wisely. There were significant problems with the program and, through its advocacy, TURN ensured that the Commission corrected those problems in the most consumer-friendly and cost-effective manner. Several of the remedies advocated by TURN resulted in a more effective LifeLine program directly benefiting program participants such as the switch to first class mail, increased outreach, and changed in the application process. Further, the mitigation measures adopted by the Commission for their switch to prequalification will help reduce the barriers for LifeLine applicants such as the enforcement of payment plans, generous credit back period and a choice between refund and bill credits. Our advocacy on the web-based system pushed the Commission to implement that program quickly once problems with the application process were identified. Often times carriers, the Commission and the CertA have their own interests and agenda when advocating for changes in the program. TURN, as part of the Joint Consumers coalition, made sure that the interests of low-income customers and more generally ratepayers were also being considered.</p>	
---	--

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Christine Mailloux	2006	30.50	\$335	D.08-04-037, p. 16 (R.06-06-028)	\$10,217.50	2006	30.5	\$335	10,217.50
Christine Mailloux	2007	35.25	\$360	D.08-04-037, p. 16 (R.06-06-028)	\$12,690.00	2007	35.25	\$360	12,690.00
Christine Mailloux	2008	47.25	\$390	D.08-04-010; principles; 3% COLA plus 5% "step increase" applied to 2007 authorized rate of \$360, rounded to the nearest \$5	\$18,427.50	2008	47.25	\$390 ²	18,427.50
Regina Costa	2006	12.50	\$235	D.07-04-032, R.05-09-006 (BPL)	\$ 2,937.50	2006	12.50	\$235	2,937.50
Regina Costa	2007	4.25	\$255	D.08-04-037, p. 16 (R.06-06-028)	\$ 1,083.75	2007	4.25	\$255	1,083.75
Regina Costa	2008	3.50	\$275	D.08-04-010;	\$ 962.50	2008	3.50	\$275 ³	962.50

² First request for a step increase.

³ First request for a step increase.

				principles; 3% COLA plus 5% "step increase" applied to 2007 authorized rate of \$255, rounded to the nearest \$5						
Subtotal:					\$ 46,319	Subtotal:				\$46,319
EXPERT FEES										
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	
[Expert 1]										
[Expert 2]										
Subtotal:						Subtotal:				
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 \$	
Christine Mailloux	2006	3.75	\$335	D.08-04-037, p.16 (R.06-06-028). The travel hours have been reduced by 50%	\$1,256.00	2006	0	----	0	
[Person 2]										
Subtotal:					\$1,256.00	Subtotal:				0
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **										
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	
Christine Mailloux	2008	12.25	\$195	D.08-04-010; principles; 3% COLA plus 5% "step increase" applied to 2007 authorized rate of \$300 reduced by 50% as the rate for the preparation of compensation requests (D.07-12-026)	\$ 2,388.75	2006	12.25	\$195	2,388.75	
Bob Finkelstein	2008	1.75	\$235	D.08-08-027, p. 5	\$ 411.25	2008	1.75	\$235	411.25	
Subtotal:					\$ 2,800.00	Subtotal:				\$2,800.00

COSTS					
#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount	
	Copies	TURN Pleadings	11.00	11.00	
	Phone/fax	Long distance phone calls and conference calls	64.00	64.00	
	Attorney Travel	Airfare	269.00	0	
	Attorney Travel	Meals/Lodging	155.00	0	
	Attorney Travel	Parking	24.00	0	
Subtotal:			\$ 523.00	Subtotal:	\$ 75.00
TOTAL REQUEST \$:			\$50,898.00	TOTAL AWARD \$:	\$49,194

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
1	Certificate of Service
2.	TURN hours related to D.07-05-030 and D.08-08-029
3.	TURN expenses related to D.07-05-030 and D.08-08-029
4.	TURN hours broken down by activity code, by attorney and by year
Activity Codes	<p>TURN has allocated its time entries by activity codes. The list of codes and their description:</p> <p>GP- General Preparation: time for activities necessary to participate in the docket</p> <p>SP- Suspension: time spent on issues related to the suspension of the LifeLine verification program and identifying problems with the program</p> <p>AP-Application Process: time spent on identifying remedies and fixes for problems with the program, work within the Implementation Working Group, work on issues relating to carrier processes such as billing credits and work on implementing the online application process</p> <p>OR- Outreach: time spent working with Staff and the Assigned Commissioner on improving customer education and outreach on changes to the program</p> <p>PQ-Prequalification: time spent on identifying problems with back billing and proposals to implement prequalification, including mitigation measures</p>

	#- Where time entries cannot easily be identified with a specific activity code. For these entries the allocation of time spent on activities can be broken down as such, AP-40%, SP15%, PQ 30%, OR 15%
Attorney Travel	TURN's lead attorney traveled from San Diego to San Francisco to attend a critical workshop held immediately after the verification program was suspended. TURN seeks recovery of the costs and half of the related travel time of that trip. Similar to travel claims for the expenses of outside counsel, the trips meet the criteria set forth in D.07-10-014: the amount of travel time and expense was reasonable, both when considered in isolation (one trip to San Francisco) and in context of this compensation request (\$448.07 of travel costs compared to a total request of over \$50,000); the travel was <u>not</u> routine commuting, but rather a trip that would not have occurred but for TURN's participation in this proceeding; the expenses were reasonably incurred; and there was no less expensive way to participate in the proceeding. Even if a Bay Area-based TURN representative had been available to cover this workshop, the costs associated with the time that Ms. Mailloux and that representative would have devoted to getting him or her prepared would have greatly exceeded the amount of travel expenses. Therefore, the Commission should grant compensation for the requested travel time and expenses.

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):

#	Reason
Mailloux - 2008	Disallow routine travel (3.75 hrs) and related expenses (\$448.00) <i>See D.07-05-043 and D.07-10-014.</i>

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 (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 D.07-05-030 and D.08-08-029.
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 \$49,194.00

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Claimant is awarded \$49,194.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, The Utility Reform Network's award shall be paid from the intervenor compensation fund, as described in Decision 00-01-020. 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 9, 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. This proceeding remains open to monitor the implementation of pre-qualification.
5. This decision is effective today.

Dated April 16, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
DIAN M. GRUENEICH
JOHN A. BOHN
RACHELLE B. CHONG
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON
Commissioners

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D0904029	Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0705030 and D0808029	
Proceeding(s):	R0412001	
Author:	ALJ Karen Jones	
Payer(s):	Intervenor Compensation Fund	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	10-24-08	\$50,898.00	\$49,194.00	No	Disallow routine travel and related expenses, excessive hours and duplication with another attorney

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$335	2006	\$335
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$360	2007	\$360
Christine	Mailloux	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$390	2008	\$390*
Regina	Costa	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$235	2006	\$235
Regina	Costa	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$255	2007	\$255
Regina	Costa	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$275	2008	\$275*

* First request for a step increase.

(END OF APPENDIX)