Decision 09-06-017 June 4, 2009

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion into Reliability Standards for Telecommunications Emergency Backup Power Systems and Emergency Notification Systems Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2393.	Rulemaking 07-04-015 (Filed April 12, 2007)

DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO THE DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES FOR ITS SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 08-09-014

Claimant: Disability Rights Advocates	**For contribution to Decision 08-09-014**
Claimed ($): $114,141.15[1]	**Awarded ($): $103,682.88 (reduced 9%)**
Assigned Commissioner: Timothy Alan Simon	**Assigned Administrative Law Judge: Jeffrey P. O'Donnell**

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES (completed by Claimant)

A. Brief Description of Decision: Decision Addressing Standards for Telecommunications Backup Power Systems and Emergency Notification Systems Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2393.

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:	No prehearing conference was held in this matter.	**Yes**

1 DisabRA submitted an initial request for compensation totaling $114,477.95. At the request of the Commission, additional information clarifying travel related expenses was submitted. DisabRA clarifies Platt's expenses, but fails to separate Platt's travel hours from consultant hours. Travel is compensated at ½ rate and DisabRA submits the request for these hours at full rate. We correct this error, recalculate the total amount at $114,141.15, and use this corrected figure for consideration in this award. We remind DisabRA that future claims must separate travel time from consultant time.

2. Other Specified Date for Notice of Intent (NOI):	June 4, 2007	**Yes**
3. Date NOI Filed:	June 11, 2007 (*see* additional comments)	**Yes**
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		**Yes**
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	Rulemaking (R.) 07-04-015	**Yes**
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 14, 2007	**Yes**
7. Based on another California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) determination (specify):	n/a	
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.07-04-015.	**Yes**
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 14, 2007	**Yes**
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	n/a	
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		**Yes**
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	Decision (D.) 08-09-014 Addressing Standards for Tele-communications Backup Power Systems and Emergency Notification Systems Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2393.	**Yes**
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	September 8, 2008	**Yes**
15. File date of compensation request:	November 7, 2008	**Yes**
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		**Yes**

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
3	DisabRA		Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA) made a motion on June 7, 2007 seeking permission to late-file the NOI in this proceeding after inadvertently missing the deadline. ALJ O'Donnell granted permission to DisabRA to make this late filing via email the same day, June 11, 2007. ALJ O'Donnell then formally granted DisabRA's NOI in his ruling of June 14, 2007.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION (completed by Claimant)

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
DisabRA served as an active participant throughout this proceeding. The Commission's final decision addresses the majority of the issues raised by DisabRA. DisabRA's suggestions will comprise a key portion of the further investigation of this proceeding's issues. Throughout this proceeding, five issues were under review. DisabRA focused on Issue 1 (concerning backup power) and Issue 2 (concerning emergency notification systems) as the most relevant for individuals with disabilities. We addressed these issues at every stage of the proceeding, including multiple rounds of comments, participation at workshops, and *ex parte* meetings. Throughout this proceeding, DisabRA offered a number of recommendations aimed at ensuring that the interests of persons with disabilities would be met for both backup power systems and emergency notification systems. The Final Analysis Report (FAR) incorporated DisabRA's suggestions	Final Decision 07-04-015 at pp. 49-50.	**Yes**

for emergency notification systems (ENS) verbatim in "Appendix S: Issues Affecting Consumers with Disabilities," and recommended that our list be considered in drafting minimum and model ENS criteria. In its final order, the Commission adopted the FAR and also supported "further consideration of the need for rules pertaining to backup power systems installed on a residential or small commercial customer's premises and whether rules for informing customers regarding backup power are necessary." DisabRA's contributions will guide these efforts and ensure that the needs of people with disabilities continue to be part of the conversation. The specific contributions are discussed in greater detail below.		
DisabRA's suggested criteria for ENS accessibility were incorporated verbatim as Appendix S to the FAR. These recommendations include: • Voice messages used to notify residents of an emergency must be slow and clear • Localities must select a service provider whose system is capable of communicating with TeleTypewriter (TTY) devices and other text-based non-standard communication devices. • To accommodate the deaf and hard of hearing, localities, in conjunction with telecommunication service providers, must ensure that their Automatic Dialing Announcing Devices or Reverse 911 system includes in its list for outgoing calls the numbers of users of alternative communications devices such as TTY devices, two-way pagers, cellular phones, and personal digital assistants.	Appendix S to the FAR, referenced at D.07-04-015 at p. 49.	**Yes**

• Localities, in conjunction with telecommunication service providers, must develop and implement a method for digitally recording a TTY or text message for distribution to non-voice devices, concurrent for the distribution of voice messages. • Localities, in conjunction with telecommunication services providers, must develop a method for compiling a list of TTY and text-based nonstandard device users and registering these numbers for inclusion in the emergency notification system. One such system could involve a web-based sign-up form that explains the need for TTY and text users to register. Accordingly, localities must ensure that their websites are accessible to blind people who use screen-reading software. They must also develop alternative ways to register for people who do not have internet access. • A coalition of public safety, emergency management, private sector, and volunteer organizations must work to inform and educate the public regarding the existence of emergency notification systems and the need to register non-traditional communication devices. The disability community should be one of the groups specifically targeted for education, which must be done in a manner that accommodates their communications needs. Localities and local carriers shall work with TTY providers, community groups, and local phone companies (who have lists of people who receive the TTY discount rates) to develop a list of residential and business TTY numbers in the jurisdiction.		

Localities and local carriers shall do public education and outreach in accessible formats to people with disabilities regarding the need to register the contact information for their nontraditional communication devices or their TTY numbers so that they will receive all emergency notifications.		
On the issue of backup power, the Final Decision notes that the FAR included suggestions for ways to improve the battery status indicators so that customers could better monitor their backup power. These options included two of DisabRA's proposals: • "Require a series of announcement options to be offered to the customer. Options could include brighter or flashing lights for deaf or hearing impaired customers, and variable volume or pitch for blind, visually-impaired, or hearing-impaired customers." • "Require a text or voice message to be automatically sent from the battery monitoring system to a specific telephone number" This would help those with hearing impairments, who would benefit from the text message, those with vision impairments, who would be able to access the voice message, and those with mobility impairments, who might not be able to physically access a battery to change it.	Final Decision 07-04-015 at pp. 19-20.	**Yes**
The FAR offers several options, referenced in the final decision, regarding consumer education. These include an issue raised verbatim by DisabRA: "Specify how [emergency] information may be provided to consumers such as through advertising materials,	Final Decision 07-04-015 at p. 20.	**Yes**

brochures, the provider's website, bill inserts, tailored information for consumers with special needs (e.g., hearing or visually impaired), etc."		
The Final Decision recognizes that "education programs should address the special needs of groups such as the deaf, disabled, or visually impaired regarding the options available to them to extend the life of the backup battery" (as recommended by the FAR).	Final Decision 07-04-015 at p. 21.	**Yes**
The Final Decision suggests additional possible opportunities to address disability issues: "the Commission may wish to consider encouraging service providers to offer optional services for disabled or other Californians with special needs. Examples could include: • Partially subsidizing the cost of additional battery backup capacity at the customer's premises. • Providing low cost backup service such as a cell phone for emergencies. • Offering incentives to community service groups to assist customers with disabilities in emergencies."	Final Decision 07-04-015 at p. 21.	**Yes**
The Commission notes, "Staff and voice providers should work together on customer outreach and education on the issues of backup power and telephone service during an outage, including … recommendations on second charged, backup batteries for emergencies and/or for family and friends, particularly if the customer has a disability, is elderly or has other special needs."	Final Decision 07-04-015 at p. 24.	**Yes**
As noted in the decision, the Commission continues to recognize the importance of "the ability to make necessary phone calls and receive emergency notifications for a	Final Decision 07-04-015 at pp. 22, 25, respectively.	**Yes**

reasonable period of time" during an emergency. In addition, the Final decision notes that "customer education is a critical factor in maximizing the potential of backup power systems…." including "tailored information for consumers with special needs (e.g., hearing or visually impaired)."		

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:		**Yes**
Cal-Ore Telephone Co Calaveras Telephone Company Ducor Telephone Company Foresthill Telephone Co. Happy Valley Telephone Company Hornitos Telephone Company Kerman Telephone Co. Pinnacles Telephone Co. Sierra Telephone Company, Inc. The Ponderosa Telephone Co. The Siskiyou Telephone Company Volcano Telephone Company Winterhaven Telephone Company AT&T Communications of California, Inc. Pacific Bell Telephone Company TCG Los Angeles, Inc. TCG San Diego TCG San Francisco The Utility Reform Network SureWest Telephone SureWest Televideo Visalia Cellular Telephone Company Division of Ratepayer Advocates TW Telecom of California LP Verizon California Inc. California Cable & Telecommunications Association		**Yes**

[2] The document in Attachment 3 to the claim is not attached to this decision.

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: DisabRA was the only party in this proceeding to represent the unique interests of consumers with disabilities. DisabRA emphasized the distinct barriers that this group experiences with regard to emergency notification and back-up power issues. Specifically, DisabRA sought to ensure that any standards regarding emergency notification systems take into consideration the unique communications needs of people who are deaf or hard of hearing. In addition, DisabRA raised concerns that backup power systems on customer premises must be accessible, including concerns that people receive warnings about maintaining any back-up power system. No other party to these proceedings focused on any of these issues, making our participation crucial. DisabRA closely coordinated its efforts with other consumer groups for submissions following the initial workshops held in this proceeding. The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) represented the interests of consumers generally. Where people with disabilities shared overlapping concerns with these represented communities of consumers at large, DisabRA worked in conjunction with TURN and DRA. Even with this overlapping perspective, however, DisabRA focused on issues that specifically addressed the needs of persons with disabilities. In light of the foregoing, DisabRA's compensation should not be reduced based on unnecessary duplication. For example, in preparation for filing the May, 29, 2008 comments on Commissioner Simon's Proposed Decision (PD), DisabRA coordinated with TURN so that each organization could address the issues most important to it, and sign on to the other party's comments when appropriate. Accordingly, DisabRA noted that it would "focus specifically on the issues of emergency notification, backup power in residences … as they directly affect consumers with disabilities," noting agreement with TURN for issues affecting the general population of consumers in a footnote (Comments of DisabRA on the PD at p. 1, fn. 1). In this way, DisabRA was able to hone in on issues of its highest priority and expertise, conserving time and resources. There were five issues addressed in this rulemaking: (1) Backup batteries installed on the property of residential and small commercial customers; (2) Standardization of emergency notification systems ("ENS") and protocols; (3) Backup power on the telecommunications network; (4) Level of implementation of Best Practices by the different telecom industry segments; and (5) Feasibility of the use of zero greenhouse gas emission fuel cell systems for backup power systems located at telecommunications service provider facilities. As noted above, DisabRA focused on Issue 1 and Issue 2 as the most relevant for individuals with disabilities. DisabRA thus further maximized the efficiency and relevance of the time its attorneys and law clerks spent on this proceeding. For additional detail, please see Attachment 3.[2]	

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
II.B.d.	DisabRA		See Attachment 3.[3]

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION (completed by Claimant)

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
This proceeding is an important step in setting the groundwork for future general standards of protection in an emergency. It was especially important that the Commission hear the voices of consumers with disabilities, since they are more vulnerable than the general public in an emergency. Persons with disabilities are highly dependent on backup power for telecommunication devices (Issue # 1) since they may need to call for assistance in an emergency. Regarding emergency notification (Issue # 2), people with disabilities, like everyone else, need access to timely information when an emergency occurs. The primary sources for this information, radio and television broadcasts, do not consistently serve the needs of people who are deaf or hard of hearing by including captions despite Federal Communications Commission requirements to do so. Because so much of emergency communications is unavailable to the deaf and hard of hearing, it is critical that they receive timely information from an accessible source. For these reasons, Disability Rights Advocates ("DisabRA") intervened in the proceeding in order to ensure that the needs of its unique constituency, persons with disabilities, were not overlooked. While it is not possible to quantify the benefits to disabled Californians, it is clear that DisabRA's participation resulted in vigorous advocacy for this underrepresented group. This has resulted in substantial benefits for individuals who may need to rely on ENS or equipment utilizing backup power in a future emergency. Such non-quantifiable benefits are appropriate for compensation. *See, e.g.,* D.07-10-002 awarding intervenor compensation to National Consumer Law Center, Inc. (NCLC) for work on D.07-05-030 at pp. 16-17 (finding NCLC to have been productive despite difficulty in quantifying social benefits, because of the impact of the LifeLine program on millions of participating Californians).	**Yes**

3 *See* the previous footnote.

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate$**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate$**	**Total $**
J. Bezoza	2007	99.4	$290/hr.	Attachment 4	$28,826.00	2007	99.4	$270/hr.	$26,838.00
S. Biedermann	2008	108.7	$180/hr.	Attachment 4	$19,566.00	2008	108.7	$150/hr.	$16,305.00
K. Gilbride	2008	9.1	$180/hr.	Attachment 4	$1,638.00	2008	9.1	$150/hr.	$1,365.00
M. Kasnitz	2007	32.1	$390/hr.	D.07-06-040	$12,519.00	2007	32.1	$390/hr.	$12,519.00
M. Kasnitz	2008	63.3	$420/hr.	Attachment 4	$26,586.00	2008	63.3	$420/hr.	$26,586.00
K. Weed	2007	5.3	$270/hr.	Attachment 4[4]	$1,431.00	2007	5.3	$230/hr.	$1,219.00
K. Weed	2008	20.4	$290/hr.	Attachment 4	$5,916.00	2008	20.4	$280/hr.	$5,712.00
				Subtotal:	**$96,482.00**			***Subtotal:***	**$90.544.00**
EXPERT FEES									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
D. Platt[5]	2007	11.5	$75/hr.	* See Attach. 12	$862.50	2007	11.5	$75/hr.	$862.50
				Subtotal:	**$862.50**			***Subtotal:***	**$862.50**
OTHER FEES **Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are claiming (paralegal, etc.):**									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
Paralegal	2007	47.1	$100/hr.	D.07-06-040	$4,710.00	2007	47.1	$100/hr.	$4,710.00
Paralegal	2008	41.8	$110/hr.	Attachment 4	$4,598.00	2008	41.8	$110/hr.	$4,598.00
				Subtotal:	**$9,308.00**			***Subtotal:***	**$9,308.00**
TRAVEL/INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION (1/2 RATE)									
Item	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Basis for Rate***	**Total $**	**Year**	**Hours**	**Rate $**	**Total $**
M. Kasnitz	2007	2.8	$195/hr.	Attachment 4	$546.00	2007	2.8	$195/hr.	$546.00
M. Kasnitz	2008	4.2	$210/hr.	Attachment 4	$882.00	2008	4.2	$210/hr.	$882.00
J. Bezoza	2007	2.4	$145/hr.	Attachment 4	$348.00	2007	2.4	$145/hr.	$348.00
S. Biedermann	2008	31.7	$90/hr.	Attachment 4	$2,853.00	2008	2.2	$75/hr.	$165.00
Paralegal	2007	1.6	$50/hr.	Attachment 4	$80.00	2007	1.6	$50/hr.	$80.00
Paralegal	2008	1.8	$55/hr.	Attachment 4	$99.00	2008	1.8	$55/hr.	$99.00
D. Platt	2007	8.7	$37.50/hr.	Attachment 12	$326.25	2007	8.7	$37.50/hr.	$326.25
				Subtotal:	**$5,134.25**			***Subtotal:***	**$2,446.25**

4 DisabRA erroneously reported and then corrected Weed's year of admittance into the Michigan State Bar as 2003, instead of 2002. We adjust the hourly rates here to correct this error.
5 *See* correspondence file, letter of April 16, 2009, containing details about Platt's time and travel expenses.

COSTS					
#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount	
1	Meals	Attachment 11	$85.37		$17.10
2	Printing and Photocopying	Attachment 11	$1,864		$100.00
3	Postage	Attachment 11	$17.78		$17.78
4	Telephone and fax	Attachment 11	$26.15		$26.15
5	Airfare[6]	Attachment 12	$328.80		$328.80
6	Airport Parking, BART	Attachment 12	$32.30		$32.30
		Subtotal:	**$2,354.40**	***Subtotal:***	**$522.13**
		TOTAL REQUEST $:	**114,141.15**	**TOTAL AWARD $:**	**$103,682.88**

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 (Claimant completes):

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	**Certificate of Service**
2	**General Comment and Request Regarding Standardized Intervenor Compensation Form**
3	**Reasonableness of Staffing and Number of Hours**
4	**Justification of Rates for Attorneys and Paralegals**
5	**Explanation of Expert Donna Platt's Fee**
6	**Reasonableness of Costs**
7	**Detailed Records for Work on the Merits in 2007**
8	**Detailed Records for Work on the Merits in 2008**
9	**Detailed Records for Work on Fees in 2007**
10	**Detailed Records for Work on Fees in 2008**
11	**Detailed Expense Records**
12	**Email correspondence dated 4-16-09 detailing breakdown of travel expenses**

6 Under Section 1802(d) of the Public Utilities Code, reasonable expenses will be compensated if the intervenor has made a substantial a contribution in a proceeding for which it is seeking intervenor compensation. To facilitate approval for these costs, please ensure that future claims initially include receipts for expenses for which compensation is being requested.

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):

#	Reason
2007-Bezoza[7]	No prior rate established by Commission. Bezoza is a 2000 graduate of law school, and was admitted to the New York Bar in 2002. She joined DisabRA in 2006 and passed the California Bar in 2006. We adopt a rate of $270, which is within the rate range (lower end) for attorneys with 5-7 years of experience as set forth in D.08-04-010. This is a more reasonable rate given Bezoza's legal experience.
2008-Gilbride[8]	Previously adopted rate of $150 in R.04-12-001. We apply this same rate here.
2008-Biedermann[9]	No prior rate established by Commission. Biedermann is a 2007 graduate of Yale Law School and passed the bar exam the same year, then joined Disability Rights Advocates. We adopt a rate of $150, which is within the rate range (lower end) for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience as set forth in D.08-04-010. This is a more reasonable rate given Biedermann's legal experience.
Printing/Photocopying Expenses	DisabRA requests $1,864 for printing/photocopying costs it claims it incurred in the duplication of documents that were electronically filed and served by the parties in the proceeding as well as rulings and decisions of the Commission. While DisabRA may wish to copy documents that are electronically retrievable, we see no reason why ratepayers should be expected to pay for this practice. We approve $100 of these costs and disallow the remainder ($1,764) for excessiveness.
2008- Biedermann's hours for intervenor compensation preparation	The hours billed for intervenor compensation preparation for this participant (31.7) are excessive, given the scope of the proceeding and the product produced. We allow a total of 15 hours collectively for all participants, which we believe to be reasonable. As such, we reduce Biedermann's hours by 29.5 hours to achieve this allowance. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards of reasonableness.
Direct Expenses	DisabRA submits a request for one lunch totaling $85.37 (Platt and 4 others). We approve 1/5th of this request (for Platt) and disallow the remainder ($68.27). Absent any other justification, Platt was the only "travelling" participant.
2007-Weed 2008-Weed	DisabRA errored when it reported Weed's year of admittance into the Michigan State Bar in 2002. Ms. Weed was admitted to the Michigan State Bar in 2003. With this new information, we adjust her previously approved hourly rates to reflect the correct rate range used to establish her hourly compensation rate.

7 *See* correspondence file, Supplemental Information for Compensation Request, provided on April 3, 2009.
8 *See* footnote 1.
9 *See* footnote 1.

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 D.08-09-014.
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 $103,682.88.

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 $103,682.88.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, the total payment shall be paid from the intervenor compensation. 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 January 21, 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 address other related matters.

5. This order is effective today.

Dated June 4, 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:	D0906017	**Modifies Decision?** No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0809014	
Proceeding(s):	R0704015	
Author:	ALJ Jeffrey P. O'Donnell	
Payer(s):	CPUC	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Disability Rights Advocates	11-07-08	$114,141.15	$103,682.88	No	Adjusted hourly rates; disallowance of excessive photocopying expenses; disallowance of excessive hours claimed for the preparation of intervenor compensation claim, miscalculation.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Jennifer	Bezoza	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$290	2007	$270
Stephanie	Biedermann	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$180	2008	$150
Karla	Gilbride	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$180	2008	$150
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$390	2007	$390
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$420	2008	$420
Katherine	Weed	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$270	2007	$230
Donna	Platt	Advocate	Disability Rights Advocates	$75	2007	$75
Katherine	Weed	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	$290	2008	$280
Paralegal			Disability Rights Advocates	$100	2007	$100
Paralegal			Disability Rights Advocates	$110	2008	$110

(END OF APPENDIX)