

Decision 09-06-045 June 18, 2009

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Regarding Policies, Procedures and Rules for the California Solar Initiative, the Self-Generation Incentive Program and Other Distributed Generation Issues.

Rulemaking 08-03-008
(Filed March 13, 2008)

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO A WORLD INSTITUTE FOR A SUSTAINABLE HUMANITY FOR ITS
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 08-10-036**

This decision awards A World Institute For A Sustainable Humanity \$32,874.27 in compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 08-10-036.

Ratepayers of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company will pay the awarded amount of \$32,874.27, plus interest, effective February 16, 2009, and continuing until full payment of the award is made. We direct these utilities to allocate payment responsibility among themselves, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2008 calendar year, the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. This proceeding remains open to address other related matters.

1. Background

The Commission initiated this rulemaking to develop rules and procedures for the California Solar Initiative (CSI) and the Self-Generation

Incentive Program (SGIP), and to consider policies for the development of cost-effective, clean and reliable distributed generation (DG).

The Scoping Memo of May 15, 2008 lists three main issue areas for this proceeding, which continues the Commission's work from prior DG rulemakings, namely, R.04-03-017 and R.06-03-004. The three issue areas for this proceeding were:

- Further development of policies and program rules in support of CSI;
- Consideration of DG policy issues generally and ongoing management of the SGIP; and
- Resolution of a DG cost-benefit methodology.

Decision (D.) 08-10-036, for which A World Institute For A Sustainable Humanity (A WISH) seeks compensation, established a \$108 million solar incentive program for Multifamily Affordable Solar Housing (MASH) as part of the CSI overseen by the California Public Utilities Commission. The MASH program provides solar incentives to qualifying affordable housing developments, as defined in state law. Incentive levels depend on whether the solar installation provides power to common areas of the affordable housing complex or directly to tenant units, with incentive levels of \$3.30 per watt for systems offsetting common area load, and \$4.00 per watt for systems offsetting tenant load. Applicants for MASH incentives may also apply for higher incentive levels through a competitive application process.

D.08-10-036 established MASH program budget and evaluation details and specified that the program is administered by the existing CSI Program Administrators in the service territories of Pacific Gas and Electric Company

(PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E).

In order to encourage solar installations on multi-tenant affordable housing properties through the MASH program, D.08-10-036 directs PG&E, SCE and SDG&E to file tariffs for a “virtual net metering” program. Virtual net metering allows the electricity produced by a single solar installation to be credited to the benefits of multiple tenants in the building, without requiring the system to be physically connected to each tenant’s meter.

2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,¹ 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).)
2. The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction. (§ 1802(b).)

¹ All subsequent statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

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.

In a proceeding initiated by a petition for rulemaking, the intervenor must file its NOI between the date the petition was filed until 30 days after the time for filing responsive pleadings, e.g., protests, responses, answers, or comments.

(Rule 17.1(a)(3).) A WISH filed a timely Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation in this proceeding on April 10, 2007 in R.06-03-009, which encompassed both the single family and multi-family low income solar proceeding. The records in R.06-03-004 were incorporated into this docket. Thus, A WISH’s NOI filed in R.06-03-004 is considered timely for the purposes of this proceeding.

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 May 14, 2007, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Duda issued a ruling in R.06-03-004 finding that A WISH met the definition of a customer pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C).

An intervenor seeking compensation must show that, without undue hardship, it cannot pay the reasonable costs of effective participation in the proceeding. A participant representing consumers or a representative authorized by a customer must disclose its finances to the Commission to make this showing. These showings may be made under an appropriate protective order. In the case of groups or organizations, significant financial hardship is demonstrated by showing that the economic interest of individual members is small compared to the overall costs of effective participation. (§ 1802(g).) Such a finding is normally made in the ALJ's preliminary ruling as to whether the customer will be eligible for compensation. (§ 1804(b).)

A WISH notes that it was found to have met the significant financial hardship test under § 1802(g) within the past year by ALJ Duda in D.08-05-025, thereby creating a rebuttable presumption of eligibility for compensation in other Commission proceedings commencing within a year, pursuant to § 1804(b)(1).

Regarding the timeliness of the request for compensation, A WISH filed its request for compensation on December 3, 2008, within 60 days of D.08-10-036 being issued.² No party opposed the request.

² D.08-10-036 was issued on October 20, 2008.

In view of the above, we affirm the ALJ's ruling and find that A WISH has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make its request for compensation in this proceeding.

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.³

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

A WISH advocated for linkages to low income energy efficiency, weatherization of units prior to solar installations, and discernible direct benefits

³ D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

to tenants, with financing mechanisms that hold tenants harmless. From the outset of the proceeding, A WISH championed the idea that low-income households should receive low-income energy Low Income Energy Efficiency (LIEE) services prior to the installation of expensive photovoltaic systems. Although D.08-10-036 does not require all tenants to participate in the LIEE or affirmatively opt out, as A WISH had suggested in its comments on the Proposed Decision (PD), D.08-10-036 discusses A WISH's suggestions at length and at 29 "requires building owners to allow eligible and willing tenants to participate in LIEE programs to the extent feasible." In addition, it requires building owners to provide LIEE information to tenants and to encourage their participation. A WISH made substantial contributions to this discussion even though its proposal was not adopted.

A WISH advocated for direct and discernible tenant benefits and urged careful scrutiny of loan schemes to ensure affordable housing residents, who do not have discretionary income to pay back loans, are not impacted by on-bill financing and placed at risk. D.08-10-036 defines "direct tenant benefit" as "any operating cost saving from solar that is shared with tenants of affordable housing building through a recurring payment or financial credit."⁴ A WISH made a substantial contribution on this issue.

A WISH opposed SCE's administrative budget request, claiming that SCE had not made a showing that an increase was needed over the administrative budget percentage for the general market CSI program. D.08-10-036 limits the

⁴ D.08-10-036, Section 4.2 Track 2 Incentives at 12.

administrative budget to 12% for the MASH program. We affirm A WISH's contribution on this issue.

A WISH supported virtual net metering (VNM) as a means of ensuring that low income residents of multi-family housing would receive benefits from solar installations in terms of energy credits and lowered bills. A WISH stated: "We believe that a central meter that is creatively parsed to benefit the eligible building occupants through a virtual decentralized utility makes a lot of sense. The allocation of savings to all units of eligible tenants and common areas in a predetermined proportion is creative."⁵ We affirm A WISH's substantial contribution on this issue.

All totaled the final decision references A WISH's contributions on the following pages:

- page 10 – opposes SDG&E loan proposal, we agreed and rejected it.
- page 12 – re: incentives, make them 125% of general market CSI; A WISH contributed to the discussion even though its proposals were not adopted.
- page 20 – opposed SCE administrative budget as being too high: we agreed to lower administrative budget.
- page 22 - re: budget, allocate more Track 1B incentives; A WISH contributed to the discussion even though its proposals were not specifically adopted.

⁵ See Comments on Staff Proposal Incentives for Multi-Family Low Income Housing, filed March 26, 2008 at 5-5, paragraph A7.

- page 25 – incorporate green jobs; we agreed and incorporated green jobs into the program.
- page 27 – require LIEE before paying MASH incentives and maximizing energy efficiency; A WISH contributed to the discussion even though its proposal was not specifically adopted.
- page 32 – supported VNM proposal; contributed to this topic.
- page 43 – do not require time of use (TOU) tariffs for MASH participants.

Although A WISH advocated for several positions as indicated above, such as requiring weatherization under the LIEE unless multi-family residents opted out and for greater protections with respect to TOU ramifications that were not adopted, the Commission did require building owners to inform tenants about the LIEE and to allow and encourage their participation. The TOU issue became moot through legislation signed recently. On these issues, we affirm A WISH made a substantial contribution.

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.

A WISH submits that they focused on sustainability, reducing greenhouse gases and maximizing energy efficiency and coordination on issues of LIEE. A WISH was the only party that addressed low- income solar in a sustainability

context and their contributions were substantial and not duplicated by any other party.

Regarding contributions by other parties, we agree with A WISH that in a proceeding involving multiple participants, it is virtually impossible to completely avoid some duplication of the work of other parties and that A WISH took all reasonable steps to keep duplication to a minimum and to ensure that its work served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showing of the other active parties. We agree that A WISH did not duplicate other parties' efforts.

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.

5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

A WISH requests \$43,097.26 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Totals
Susan Brown	2007	13.80	\$400	\$ 5,520.00
Susan Brown	2008	60.87 ⁶	\$412	\$25,078.44
Michael Karp	2007	2.65	\$200	\$ 530.00
Michael Karp	2008	57.25 ⁷	\$206	\$11,793.50

⁶ A WISH fails to separate Brown's hours (7.25) spent on intervenor compensation matters and her travel hours (1.0 hr in 2007, .5 hour in 2008) billed at 1/2 rate, from Brown's professional hours. Instead, it states that it has only billed 1/2 the actual hours required to prepare the claim and for actual travel time. We remove and adjust the hours spent on intervenor compensation preparation accordingly from A WISH's totals and allocate these in the proper area in Section 7 on this claim. We make no adjustment for the travel time as it is disallowed.

Total for Hourly Compensation	\$42,921.94
Expenses	\$ 175.32
Total Request for Compensation	\$43,097.26

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 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. In addition, when intervenors utilize multiple people to represent their interests, they must provide us with sufficient information to ensure that their work is not duplicative of one another.

A WISH has documented its claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of its attorneys, accompanied by a brief description of each activity.

The table listed below outlines adjustments we have made to A WISH's request for compensation. In general, the disallowances are for routine travel

⁷ A WISH fails to separate Karp's hours (3.50) spent on intervenor compensation matters (billed at 1/2 rate) from Karp's professional hours. Instead, it states that it has only billed 1/2 the actual hours required to prepare the claim. We remove and adjust these hours accordingly from A WISH's totals and allocate them in the proper area in Section 7 on this claim.

that is not compensable and for hours that we consider excessive, duplicative, and inefficient given the nature of the contributions.

CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments

Participant	Reason
2007-Brown	5-2-07 and 8-15-07 travel disallowed as being “routine” and not compensable. <i>See</i> D.08-04-022, at 23. Disallow (1.0 hours).
2008-Brown	3-17-08 travel disallowed as being “routine” and not compensable. <i>See</i> D.08-04-022, at 23. Disallow (.5 hours).
2007-Brown 2007-Karp	Both participants log 1.25 on 7-18-07 hours for “reviewing joint proposal re: low income multi-family solar.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown-disallow .63 hours; Karp-disallow .63 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants log hours on 3-25-08 for “reviewing and analyzing staff proposal.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown-disallow .50 hrs; Karp-disallow .38 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants log 4.00 hours on 4-3-08 for “finalizing and editing reply comments.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown-disallow 2 hours; Karp-disallow 2 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants log 3.50 hours on 4-4-08 for “revising and editing final comments & serve/file.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown-disallow 1.75 hours; Karp-disallow 2 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants, Brown on 4-4-08 and Karp on 4-5-08 log time for “reviewing reply comments CCSE, SDG&E, PG&E, Global Green, SCE, Brobeck, Solar Alliance, & Bay Area Local Initiatives.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown-disallow 2.25 hours; Karp-disallow .87 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 9-21-08 log 2.00 hours for “reviewing and analyzing PD.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow 1 hour; Karp-disallow 1 hour.)
2008-Brown	On 9-24-08, Brown logs 2.75 hours and Karp logs 2.50 hours for “preparing

2008-Karp	comments on solar PD and analyzing decision.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow 1.38 hours; Karp disallow 1.25 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 9-25-08 log 2.75 hours for “Preparing comments on l.i. solarmulti-family.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow 1.38 hours; Karp disallow 1.38 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 9-26-08 log hours, Brown 3.25 hours and Karp 1.5 hours, for “preparing and editing comments on solar.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow 1.63 hours; Karp disallow .75 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 9-28-08 log 1.25 hours for “preparing proposed finds and conclusions of law.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow .62 hours; Karp disallow .62 hours.)

2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 9-29-08 log hours, Brown .25 hours and Karp .50 hours, for “reviewing and editing PD of Pres. Peevey modifying D.07-11-045.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow .13 hours; Karp disallow .25 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 9-30-08 log hours, Brown 1.0 hours and Karp 1.75 hours, for “reviewing comments of SDG&E, PG&E, CCSE, LISC & SCE on MASH.” We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow .5 hours; Karp disallow .87 hours.)
2008-Brown 2008-Karp	Both participants on 10-6-08 log hours, Brown .30 hrs and Karp .50 hrs, for “reviewing reply comments on SDG&E on MASH. We find these hours to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of these hours. (Brown disallow .15 hours; Karp disallow .25 hours.)
2008- Brown hours for preparation of intervenor compensation claim	The hours billed for intervenor compensation preparation (21.5) are excessive, given that the claim is a short request related to a single Commission decision. In D.08-05-005, in the same proceeding, we cautioned A WISH that in future requests, the Commission expected to see more efficient use of time for this same task. We allow a total of 15 hrs collectively for all participants, which we believe to be more reasonable. As such, we reduce Brown’s hours by 6.5 hrs to achieve this allowance. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards of reasonableness.
Total Hourly Disallowance s	2007- Brown .63 hours of professional time; 1.0 hour for travel time 2007- Karp .63 hours of professional time 2008- Brown 13.29 hours of professional time; .5 hrs travel; 6.5 hours (Icomp matters) 2008- Karp 11.62 hours of professional time

Excluding the adjustments and disallowances listed above, the remainder of A WISH’s hours for its attorney and expert reasonably support its claim.

5.2. Intervenor Hourly Rates

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

have 2007 rates approved by the Commission. We use those rates without further discussion and adopt 2008 rates based on our standard hourly rate methodology.

Adopted Rates			
Name	Year	Hourly Rate	Justification
Susan Brown	2007	\$400	D.08-05-015
Susan Brown	2008	\$410	2007 rate + 3% COLA, rounded to the nearest \$5.00.
Michael Karp	2007	\$200	D.08-05-015
Michael Karp	2008	\$205	2007 rate + 3% COLA, rounded to the nearest \$5.00.

5.3. Direct Expenses

A WISH requests reimbursement for copying and supplies as follows:

Expenses	
Photocopying	\$130.09
Supplies	\$ 45.23
Total	\$175.32

We approve these costs as being reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

6. Productivity

One of the requirements for receiving intervenor compensation is that an intervenor’s advocacy is necessary for a fair determination of the proceedings. In D.98-04-059, the Commission further defined this standard as requiring the party to weigh the costs of its participation against the benefits of that participation.

This same decision also requires a party’s participation to be guided by the Scoping Memos. A WISH states that in this proceeding, all of its participation was within the scope of the proceeding, and that its unique participation helped to provide, augment and facilitate low income energy and sustainable benefits to

vulnerable energy customers. In this light, we agree that the benefits of A WISH's participation, have other social benefits which, though hard to quantify, are substantial. Thus, we find that A WISH's efforts have been productive.

7. Award

As set forth in the table below, we award A WISH \$32,874.27:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Susan Brown	2007	12.17	\$400	\$ 4,868.00
Susan Brown	2008	40.08 ⁸	\$410	\$16,432.80
Michael Karp	2007	2.20	\$200	\$ 404.00
Michael Karp	2008	42.13 ⁹	\$205	\$8,636.65
Total Hourly Compensation				\$30,341.45
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request (1/2 rate)				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Susan Brown	2008	8.0	\$205.00	\$1,640.00
Michael Karp	2008	7.0	\$102.50	\$ 717.50
Total NOI and Compensation Request				\$2,357.50
Calculation of Final Award				
Work on Proceeding				\$30,341.45
NOI and Compensation Request Preparation				\$2,357.50
Expenses				\$ 175.32
TOTAL AWARD				\$32,874.27

Pursuant to § 1807, we order PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to pay this award.

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

⁸ See footnote 6, at 10.

⁹ See footnote 7, at 10.

February 16, 2009, the 75th day after A WISH filed its compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

We direct PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to allocate payment responsibility among themselves based upon their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2008 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated.

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. A WISH'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. Intervenors should retain records pertaining to an award for a period of three years.

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

Michael R. Peevey is the assigned Commissioner, and Dorothy J. Duda is the assigned ALJ in this portion of the proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. A WISH has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.
2. A WISH made a substantial contribution to D.08-10-036 as described herein.

3. A WISH requested hourly rates for its representatives that are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.

4. A WISH requested related expenses that are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

5. The total of the reasonable compensation is \$32,874.27.

6. The Appendix to this decision summarizes today's award.

Conclusions of Law

1. A WISH 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.08-10-036.

2. A WISH should be awarded \$32,874.27 for its contribution to D.08-10-036.

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

4. This proceeding remains open to address other related matters.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. A World Institute For A Sustainable Humanity is awarded \$32,874.27 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 08-10-036.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas & Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company shall pay A World Institute For A Sustainable Humanity their respective shares of the award. We direct Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company to

allocate payment responsibility among themselves, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2008 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. 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 16, 2009, the 75th day after the filing date of A World Institute For A Sustainable Humanity's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. Rulemaking 08-03-008 remains open to address other related matters.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 18, 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:	D0906045	Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0810036	
Proceeding(s):	R0803008	
Author:	ALJ Duda	
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
A WISH	12-03-08	\$43,097.26	\$32,874.27	No	Travel time not compensable; inefficiency; excessive hours

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Susan	Brown	Attorney	A WISH	\$400	2007	\$400
Susan	Brown	Attorney	A WISH	\$412	2008	\$410
Michael	Karp	Expert	A WISH	\$200	2007	\$200
Michael	Karp	Expert	A WISH	\$206	2008	\$205

(END OF APPENDIX)