

Decision 09-06-047 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 CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY FOR ITS SUBSTANTIAL  
CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 08-10-036**

This decision awards CALifornians for Renewable Energy \$8,578.83 in compensation for its substantial contribution to Decision 08-10-036.

**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 Rulemaking (R.) 04-03-017 and R.06-03-004. The three issue areas for this proceeding are:

- 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 Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE) seeks compensation, establishes 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 will provide 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. The decision establishes MASH program budget and evaluation details and specifies that the program will be 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 multitenant 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 will allow 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,<sup>1</sup> requires California-jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if that party makes a substantial contribution to the Commission's proceedings. The statute provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

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

1. The intervenor must satisfy certain procedural requirements including the filing of a sufficient notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days of the prehearing conference, 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).)
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).)

---

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

6. The claimed fees and costs must be reasonable (§ 1801), necessary for and related to the substantial contribution (Decision (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).) CARE filed a timely Notice of Intent to Claim Compensation on April 21, 2006 in R.06-03-004. Pursuant to a ruling issued by Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Duda on April 4, 2008, intervenors already granted eligibility to request compensation in R.06-03-004 were not required to file a new NOI for R.08-03-008. Thus, CARE's NOI filed in R.06-03-004 is considered timely for 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 16, 2006, ALJ Duda issued a ruling in R.06-03-004 finding that CARE 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).)

CARE notes that it was found to have met the significant financial hardship test under § 1802 (g) within the past year by an ALJ ruling on November 22, 2005 in R.05-06-040. This proceeding commenced within one year of that finding. Therefore, in accordance with § 1804(b)(1), the rebuttable presumption in R.05-06-040 is applicable.

Regarding the timeliness of the request for compensation, CARE filed its request for compensation on December 19, 2008, within 60 days of D.08-10-036 being issued.<sup>2</sup> No party opposed the request.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> D.08-10-036 was issued on October 20, 2008.

### **3. Substantial Contribution**

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

As described in § 1802(i), the assessment of whether the customer made a substantial contribution requires the exercise of judgment:

In assessing whether the customer meets this standard, the Commission typically reviews the record, composed in part of pleadings of the customer and, in litigated matters, the hearing transcripts, and compares it to the findings, conclusions, and orders in the decision to which the customer asserts it contributed. It is then a matter of judgment as to whether the customer's presentation substantially assisted the Commission.<sup>3</sup>

With this guidance in mind, we turn to the contributions CARE claims it made to the proceeding.

CARE claims that it was extensively involved in the development of the MASH program, and through that participation, made substantial contributions to the final decision. CARE contends that it made a substantial contribution to the proceeding by submitting comments and reply comments on the Commission's staff proposal and offering recommendations on several issues. CARE states that it supported and advocated many of the components of the

staff proposal which were ultimately adopted by the Commission, that its comments caused the Commission to clarify certain program components, and that it contributed to the discussion of the MASH proposal by suggesting alternatives to components of the staff proposal. CARE summarizes its participation by indicating that although the Commission did not agree with CARE on all points, the Commission nonetheless considered in depth the suggestions CARE made. Specifically, CARE's compensation request lists several areas where it claims it made substantial contributions to D.08-10-036, which we now discuss in detail below.

First, CARE claims it contributed to D.08-10-036 by requesting the Commission clarify the definition of "direct tenant benefit" required for participation in Track 2 Solar Grants. CARE references the Decision at 16 where the Commission did clarify the definition by stating that direct tenant benefits could include "tenant bill credits, tenant bill reduction, or energy efficiency investments to benefit tenants."<sup>4</sup> An examination of CARE's filings indicates that while it criticized the definition of "direct tenant benefits", it did not offer any suggestions for how to improve the definition. We find that CARE made a minor contribution on this issue.

Second, CARE asserts it contributed to the decision by suggesting the Commission create a review or appeal process due to the complexity of applications under Track 2.<sup>5</sup> While the Commission did not adopt CARE's

---

<sup>3</sup> D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

<sup>4</sup> D.08-10-036 at 16.

<sup>5</sup> Comments of CARE on Staff Proposal for a California Solar Initiative Low Income Multifamily Program (Comments), March 26, 2008 at 8.

appeal suggestion, it did require standardization of the Track 2 application review process to avoid inequitable decision-making.<sup>6</sup> We find CARE made a contribution on this issue.

Third, CARE claims it contributed to the decision by suggesting the Commission clarify whether enrollment in energy efficiency programs would be a requirement for participation in MASH. Comments at 8 - 9. CARE also supported the “idea of requiring affordable housing owners to distribute [Low Income Energy Efficiency] LIEE materials to all low-income tenants.” Comments at 9. In D.08-10-036, the Commission restricted any energy efficiency requirements to those already required in other programs.<sup>7</sup> Moreover, the Commission required building owners to provide LIEE information to tenants to encourage their participation.<sup>8</sup> We find that CARE made substantial contributions on these energy efficiency issues.

Next, CARE claims it supported the staff proposal in the area of submetering, to allow building owners to pass energy savings from solar installations directly to their tenants. In D.08-10-036, the Commission stated that the concept CARE supported is already allowed. We find that CARE made no contribution in this area.

Finally, CARE claims that it contributed by suggesting incorporation of a loan mechanism into the MASH incentive structure. CARE admits the Commission did not agree with CARE on this point, but it claims the Commission considered the suggestion in depth. In D.08-10-036, the

---

<sup>6</sup> D.08-10-036 at 17.

<sup>7</sup> *Id* at 28.

<sup>8</sup> *Id* at 29.

Commission declined to adopt CARE's loan proposal because the concept was not explained in sufficient detail.<sup>9</sup> We disagree with CARE's claim that its proposal was considered in depth, but nonetheless, we find CARE made a minor contribution on this issue.

Although not described in CARE's compensation request, the decision discusses CARE's proposal to integrate MASH with existing affordable housing efforts and use local authorities to administer MASH.<sup>10</sup> Again, we find that CARE did not make a substantial contribution on this issue because its proposal was not sufficiently developed beyond a few sentences in its filing. The decision rejected CARE's suggestion because it could lead to unnecessary program delay while determining interest by local housing agencies and considering legal questions.<sup>11</sup>

In summary, we find that CARE's claims that it was extensively involved in the development of the MASH program and it made substantial contributions to the decision are overstated. CARE provided 9 pages of opening comments and 3 pages of reply comments on the staff proposal, and it provided no comments on the proposed decision.<sup>12</sup> It is more accurate to state that CARE made some minor contributions to D.08-10-036, and when these contributions are

---

<sup>9</sup> *Id* at 11.

<sup>10</sup> *Id* at 24.

<sup>11</sup> *Id* at 25.

<sup>12</sup> CARE states that it decided not to file comments on the Proposed Decision in deference to the Commission's admonition of Rule 14.3(c) in the Rules that parties should avoid filing comments on proposed decisions that "merely reargue positions taken" in prior submissions. After a review of the Proposed Decision, CARE concluded that its comments would echo positions taken previously and therefore comments on the Proposed Decision were unnecessary.

considered together, we can conclude that CARE made a substantial contribution to the decision.

#### **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.

CARE submits that they contributed to the proceeding in a manner that did not duplicate contributions made by other intervenors. CARE sought to represent the interests of affordable housing tenants in particular, while seeking to maximize the benefits of the MASH program to the environment by suggesting methods of maximizing the amount of carbon reduction per dollar spent. CARE' participation differed from most, if not all, intervenors and other parties. Additionally, CARE did not submit comments on the Commission's proposed decision based on its assessment that such comments would simply reiterate positions it had already taken in comments on the staff proposal and be duplicative in nature.

We affirm that CARE took 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 and 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

CARE requests \$12,431.43<sup>13</sup> for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

<b>Work on Proceeding</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Stephan Volker	2008	1.8	\$600	\$ 1,080.00
Joshua Harris	2008	32.6	\$225	\$ 7,335.00
Michael Boyd	2008	12.5	\$130	\$ 1,625.00
<b>Total for Hourly Compensation</b>				<b>\$10,040.00</b>
<b>NOI/Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation (1/2 hourly rate)</b>				
Stephan Volker	2008	3.2	\$300	\$ 960.00
Joshua Harris	2008	11.2	\$112.50 <sup>14</sup>	\$1,260.00
Michael Boyd	2008	1.0	\$ 65	\$ 65.00
<b>Total for NOI/Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation (1/2 hourly rate)</b>				<b>\$2,285.00</b>
<b>Expenses</b>				<b>\$ 106.43</b>
<b>Total Request for Compensation</b>				<b>\$12,431.43</b>

In general, the components of this request must constitute reasonable fees and costs of the customer's preparation for and participation in a proceeding that resulted in a substantial contribution. The issues we consider to determine reasonableness are discussed below.

<sup>13</sup> CARE incorrectly totals its fees and costs as \$12,795.43, due to a miscalculation of the total request, including Boyd's totals in Exhibit 3 - CARE's summary of fees and costs and its failure to reduce Harris's hourly rate for compensation matters by 1/2 (\$112.50, not \$145.00 as submitted). We correct these errors here and use the corrected totals for consideration in this award.

<sup>14</sup> See footnote 13.

### **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.

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

CARE's request includes approximately 46 hours of work to write 12 pages of comments. We find that the number of hours for which CARE claims compensation is not commensurate with its level of contribution to the decision. The supporting documentation provided in CARE's request is not sufficiently detailed to produce a precise assessment of disallowances for each discrete item. Therefore, we shall instead apply a uniform percentage disallowance to CARE's overall claim of hours. This approach is in keeping with our practice in past intervenor compensation claims where we have disallowed costs for intervenors who failed to make a substantial contribution in the proceeding. In a number of instances, we have applied disallowance percentages between 10% and 33%. Given the circumstances related to this particular situation, we conclude that CARE warrants a disallowance somewhere within the middle of this range. Accordingly, we shall apply a disallowance equal to 20% of CARE's total claimed costs.

We exclude 20% of CARE's request for its total hourly compensation based on the assessment we made above regarding its lack of substantial contributions on proceeding issues.

In addition, the hours CARE bills for intervenor compensation preparation (15.4) are excessive, given that the claim is a short request related to a single

Commission decision. In D.08-12-015, CARE received compensation for 10 hours spent preparing its NOI and compensation request. We see no reason why CARE needs more time in this proceeding. CARE is experienced in claim preparation and we would expect to see more efficient use of time for completion of this task. We allow a total of 10 hrs collectively for all participants, which we believe to be more reasonable. As such, we reduce Volker’s time by 2.2 hrs and Harris’s time by 3.2 to achieve this allowance. This adjusted total more closely reflects our standards of reasonableness.

Excluding the adjustments and disallowances we have listed above, the remainder of CARE’s hours for its attorneys 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. Volker and Harris have established rates for work in 2008 in D.09-05-011, issued on May 7, 2009. We have reviewed and agree with the rationale used to establish these rates.<sup>15</sup> We adopt the same rates here without further discussion.

CARE’s request for a 3% COLA increase for Boyd above his 2007 rate of \$125 in D.08-12-015 is reasonable and we adopt it here:

Participant	Requested Rate	Year	Adopted Rate	Justification
Stephan Volker	\$600	2008	\$330	D.09-05-011
Joshua Harris	\$225	2008	\$215	D.09-05-011
Michael Boyd	\$130	2008	\$130	D.08-12-015 +

---

<sup>15</sup> See D.09-05-011, issued on May 7, 2009 at 14-15.

				3% COLA
--	--	--	--	---------

**5.3. Direct Expenses**

CARE requests reimbursement for photocopying, telephone and postage expenses as follows:

Expenses	
Photocopying	\$ 82.00
Telephone	\$ 2.16
Postage	\$ 22.27
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$106.43</b>

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.

CARE submits that it contributed to the proceeding in a manner that was productive and resulted in benefits to ratepayers relative to the costs of its participation. CARE sought to ensure that incentive dollars paid would provide the maximum benefits possible to multifamily affordable housing tenants and the environment. CARE states that throughout the proceeding it sought to provide input only where its expertise would be helpful to the Commission.

In this light, we agree that the benefits of CARE’s participation have other social benefits which, though hard to quantify, are substantial. Excluding the disallowances and adjustments we have made to this claim, we otherwise find that CARE’s efforts have been productive.

## 7. Award

As set forth in the table below, we award CARE \$8,578.83:

<b>Work on Proceeding</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Stephan Volker	2008	1.8	\$330	\$ 594.00
Joshua Harris	2008	32.6	\$215	\$7,009.00
Michael Boyd	2008	12.5	\$130	\$1,625.00
<b>Total Hourly Compensation</b>				<b>\$9,228.00</b>
<i>Adjusted Total Hourly Compensation (reduced 20%)</i>				<i>\$7,382.40</i>
<b>Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request (1/2 rate)</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
Stephan Volker	2008	1.0	\$165.00	\$ 165.00
Joshua Harris	2008	8.0	\$107.50	\$ 860.00
Michael Boyd	2008	1.0	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00
<i>Total NOI and Compensation Request</i>				<i>\$1,090.00</i>
<b>Calculation of Final Award</b>				
<b>Work on Proceeding (minus 20% reduction for lack of substantial contribution)</b>				<b>\$7,382.40</b>
<b>NOI and Compensation Request Preparation</b>				<b>\$1,090.00</b>
<b>Expenses</b>				<b>\$ 106.43</b>
<b>TOTAL AWARD</b>				<b>\$8,578.83</b>

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 March 4, 2009, the 75th day after CARE filed its compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

We direct Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company 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. CARE'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 the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, we waive the otherwise applicable 30-day public review and 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. CARE has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.
2. CARE made a substantial contribution to D.08-10-036 as described herein.
3. CARE requested hourly rates for its representatives, as adjusted herein, that are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.

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

5. The total of the reasonable compensation is \$8,578.83.

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

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. CARE 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. CARE should be awarded \$8,578.83 for its contribution to D.08-10-036.

3. This order should be effective today so that CARE 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. Californians for Renewable energy is awarded \$8,578.83 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 08-10-036.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Edison Company shall pay Californians for Renewable energy 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 March 4, 2009, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing date of CALifornians for Renewable energy's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. Rulemaking 08-03-008 remains open.

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**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>	D0906047	<b>Modifies Decision?</b> No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D0810036	
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	R0803008	
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Duda	
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company	

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Claim Date</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/Disallowance</b>
Californians For Renewable Energy	12-19-08	\$12,431.43	\$ 8,578.83	No	Miscalculation; excessive hours; lack of substantial contribution; adjusted hourly rates

**Advocate Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Stephan	Volker	Attorney	Californians For Renewable Energy	\$600	2008	\$330
Joshua	Harris	Attorney	Californians For Renewable Energy	\$225	2008	\$215
Michael	Boyd	Expert	Californians For Renewable Energy	\$130	2008	\$130

**(END OF APPENDIX)**