

Decision 09-10-022 October 15, 2009

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Joint Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902G), Southern California Gas Company (U904G) and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39G) to Reallocate the Costs of Natural Gas Public Purpose Programs and Other Mandated Social Programs Among Customer Classes.

Application 07-12-006
(Filed December 11, 2007)

**DECISION AWARDING COMPENSATION TO
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR ITS
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 09-03-024**

Claimant: Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA)	For contribution to: Decision (D.) 09-03-024
Claimed (\$): \$74,334.60¹	Awarded (\$): \$63,380.20 (reduced 15%)
Assigned Commissioner: Timothy Alan Simon	Assigned ALJ: Michael J. Galvin

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

- A. Brief Description of Decision:** This decision denied the joint request of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), Southern California Gas Company (SoCal Gas), and Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E) collectively identified as "the utilities," to change the cost allocation methods by which their natural gas customers are charged for the costs of their Public Purpose Programs (PPP) from the various cost allocation methods currently in use to a single allocation method.

¹ See adjustment noted with a * in Section C at 11.

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:	2/28/08	Yes
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	4/1/08	Yes
3. Date NOI Filed:	3/28/08	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:	A.07-12-006	Yes
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	4/4/08	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:	A.07-12-006	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	4/4/08	Yes
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.09-03-024	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	3/17/09	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	5/18/09	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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
<p>Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA) opposed the Application, which sought to change the cost allocation method by which customers are charged for the costs of natural gas PPPs, on behalf of customers with disabilities in California. The final decision rejects the joint application of SDG&E, PG&E and SoCal Gas.</p>	<p>Decision at pp. 5, 22.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>DisabRA was an active party throughout this proceeding and the only party to represent customers with disabilities. DisabRA filed a protest to the Application (with The Utility Reform Network (TURN), Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet), and A World Institute for a Sustainable Humanity (AWISH), an Opening Brief, a Joint Reply Brief and Joint Comments and Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision (with DRA, TURN, Consumer Federation of California (CFC) and Latino Issues Forum). Additionally, DisabRA submitted written testimony, attended workshops and delivered final oral arguments.</p>	<p>A.07-12-006 Docket. Joint Protest filed 1/14/08. Testimony of D. Giacomini submitted on 6/13/08. Opening Brief filed 8/21/08. Oral Arguments delivered on 8/25/08. Joint Reply Brief filed 9/2/08. Joint Comments on Proposed Decision filed 12/8/08. Joint Reply Comments on Proposed Decision filed 12/15/08.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Throughout the proceeding, DisabRA presented the Commission and other parties with a view of the Application's impact on the individual customer. Specifically, DisabRA focused on explaining the potential impact on two sets of customers: customers who qualify for California Alternate Rates</p>	<p>A.07-12-006 Docket.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>for Energy (CARE) and would face an increase in their gas bill to pay for non-CARE PPPs (and who are at risk if the overall stability of the program is threatened) and customers who narrowly exceed the CARE threshold (between 200% and 250% of the poverty line). Being that people with disabilities are disproportionately low-income, many fall into one of these two categories. Where DisabRA submitted filings jointly with other customers, we generally took the lead on the portions of the documents relating to these issues.</p>		
<p>DisabRA encouraged the Commission to reject the Application due to the problems it would have created for residential customers, customers with disabilities and the CARE program itself. This participation helped to inform the Commission’s Decision to reject the application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Application underestimates the impact that the surcharge reallocation would have on low and lower-income residential customers • The proposed Application will adversely impact “low-income” customers both by increasing their energy bills and by risking the overall stability of the CARE program. • Residential customers earning between 200% and 250% of the poverty line, living on the edge of financial survival, would be charged the full PPP surcharge. Even a slight increase in their energy bill could cause extreme difficulty and harm to this customer population. 	<p>Decision at p. 17, § 5.2.2. DisabRA Opening Comments at pp. 2, 4, 6.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People with disabilities are also more likely to be subject to higher bill increases than the “average” customer because people with disabilities tend to use more energy than their non-disabled peers. 		
<p>DisabRA worked in close cooperation with TURN, DRA, Aglet, and AWISH to file a joint protest to the application and joint comments and reply comments on the Proposed Decision. In these joint comments we took the lead on explaining the impact of the gas surcharge on low-income and lower-income customers.</p>	<p>A.07-12-006 Docket.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>DisabRA conducted extensive outreach to individuals and community based organizations serving the disabled community to inform them of the potential increase in their PPP charges and to collect real world stories from customers who would be adversely affected by the reallocation of the gas surcharge. The results of our outreach formed the basis of our testimony submitted to the Commission. We also encouraged individuals to contact the Commission and voice their concerns regarding the potential increase in their gas bill.</p>	<p>Decision at p. 4 (regarding letters and emails in opposition to Application being placed in the correspondence file for the proceeding).</p> <p>Testimony of Dorene Giacopini, Outreach Coordinator, submitted on 6/13/08.</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
<p>If so, provide name of other parties: California Manufacturers & Technology Assn., SDG&E/SoCal Gas, Indicated Producers, TURN, DRA, Latino Issues Forum, CFC, DisabRA, The Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, California League of Food Processors, Sutherland Asbill & Brennan LLP, Hanna and Morton LLP, Douglas & Liddell, Indicated Producers, CA Cotton Ginners & Growers Association, PG&E, SDG&E/ SoCalGas, Natural Resources Defense Council, Goodin, Macbride, Squeri, Day & Lamprey, California Energy Markets, PG&E, MRW & Associates Inc, PG&E, Mccarthy & Barry LLP, Aglet, Lindh & Assoc., Alcantar & Kahl, LLP, RCS, Inc.</p>		Yes
<p>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>DisabRA represents a unique consumer group that was not represented by any other party in the proceeding. During the course of the proceeding, DisabRA closely coordinated its efforts with other consumer groups. DisabRA joined with TURN, DRA and Latino Issues Forum to file a Joint Reply Brief, Joint Comments and Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision. When working together, we sought to maximize effectiveness and avoid duplication by ensuring that each organization took the lead in its area of expertise.</p> <p>DisabRA was the only party in this proceeding to represent the interests of persons with disabilities. To that end, in joint comments, DisabRA took the lead on explaining the personal aspect of the potential reallocation of the gas surcharge. Specifically, we explained the impact of the Application on both low-income and lower-income customers. Since people with disabilities are disproportionately low-income, representing these two groups of customers allowed us to advocate for our constituency. Being that this was our niche area in the proceeding, we took the lead in writing the portions of the joint comments that related to the Application’s real-world affect on customers. Additionally, we submitted testimony and participated at the hearing advocating on behalf of low-income and lower-income customers.</p>		Yes

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

(completed by claimant except where indicated)

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>DisabRA's arguments and testimony that was presented significantly contributed to the rejection of the utilities' request to reallocate PPP surcharges. Assigning a specific dollar value to DisabRA's participation in this proceeding, however, may be difficult because the reallocation of PPP surcharges would have affected residential customers on an on-going basis while the costs of Public Participation Programs are likely to change in the future. At the time of the application, however, the utilities' proposal would have shifted significant costs from large business customers onto the residential class - \$65.2 million for SoCalGas, \$27.2 million for PG&E, and \$7.9 million for SDG&E. (Exh. 51, p. 4). Therefore, DisabRA's participation directly resulted in protecting residential customers from such a result. The cost of DisabRA's participation (\$76,649.60) was therefore significantly less than the benefits realized from DisabRA's participation.</p>	<p>After the adjustments and disallowances we make to this claim, the remainder of DisabRA's hours and costs are reasonable.</p>

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa Kasnitz	2007	1.8	390	D.07-06-040	702	2007	1.3	390	507.00
Melissa Kasnitz	2008	68.5	420	D.09-03-018	28,770	2008	62.70	420	26,334
Melissa Kasnitz	2009	8.2	420	Equal to 2008 adopted rate	3,444	2009	5.80	420	2,436
Mary-Lee Kimber	2007	1.0	190	D.09-03-042	190	2007	.6	190	114
Mary-Lee Kimber	2008	6.0	215	D.09-07-017	1,290	2008	4.4	215	946
Julia Pinover	2008	126.6	180	Attachment 4	22,788	2008	120.95	150	18,142.50
Subtotal:					\$57,184	Subtotal: \$48,479.50			
OTHER FEES									
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are claiming (paralegal, outreach coordination):									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Paralegal	2008	17.7	110	D.09-03-018	1,947	2008	16.30	110	1,793
Paralegal	2009	8.4	120	Equal to 2008 rate	1,008	2009	7.80	110	858
Summer Associate	2008	53.0	110	Attachment 4	5,830	2008	51.3	110	5,643
Outreach coordinator	2008	33.7	110	D.09-07-017	3,707	2008	32.3	110	3,553

					Subtotal:	\$12,492				Subtotal:	\$11,847.00
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION (1/2 RATE)											
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$		
Melissa Kasnitz	2008	.9	210	D.09-03-018	189	2008	.9	210	189		
Melissa Kasnitz	2009	8.5	210	Attachment 4	1,785	2009	8.00	210	1,680		
Mary-Lee Kimber	2008	4.8	107.5	Attachment 4	516	2008	1.8	107.5	193.50		
Paralegal	2008	1.1	55	D.09-03-018	60.50	2008	1.1	55	60.50		
Paralegal	2009	27.9	60	Attachment 4	1,674	2009	11.2	60	672		
					Subtotal:	\$4,224.50				Subtotal:	\$2,795.00
COSTS											
#	Item	Detail			Amount \$	Amount \$					
1	Photocopying	Attachments 5 and 11			300.00	160.00					
2	Postage	Attachments 5 and 11			5.84	5.84					
3	Telephone	Attachments 5 and 11			92.86	92.86					
4	Travel	Attachments 5 and 11			35.40	-0-					
					Subtotal:	\$434.10	Subtotal: \$258.70				
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$74,334.60	TOTAL AWARD \$:					\$63,380.20

C. Attachments or Comments Documenting Specific Claim (not attached to final Decision):

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	Reasonableness of Costs
6	Detailed Records for Work on Merits in 2007
7	Detailed Records for Work on Merits in 2008
8	Detailed Records for Work on Merits in 2009
9	Detailed Records for Work on Fees in 2008
10	Detailed Records for Work on Fees in 2009
11	Detailed Expense Report

CPUC Adoptions, Disallowances & Adjustments:

While DisabRA made a substantial contribution to this proceeding and the hours claimed, in general are reasonable, we have made adjustments and disallowances to this claim. These adjusted hours and costs illuminate areas of excessiveness and/or inefficiency, include reductions for costs which are not justified, and the disallowance of hours for travel (*See* D.08-04-022) and clerical work, which are not compensable.

In addition, we make adjustments in several areas where we feel that the work of Kasnitz, Pinover and Kimber overlapped, without explanation. DisabRA is experienced in work related to Commission proceedings and we would expect that duplication of efforts would be non-existent, minimal or at the very least, explained in DisabRA's claim. We do not find here however, that this is the case.

Item	Adjustments/Disallowances
2007 - Kasnitz and Kimber	Dec- Both Kasnitz and Kimber logged time for "receiving and reviewing application to reallocate gas costs to residential customers." We find this time to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of DisabRA's time spent on this task. (reduced Kasnitz -.50 hrs and Kimber -.40 hrs.)
2008 - Kasnitz	Jan 8- Kasnitz logged time for "email exchange with N. Suetake and M. Kimber of TURN re: coordination on protest of application." We reduce this time by .10 to equal the same amount of time logged by Pinover for this same task. (reduced Kasnitz .10 hrs.)
2008 - Kasnitz	Jan 15-Kasnitz logged time for "reviewing protests and responses to application." We reduce this time by .40 hrs, equal to the same time logged by Kimber for this same task.
2008 - Kasnitz	Feb 14-Kasnitz logged time for "receiving and reviewing notice of prehearing conference and calendaring same." We disallow .10 hrs of this as clerical work and not compensable.
2008 - Kasnitz and Kimber	Feb 27-Both Kasnitz and Kimber logged time for "receiving and reviewing TURN's motion to dismiss application and email from TURN re: same." We find this time to be duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient. As such, we disallow 50% of DisabRA's time spent on this task. (reduced Kasnitz 1.5 hrs and Kimber .10 hrs.)
2008 - Kimber	Feb 28-Kimber logged 1.0 hrs for "travel to PHC." We disallow this as being related to "routine travel", which is non-compensable.
2008 - Law Clerk	Mar 4-DisabRA logged .20 hrs for "calendaring dates set out in scoping memo." We disallow this clerical time which is non-compensable.
2008 - Kimber	Mar 6-We disallow .20 hrs logged for "reviewing scoping memo," as being duplicative of Kasnitz work for this same task on 3/4/08.
2008 - Kasnitz	Mar 24- DisabRA logged a double entry for Kasnitz's work for "receiving and reviewing supplemental testimony from applicants." To correct this error, we remove .50 hrs from DisabRA's request.

2008 - Kimber	Apr 22-DisabRA logged a double entry for Kimber's work for "teleconference with Lex from CFC re: public participation hearings; conference with M. Kasnitz and J. Pinover." To correct this error, we remove .30 hrs from DisabRA's request.
2008 - Kasnitz	May 2-Kasnitz logged .10 hrs for "receiving and reviewing applicants' response to CFC letters re: PPHs." We disallow this time as being duplicative of the efforts of Pinover and the Outreach Coordinator for the same task.
2008 - Outreach Coordinator and Pinover	May 21-Outreach Coordinator and Pinover both log 2.80 hrs for a conference with themselves and M. Kasnitz "re: outreach and plan for drafting testimony; email exchange with D. Giacomini re: same; reviewing previous testimony work with R. Giacomini to prepare outline." We find these efforts duplicative of each others efforts and inefficient, and disallow 50% of the requested time. (reduced Outreach Coordinator 1.4 hrs and Pinover 1.4 hrs.)
2008 - Paralegal	May 29-We disallow .10 hrs logged for "reviewing and indexing pleadings and correspondence." This is a clerical task which is non-compensable.
2008 - Kasnitz	Jun 18-Kasnitz logged 2.2 hrs for "conference with J. Pinover re: preparation for PPH; outreach and email exchange re: same; next steps and follow-up testimony." We reduce this time by 1.6 hrs, to equal the same amount of time logged by Pinover for this same task.
2008 - Pinover	Jun 20-Pinover logged .50 hrs for "meeting w/Kasnitz re: cross-examination of proponent's testimony; email exchange with consumer groups re: scheduling teleconference next week." We disallow .20 hrs of this time, equal to the same amount of time logged by Kasnitz for this same task.
2008 - Pinover	Jun 26- Pinover logged .50 hrs for "conference with M. Kasnitz re: preparation for teleconference w/ consumer advocates." We reduce this time by .30 to equal the same amount of time logged by Kasnitz for this same conference.
2008 - Kasnitz	Jun 26- Kasnitz logged .80 hrs for "consumer conference call re: testimony and preparation for hearing." We disallow this time as being duplicative of Pinover's attendance at the same conference, and inefficient.
2008 - Summer Associate	Jun 26- Summer Associate logged .20 hrs for "instructions from J. Pinover re: review of CFC date requests." We reduce these hours by .10, equal to the same amount of time logged by Pinover for this same task.
2008 - Summer Associate	Jun 27- Summer Associate logged .30 hrs for "review documents in preparation for document review." We disallow this time as being vague and inefficient.
2008 - Pinover	Jul 8- Pinover logged .70 hrs for "meeting with Kasnitz and summer intern re: additional outreach to individuals in advance of hearing." We disallow .60 hrs to equal the same time logged by Kasnitz and Summer Associate for this same meeting.
2008 - Pinover	Jul 11- Pinover logged .30 hrs for "conference with M. Kasnitz re: witness list; prepare the same." On this same date in the preceding timesheet entry, this same task was already incorporated into Pinover's request for .80 hrs. As such, we remove .30 hrs from DisabRA's request.
2008 - Kasnitz	Jul 14- Kasnitz logged .20 for "receiving and reviewing CFC's motion to

	compel.” A request for this same task was logged for Kasnitz’s work on 06/26/08. We disallow this time as being previously compensated.
2008 - Summer Associate	Jul 17- 1.3 hours billed for “travel time to/from public workshop (PUC building in San Francisco.” This time is related to “routine travel” and is non-compensable.
2008 - Pinover	Jul 21- Pinover logged .50 hrs for “travel to/from hearing.” This time is related to “routine travel” and is non-compensable.
2008 - Pinover	Jul 24- Pinover logged .10 hrs for “reviewing notice scheduling oral argument, calendar the same.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Paralegal	Jul 29- .20 hrs logged for “updating calendar per changes to schedule made at the hearings.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Pinover	Jul 30- Pinover logged .60 hrs for “reviewing documents, reading 7/22 transcript re: preparation of brief. A request for this same task was logged for Pinover’s work on 7/29/08. We disallow this time as being previously compensated.
2008 - Paralegal	Jul 31- DisabRA logged .30 hrs of paralegal time for “preparing contact list and mailing information outreach letters.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Paralegal	Aug 4- DisabRA logged .20 hrs of paralegal time for “updating calendar.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Pinover	Aug 25- Pinover logged 1.20 hrs for travel to/from oral argument. This time is related to “routine travel” and is non-compensable.
2008 - Paralegal	Aug 29- DisabRA logged .30 hrs of paralegal time for “review and index documents from hearing.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Kasnitz and Pinover	Sept 3- Kasnitz and Pinover both logged hour for “review party reply briefs.” We find this time to be duplicative and inefficient. As such we disallow 50% of the time spent on this task. (reduced Kasnitz .20 hrs and Pinover .25 hrs.)
2008 - Paralegal	Nov 17- DisabRA logged .30 hrs for “calendarizing comments and replies on proposed decision.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Kasnitz	Nov 18- Kasnitz logged .10 hrs for “email exchange with consumers setting call.” We disallow this time as being duplicative of Pinover’s work and inefficient.
2008 - Kasnitz and Pinover	Dec 10- Kasnitz and Pinover both logged time for “reviewing draft comments from DRA and sending emails re: follow-up. We reduced this time by 50% for being duplicative of each others for and inefficient. (reduced Kasnitz .20 hrs and Pinover .20 hrs.)
2009 - Paralegal	Jan 29- DisabRA logged .30 hrs for “calendarizing an all-party meeting, and RSVP to commission regarding same.” We disallow this clerical task.
2009 - Kasnitz	Feb 4- DisabRA logged the same task “receiving and review replies re: attendance at all party meeting.” twice on this date. We disallow .10 hrs to correct this error.
2009 - Kasnitz	Feb 10- Kasnitz logged .80 hrs to “travel from all party meeting.” We disallow this time as “routine travel” which is non-compensable.
*2009 - Kasnitz	Mar 18- Kasnitz logged 1.5 hrs for “reviewing time records for completeness and

	accuracy.” These hours are billed at full rate. We correct DisabRA’s error here. First, we reduce Kasnitz’s professional time by 1.5 hours. Next, we increase the hours logged for intervenor compensation by 1.5 hrs (billed at ½ rate). And lastly, we re-compute DisabRA’s totals using these adjusted hours.
2009 - Paralegal	Apr 3- DisabRA logged .30 hrs of paralegal time for “reviewing proceeding info on PUC website, review commission meeting agenda.” We disallow this clerical task.
2008 - Hourly rate for J. Pinover.	Pinover is fairly new to Commission proceedings and has a pending rate approval before the Commission for her work in R05-04-005. Pinover’s role in that proceeding was strictly limited to the preparation of DisabRA’s intervenor compensation claim. Pinover is a 2007 graduate of Georgetown University Law Center who joined DisabRA immediately following graduation. DisabRA requests an hourly rate of \$180, which is mid-range for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience (\$150-\$205). Given that Pinover is new to Commission proceedings, and has no related legal experience, we adopt a rate of \$150 for work in 2008, which is at the lower end but within the range of rates (\$150-\$205) adopted by the Commission for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience.
2009 - Hourly rate for paralegals	Resolution ALJ 235 disallows Cost of Living Allowance raises for intervenor participants for 2009 work. As such, we deny DisabRA’s increase in hourly rates for its paralegals, and apply the previously adopted 2008 rate of \$110.
Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation	DisabRA request 41.7 hours of compensation for preparation of its Notice of Intent (NOI) and intervenor compensation claim. Although we applaud DisabRA’s assignment for most of this task to its paralegals versus its attorneys, the total hours requested are still excessive given the fact that the claim is relatively small and related to only one decision. As such, we approve a total of 20 hrs for compensation. To achieve this allowance, we reduce Kasnitz’s time by 2.0 hrs, Kimber’s time by 3.0 hrs and the 2009 Paralegal hours by 18.2 hrs.
Printing/Photocopying Expenses	DisabRA requests \$300 for printing/photocopying costs (equal to 1,500 copies @ 20¢) 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 \$160 of these costs and disallow the remainder (\$140) for excessiveness. This amount is similar to the amount paid to another intervenor, with which DisabRA filed joint protests, opening and reply comments.
Costs (#4-Travel)	Initially, when the claim was filed, DisabRA failed to submit the receipts associated with these costs. In response to the Commission’s request to provide them, DisabRA indicated via a correspondence email that they would waive these costs as they were unable to locate the requested receipts. As such, we disallow \$35.40 for travel costs.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

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.09-03-024.
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 \$63,380.20.

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 \$63,380.20.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay claimant the total award. We direct these utilities to allocate payment responsibility among themselves based on their California-jurisdictional natural gas revenues for the 2008 calendar year, 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 August 1, 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 decision is effective today.

Dated October 15, 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:	D0910022	Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0903024	
Proceeding(s):	A0712006	
Author:	ALJ Michael J.Galvin	
Payer(s):	San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Disability Rights Advocates	05-18-09	\$74,649.60	\$63,380.20	No	Duplication of efforts between participants, inefficiencies, excessive hours, adjusted hourly rates, undocumented expenses, excessive costs, clerical tasks and routine travel.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$390	2007	\$390
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$420	2008	\$420
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$420	2009	\$420
Mary-Lee	Kimber	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$190	2007	\$190
Mary-Lee	Kimber	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$215	2008	\$215
Julia	Pinover	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$180	2008	\$150
Paralegals			Disability Rights Advocates	\$110	2008	\$110
Paralegals			Disability Rights Advocates	\$120	2009	\$110
Summer Associate			Disability Rights Advocates	\$110	2008	\$110
Outreach Coordinator			Disability Rights Advocates	\$110	2008	\$110

(END OF APPENDIX)