

Decision 10-10-013 October 14, 2010

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Implement and Recover in Rates the Costs of its Photovoltaic (PV) Program (U39E).

Application 09-02-019  
(Filed February 24, 2009)

**DECISION AWARDING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION  
TO THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE  
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 10-04-052**

<b>Claimant: The Greenlining Institute (Greenlining)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 10-04-052</b>
<b>Claimed: \$45,349</b>	<b>Awarded: \$33,529 (reduced 26%)</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey</b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Maryam Ebke</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

**A. Brief Description of Decision:**

The decision adopted a five-year solar photovoltaic (PV) program to develop up to 500 MWs of solar PV facilities in Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E's) service territory. The PV program includes 250 MWs of utility-owned generation (UOG) and 250 MWs furnished through power purchase agreements (PPAs).

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	05/14/09	Yes
2. Other Specified Date for the Notice of Intent (NOI):		
3. Date the NOI Filed:	06/11/09	Yes

4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 07-11-011	Yes
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	03/17/08	Yes
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.07-11-011	Yes
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	03/17/08	Yes
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.10-04-052	Yes
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	04/28/10	Yes
15. File date of compensation request:	06/25/10	Yes
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**

**A. Claimant’s description of its claimed contribution to the final decision:**

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
1. Opposed high cost of the UOG PV program, especially as compared to other UOG programs, as well as non-UOG programs. (See Protest (filed March 27, 2009), pp. 2-3; Opening Brief (filed Oct 1, 2009), pp. 2-3; Reply Brief (filed Oct. 16, 2009), pp. 3-4; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision (filed Feb. 16, 2010), p. 1; Opening Comments on Alternate Decision (filed Feb. 16, 2010), p. 1)	D.10-04-052, p. 12 (discusses Greenlining opposition to high cost of project), pp. 30-33 (although decision accepts PG&E’s proposed cost estimate for the UOG program, it implements several mechanisms to lower costs: excess costs subject to reasonableness review, an independent evaluator to ensure competitiveness, and a cost incentive mechanism whereby 10% of costs savings go to shareholders). The Scoping Memo identified this issue—cost-effectiveness—as	Yes

	within the scope of the proceeding: (see Scoping Memo (issued July 1, 2009), Sec. 2.1)	
2. Identified disposal of PV panels and other decommissioning costs as a significant cost (up to \$27.5 million) not accounted for by PG&E’s UOG application. (See Prehearing Conference Statement (filed May 11, 2009), p. 8; Opening Brief, p. 13; Reply Brief, p. 7; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision (filed Feb. 16, 2010), p. 4; Opening Comments on Alternate Decision (filed Feb. 16, 2010), p. 5)	D.10-04-052, pp. 25-26 (discussing Greenlining’s identification of panel disposal costs as a significant deficiency in PG&E’s application). The Scoping Memo identified this issue—costs of disposal of the solar facilities—as within the scope of the proceeding: (see Scoping Memo, Sec. 2.6)	Yes
3. Opposed additional 1% rate of return for the PV UOG program, arguing that the PV program was not experimental and thus did not merit additional rate of return under Pub. Util. Code § 454.3. (See Opening Brief, pp. 10-12; Reply Brief, p. 5; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 5; Opening Comments on Alternate Decision, p. 6.)	D.10-04-052, p. 64 (discussing Greenlining’s contributions), pp. 65-66 (rejecting additional rate of return because the OUG PV program is not an experimental program) The Scoping Memo identified this issue—the cost recovery mechanism, including the rate of return—as within the scope of the proceeding: (See Scoping Memo, Sec. 2.3)	Yes
4. Recommended that PV program be limited to projects above 3 MW, to protect the SB 32 mandated feed-in tariff and net metering efforts) (See Opening Brief on Impact of SB 32 and AB 920 (filed Nov. 10, 2009), pp. 3-5; Reply Brief on Impact of SB 32 and AB 920 (filed Nov. 17, 2009), pp. 3-5).	D.10-04-052, pp. 46-48 (while the decision did not limit projects to those above 3 MW, it did institute procedures, such as standard contracts, to ensure that smaller projects are treated fairly). This issue—the MW capacity of individual projects—was identified as added to the scope of the proceeding by the passage of Senate Bill 32 and Assembly Bill 920 (see ALJ’s Ruling Requesting Briefs on the Impacts	Yes

	of SB 32 and AB 920 (issued Oct. 30, 2009), p. 2.	
5. Considering the high cost estimate of the program, supported using the price forecast as a cost cap. (See Protest, p. 4; Opening Brief, p. 12; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 3; Opening Comments on Alternate Decision, p. 3.)	D.10-04-052, pp. 55-56 (discussing establishment of a cost cap, set at 20% above cost estimate) The Scoping Memo identified this issue—the reasonableness of the cost estimate—as within the scope of the proceeding: (See Scoping Memo, Sec. 2.4.)	Yes, although ultimately Greenlining’s position did not prevail on this issue, Greenlining’s work here clearly influenced the Commission’s decision making process in “whole or in part” as defined in Section 1802.
6. Opposed fixed price for the power purchase agreement (PPA) component of the Solar PV program; argued that dropping prices for PV meant that a competitive process for establishing prices was more cost effective. (See Protest, p. 5; Opening Brief, pp. 4-7; Opening Comments on Proposed Decision, pp. 2-3; Opening Comments on Alternate Decision, pp. 2-3.)	D.10-04-052, pp. 37, 39 (discussing Greenlining’s contribution), p. 39 (establishing competitive prices for the PPA program, as changing factors could lead to a lower price). The Scoping Memo identified this issue—the reasonableness of using fixed price—as within the scope of the proceeding: (See Scoping Memo, Sec. 2.2.)	Yes
7. Greenlining proposes that PV project contain features that provide economic development benefits, such as local jobs. (See Prehearing Conference Statement, pp. 3, 6; Opening Brief, p. 6; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision, p. 4.)	The Scoping Memo identified this issue—jobs and diverse business development—as outside the scope of the proceeding: (See Scoping Memo, pp. 5-6.)	On July 7, 2009 an Assigned Commissioner’s and Administrative Law Judge’s Scoping Memo was issued stating that “Greenlining also requests that we add the issue of whether PG&E is committed to providing jobs to diverse business entities and underserved communities in implementing this program. The Commission has established General Order (GO) 156, which sets forth rules and

		<p>regulations for utilities’ supplier diversity programs, and requires all investor-owned utilities to report to the Commission on how they fulfill those requirements. We will not review GO 156 in this proceeding.”<sup>1</sup></p> <p>We disallow 9% of Greenlining’s professional and witness hours which it estimates was spent on this issue.</p>
--	--	---

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

	<b>Claimant</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding?</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding?</b>	Yes	Yes
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b>                      Californians for Renewable Energy (CARE), California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA), Western Power Trading Forum (WPTF) and Direct Access Customer Coalition (DACC), Consumer Federation of California (CFC), Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE), The Solar Alliance, Independent Energy Producers Association (IEP), The Utility Reform Network (TURN), California Farm Bureau Federation (Farm Bureau), and California Solar Energy Industries Association (CALSEIA) and others that were less active participants.</p>		Yes
<p><b>d. Claimant’s description of how it coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how claimant’s participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b></p> <p>While Greenlining seeks to protect all ratepayers from unnecessary costs and promote rules that foster renewable energy, Greenlining’s specific constituents are communities of color and low income communities. Therefore, Greenlining’s perspective on issues differs from that of general ratepayer advocates, and supplements it by providing analysis specific to vulnerable and/or underserved segments of the ratepayer population. For example, our advocacy sought to protect small solar enterprises that would</p>		Yes

<sup>1</sup> We note that the Commission is currently contemplating opening a proceeding to consider diversity issues across utility operations.

<p>need to compete with PG&amp;E’s UOG PV program.</p> <p>Greenlining coordinated with the Division of Ratepayer Advocates and with other ratepayer advocates to ensure that our efforts were not duplicated. Where our issues overlapped, we sought to coordinate strategies to minimize duplication and maximize efficacy. Where parties made similar arguments, the reasoning in support of each differed, allowing the Commission a broader range of opinions on the issues.</p>	
--	--

**C. Additional Comments on Part II:**

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
II.A.1, 4, 5	X		<p>Although ultimately Greenlining’s position did not prevail in these particular issues, Greenlining’s participation substantially contributed to the decision by providing a meaningful opposition to other parties’ proposals as well as justification to certain alternative views. Greenlining brought to the proceeding perspectives of the low-income and minority ratepayers regarding the PV project.</p>

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§§ 1801 & 1806):**

Claimant’s explanation as to how the cost of claimant’s participation bore a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through claimant’s participation	CPUC Verified
<p>It is difficult to assign a precise dollar value to Greenlining’s participation. Some of Greenlining’s contribution’s accepted by the final decision will clearly save ratepayers costs, such as advocacy to disallow an increase in the rate of return, identification of costs (panel disposal—which the Commission estimated at \$27.5 million) missing from the UOG application and advocacy for competitive pricing of the PPA program.</p> <p>Additionally, Greenlining’s contribution’s assisted the Commission in developing an efficient PG&amp;E solar PV program. This solar PV program will provide environmental benefits to ratepayers, such as the reduction of greenhouse gases and other pollution. These benefits are difficult estimate a dollar figure, but provide environmental and health benefits for all ratepayers.</p> <p>These contributions, as well as additional contributions described above, informed the record and the Commission’s decision-making process. Although some were not ultimately adopted, they were primarily measures to keep future costs under control. How much ratepayer money these measures ultimately save will not be known until the program is built out and annual reports are analyzed. However, it is clear that our advocacy was</p>	<p>After the reductions and disallowances we make to this claim, the remaining hours are reasonable and should be compensated.</p>

designed to keep costs low and derive as many benefits to ratepayers as possible. Thus, Greenlining’s participation creates benefits to ratepayers.	
---	--

**B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Samuel Kang	2009	26.8	210	D.09-11-031	5,628.00	2009	25.6	190	4,864
Samuel Kang	2010	9.1	220	Adopted here	2,002.00	2010	9.1	200	1,820
Stephanie Chen – Legal Fellow	2009	15.1	125	D.10-05-010 <sup>2</sup>	1,887.50	2009	11.6	125	1,450
Stephanie Chen – Legal Counsel	2009	58.2	190	Adopted here	11,058.00	2009	57.9	175	10,133
Stephanie Chen	2010	24.3	210	Adopted here	5,103.00	2010	12.9	185	2,387
Elena Gil	2009	90.1	175	Adopted here	15,767.50	2009	75.1	175	13,143
<b>Subtotal: \$41,446</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$33,797</b>			
Disallowance of 9% of Greenlining’s professional hours spent on issue outside the scope of the proceeding. <sup>3</sup> See Part II, Section A, item #7									<b>-\$3,042</b>
						<b>Adjusted Subtotal: \$30,755<sup>4</sup></b>			
EXPERT FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Orson Aguilar	2009	2.8	200	D.10-05-010	560.00	2009	2.8	200	560
<b>Subtotal: \$560.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$560.00</b>			

<sup>2</sup> Here Greenlining refers to Chen as a “legal fellow,” but D.10-05-010 at 7 ruled that Chen was more akin to a paralegal or legal associate, and during this period of time. The Commission denied Greenlining’s request that Chen be compensated as an attorney. D.10-05-010 did however adopt a higher hourly rate of \$125 for her 2008-2009 advocacy work in A.08-03-015. We apply this same hourly rate here without further discussion.

<sup>3</sup> We apply the 9% disallowance to the total of Greenlining’s adjusted hours.

<sup>4</sup> Rounded to nearest dollar amount.

Disallowance of 9% of Greenlining's witness hours spent on issue outside the scope of the proceeding. See Part II, Section A, item #7 (.25 hrs)									<b>-\$50</b>
									<b>Adjusted Subtotal: \$510</b>
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Sam Kang	2009	0.8	105	½ rate adopted in D.09-11-031	84.00	2009	0.8	95	76
Stephanie Chen	2010	1.7	105	½ rate adopted here	178.50	2010	0.0	92.5	-0-
Elena Gil	2009	6.8	87.50	½ rate adopted here	595.00	2009	1.0	87.50	87.50
Enrique Gallardo	2010	14.2	175	½ rate adopted here	2,485.00	2010	12.0	175	2,100
<b>Subtotal: \$3,342.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$2,264</b>			
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$45,349.00<sup>5</sup></b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$33,529</b>			
<p>*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.  <b>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. Claimant's records should identify specific issues for which it seeks 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. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</b></p>									

**C. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments:**

Item	Reason
<b>Substantive Issues</b>	
2009 Kang	Kang logs 3.2 hours for "prep for and attendance" at a prehearing conference on 5/14/09. We reduce this time by 1.2 hours, equal to the same amount of time logged by another intervenor for this same task. The adjusted hours more closely reflects our standards on reasonableness of hours.
2009 Chen (Legal Fellow)	We disallow 3.5 hours of Chen's time participating in a PG&E workshop on 4/27/09. We have previously compensated Kang for his attendance at this same workshop. We see no reason why ratepayers should pay for multiple participants to participate in the same workshop on behalf of the same intervenor.

<sup>5</sup> Rounded to nearest dollar amount.

2009 Chen (Counsel)	We disallow approximately .3 hrs of Chen’s time associated with the “filing and serving” of documents. This task is clerical in nature and is subsumed in the fees paid to attorneys.
2010 Chen (Counsel)	We disallow 2.5 hrs of Chen’s work on 1/28/10 reading the PD and AD. We have previously compensated Kang for these same efforts. If Greenlining chooses to have multiple parties assigned to performing the same tasks, ratepayers should not be expected to pay for inefficient or duplicative efforts.
2010 Chen (Counsel)	We disallow 1.9 hrs of Chen’s approximated time associated with the “filing and serving” of documents. This task is clerical in nature and subsumed in the fees paid to attorneys.
2010 Chen (Counsel)	Chen logs 19 hrs for “drafting and editing” Greenlining’s opening brief. We find Chen’s hours spent on this task to be excessive given the scope of the document. We approve a more reasonable amount of time of 12 hrs for this task.
2009 Gil	We disallow 1.5 hrs of Gil’s time spent “drafting Greenlining’s protest” to PG&E’s Application. The adjusted total is reflective of the amount of time logged by other intervenors for this same task and more closely reflects our standards on the reasonableness of hours.
2009 Gil	Gil logs 20.2 hrs for “drafting, proofreading and editing and discussing” Greenlining’s Prehearing Conference Statement. We find Gil’s hours spent on this task excessive given the number of issues addressed and the scope of this task. As such, we disallow 10.2 hrs from the total of hours requested. The reduced amount more closely reflects our standards on the reasonableness of hours.
2009 Gil	We disallow 3.5 hours of Gil’s time participating in a PG&E workshop on 4/27/09. We have previously compensated Kang for his attendance at this same workshop.
<b>Adoption of Hourly Rates</b>	
2009 hourly rate for Kang	The Commission has previously approved a rate of \$190 for his work in D.09-11-031. ALJ-235 disallows COLA increases for 2009 intervenor work. As such, we apply Kang’s previously approved rate without further discussion.
2010 hourly rate for Kang	We apply a 5% step-increase to Kang’s previously approved rate of \$190 for his 2009 work and adopt an hourly rate of \$200 for his 2010 work here.
2009 hourly rate for Chen as Legal Counsel	In September of 2009, Chen obtained a position as Legal Counsel with Greenlining. Prior to this appointment, she had been working for Greenlining for two years as a Legal Associate, not an attorney. <sup>6</sup> In D.10-05-010, we advised Greenlining that in future claims we would consider an appropriate rate for Chen after she became Legal

<sup>6</sup> See D.10-05-010 at 7.

	Counsel. We approve a rate of \$175 for her 2009 work here as Legal Counsel. This within the range of \$150-\$205 for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience as approved in D.08-04-010. <sup>7</sup>
2010 hourly rate for Chen	We approve a 5% step-increase, equal to \$185 <sup>8</sup> to Chen’s 2010 work here. ALJ-247 disallows COLA increases for intervenor work in 2010.
2009 hourly rate for Gil	In May of 2008, Gil received her J.D. from the University of San Francisco School of law and was admitted to the Bar in December 2008. Greenlining states that Gil was a Legal Fellow with The Greenlining Institute. We have no previously established rates for her participation in work before the Commission. According to Greenlining, Gil has previously served as a Haywood-Burns Environmental Justice Fellow at the New York Environmental Law and Justice Project and as a legal intern at the Center of Race, Poverty & Environment in San Francisco. We approve a rate of \$175 for her 2009 work here. This is within the range of \$150-\$205 for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience as approved in D.08-04-010.
2010 hourly rate for Gallardo	Gallardo has been participating in Commission proceedings since 2001. He is a 1987 graduate of the University of California at Berkeley School of Law. In 2010, Gallardo enters into a new range of experience, now having 13 years of experience as an attorney. Greenlining requests a rate of \$350 for his 2010 work here. This rate is at the lower end of the range of \$200-\$535 approved in D.08-04-010 for attorneys with 13+ years of experience. We find this rate to be reasonable and comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services and adopt this rate here.
<b>Intervenor Compensation Preparation</b>	
2010 Chen Intervenor Compensation Preparation	We disallow 1.7 hrs of Chen’s time spent “compiling Greenlining’s intervenor compensation request.” This task is clerical in nature and is subsumed in the fees paid to attorneys.
2009 Gil Intervenor Compensation Preparation (NOI)	Greenlining requests a total of 6.8 hrs for Gil’s and 0.8 hrs for Kang’s time spent preparing Greenlining’s NOI. The two other intervenors in this proceeding TURN and CARE requested one hour or less to prepare their NOIs. One hour is generally sufficient to prepare a NOI, especially given the availability of the standardized NOI to intervenors on the Commission’s website and Greenlining’s experience in Commission proceedings. We have already allowed 0.8 hrs for Kang for this task. We allow 1 hr for Gil, recognizing that she is new at the Commission. We recommend that in future claims, Greenlining consider the use of the standardized NOI form.

<sup>7</sup> ALJ-235 disallows COLA increases for intervenor work in 2009.

<sup>8</sup> Rounded to nearest \$5.00 increment.

2010 Gallardo Intervenor Compensation Preparation	We have considered the reasonableness of the 14.2 hours Gallardo spent on preparing Greenlining’s intervenor compensation request. We find them excessive considering the claim covers a period of time just over a year and relates to only one decision. In addition, Gallardo logs no other time in this proceeding other than time spent reviewing the final decision and preparing Greenlining’s compensation request. In contrast, Greenlining’s attorneys Kang and Chen were fully involved in this proceeding from the onset. Given their knowledge of this proceeding, either of these two attorneys would have been the most logical preparers of this claim. We caution Greenlining that we will reduce future claims where it engages in the practice of assigning claim preparation to its most senior attorney. We reduce the amount of Gallardo’s time spent on this task by 2.2 hrs. Twelve hours is a more reasonable amount of time given a project of this complexity.
---	---

**PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS**

**A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim?**

No
----

**B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?**

Yes
-----

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Claimant has made a substantial contribution to Decision 10-04-052.
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 \$33,529.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. Claimant is awarded \$33,529.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay Claimant the total award. 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 September 8, 2010, the 75<sup>th</sup> 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.

This order is effective today.

Dated October 14, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY  
President  
DIAN M. GRUENEICH  
JOHN A. BOHN  
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON  
NANCY E. RYAN  
Commissioners

**APPENDIX****Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>	D1010013	<b>Modifies Decision?</b> No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D1004052	
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A0902019	
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Maryam Ebke	
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Pacific Gas and Electric 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>
The Greenlining Institute	06-25-10	\$45,349	\$33,529	No	adjusted hourly rates, excessive hours, duplication of effort, inefficient efforts, and the and disallowance of work performed outside of the scope of the proceeding

**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>
Samuel	Kang	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$210	2009	\$190
Samuel	Kang	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$220	2010	\$200
Stephanie	Chen	Legal Fellow	The Greenlining Institute	\$125	2009	\$125
Stephanie	Chen	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$190	2009	\$175
Stephanie	Chen	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$210	2010	\$185
Elena	Gil	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$175	2009	\$175
Enrique	Gallardo	Attorney	The Greenlining Institute	\$350	2010	\$350
Orson	Aguilar	Expert	The Greenlining Institute	\$200	2009	\$200

**(END OF APPENDIX)**