

Decision 07-12-026 December 20, 2007

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2007.

(U 39 M)

Application 05-12-002
(Filed December 2, 2005)

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

Investigation 06-03-003
(Filed March 2, 2006)

**OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO
DECISIONS (D.) 06-06-014, D.07-03-044, AND D.07-05-058**

1. Summary

This decision awards The Utility Reform Network (TURN) \$436,920.55 in compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 06-06-014 and D.07-03-044 and \$27,883.10 in compensation for its substantial contributions to

D.07-05-058. TURN had requested compensation of \$482,720.09¹ for D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044. We reduce TURN's requested amount to correct mathematical errors, disallow inappropriately claimed expenses, and disallow hours for work that did not substantially contribute to our resolution of issues in D.07-03-044.

These proceedings remain open.

2. Background

In Application (A.) 05-12-002, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) requested, among other things, authority to (1) increase its general rate case (GRC) revenue requirement, and (2) close all 84 of its front counters and to replace the front counters with Neighborhood Payment Centers operated by third parties.² D.06-06-014 adopted a settlement agreement (Pension Settlement) between PG&E, the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), and the Coalition of California Utility Employees (CCUE) to recover contributions to PG&E's employee pension plan during 2006-2009. D.07-03-044 adopted a settlement (GRC Settlement) between PG&E and most of the active parties in the proceeding which resolved the revenue requirement elements in PG&E's application.

D.07-03-044 also adopted an accord between PG&E and Greenlining Institute/Latino Issue Forum (Greenlining), which resolved the issues raised by Greenlining concerning supplier diversity, personnel diversity and philanthropy. D.07-05-058 adopted a settlement (Front Counter Settlement) between PG&E, the

¹ TURN had originally requested \$483,915.19. On July 30, 2007, TURN sent an email to the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) revising Goodson's 2006 requested hourly rate from \$200 to \$195 and Goodson's 2007 requested hourly rate from \$215 to \$210.

² Front counters are places where customers can talk with PG&E customer service representatives, pay bills, start and stop service, and perform other transactions.

California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF), CCUE, DRA, Greenlining and TURN concerning front-counter issues.

3. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, which is set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,³ 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).)
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

³ All subsequent statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

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.

3.1. 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 in which a PHC is held, the intervenor must file and serve its NOI between the dates the proceeding was initiated until 30 days after the PHC is held. (Rule 17.1(a)(1).) The PHC in this matter was held on January 23, 2006. TURN timely filed its NOI on February 22, 2006.

TURN asserted financial hardship in its NOI. On March 7, 2006, ALJs Tim Kenney and Janet Econome ruled that TURN met the financial hardship condition pursuant to § 1804(b)(1) through a rebuttable presumption of eligibility because the Commission found TURN met this requirement in another proceeding within one year of the commencement 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 March 7, 2006, ALJs Kenney and Econome issued a ruling that found TURN a customer pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C).

3.2. Timeliness of Request for Compensation

TURN filed its request for compensation for substantial contributions to D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044 on May 21, 2007 (May 21st Request). TURN filed its request for compensation for work in D.07-05-058 on July 30, 2007 (July 30th Request).⁴ D.07-05-058, which ended this proceeding, was issued on May 29, 2007. Pursuant to Rule 17.3, compensation requests are to be filed within 60 days of issuance of the decision that resolves an issue on which the intervenor believes it made a substantial contribution, or at the end of the proceeding. TURN's compensation requests were filed within the timeframe specified by Rule 17.3.

In view of the above, we find that TURN has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make its request for compensation in this proceeding.

4. Substantial Contribution

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, we look at several things. First, we consider whether the Commission adopted one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the customer.⁵ Second, we consider if the customer's contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, whether the customer's participation unnecessarily duplicated or materially supplemented, complemented, or contributed to the presentation of the other party or to the development of a fuller record that assisted the Commission in making its decision.⁶

⁴ No party opposes either compensation request.

⁵ Pub. Util. Code § 1802(j).

⁶ *Id.* §§ 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.⁷

Should the Commission not adopt any of the customer's recommendations, compensation may be awarded if, in the judgment of the Commission, the customer's participation substantially contributed to the decision or order. For example, if a customer provided a unique perspective that enriched the Commission's deliberations and the record, the Commission could find that the customer made a substantial contribution.⁸ With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions TURN made to the proceeding.

4.1. D.06-06-014

PG&E sought to recover \$155 million for contributions to its pension trust in 2006 and \$217 million per year for contributions during 2007-2009. PG&E's pension issues were ultimately resolved in the Pension Settlement between PG&E, CCUE and DRA. Although TURN was not a party to, and did not take a position on, the proposed Pension Settlement, it did comment on the disparity between the projected earnings on PG&E's Pension trust fund equity

⁷ D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC 2d 628 at 653.

⁸ D.03-12-019, citing to D.89-03-063, 31 CPUC 2d 402, awards San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace and Rochelle Becker compensation in the Diablo Canyon Rate

Footnote continued on next page

investments and PG&E's authorized return on equity (ROE). Thus, TURN proposed that the Commission allow PG&E to place up to 50% of the trust fund's equity investments in the companies that PG&E used to support its ROE request.

In D.06-06-014, the Commission rejected TURN's proposal, but agreed that it was a topic worth exploring. Further, D.06-06-014 provided: "In future cost-of-capital proceedings, we will ask PG&E to explain and compare the equity markets data it used to prepare (1) its requested ROE, and (2) the pension costs reported in PG&E's most recent form 10-K."⁹ Since TURN's recommendation was adopted in part, we find that TURN made a substantial contribution to D.06-06-014.

4.2. D.07-03-044

TURN claims substantial contribution to D.07-03-044 on a number of issues. Summarized below are the main areas which TURN included in its compensation request.

4.2.1. Electric Distribution Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Expenses

Late Payment Fee: TURN claims time to address PG&E's proposed late payment fee. The late payment fees portion was removed from consideration in this proceeding.¹⁰ Therefore, TURN's work on this issue did not substantially contribute to the resolution of issues in D.07-03-044. Accordingly, we disallow TURN's time spent on the late payment fee issue.

Case on the basis that their arguments, although ultimately unsuccessful, forced the utility to thoroughly document the safety issues involved.

⁹ D.06-06-014, p. 19. *See also* D.06-06-014, pp. 24 COL 24 & 26 OP 10.

¹⁰ D.07-03-044, pp. 31 (fn. 33) & 34.

Not Sufficient Funds (NSF) Fee: PG&E proposed to increase its NSF fee from \$8.00 to \$11.50. TURN proposed that this fee be set either at \$6.00 plus 1% of the check or at a flat fee by customer class. Although the Commission declined to adopt either of TURN's recommendations, it indicated that the issue of whether to adopt a separate, cost-based flat fee for each of the major customer classes would be considered as part of PG&E's next GRC proceeding.¹¹

Service Restoration Fee: PG&E requested that the existing fee be doubled. DRA proposed that the increase be limited to 25% for reasons of affordability. TURN's testimony supported DRA's proposal and provided further explanation why the increase should be limited. The GRC Settlement essentially adopted DRA's position.

Customer Service Standards: TURN proposed adding an erroneous shutoff guarantee of \$100 to PG&E's Quality Assurance Program. PG&E agreed to this proposal, and the Commission found the GRC Settlement adopting this new standard to be reasonable.¹²

Bill Set-up Costs: PG&E proposed a one-time charge of \$3.2 million for bill redesign. TURN proposed that this cost be recovered over three years. PG&E agreed to TURN's recommendation.

4.2.2. Gas Distribution O&M Expenses

Mark and Locate: PG&E projected a 7% annual increase in the number of underground service alert (USA) tags processed. For 2007, this represented a cost of \$31.2 million. TURN proposed that this amount be reduced by \$1.201 million due to a lower projected annual growth in the number of USA tags. The

¹¹ *Id.*, p. 37.

¹² *Id.*, pp. 26 - 27.

Settling Parties maintain that TURN's proposed disallowance is reflected in the GRC Settlement outcome for Gas Distribution O&M expenses.

Leak Survey: PG&E requested \$6.271 million for Leak Survey expenses in 2007. This amount was based on a 12% increase in expenses over 2004. TURN proposed a 9% increase, and recommended that PG&E's request be reduced by \$0.157 million. The Commission agreed with TURN's recommendation, but declined to reduce the GRC Settlement by \$0.157, as it assumed that TURN's proposed disallowance was reflected in the settlement.

Operate Gas Systems (OGS): PG&E requested \$3.3 million for OGS in 2007. TURN recommended a disallowance of \$0.135 million because OGS costs generally declined during 2000-2005. The Commission generally agreed with TURN's recommendation, but declined to reduce the GRC Settlement, as it assumed that TURN's proposed disallowance was reflected in the settlement.

Corrective Maintenance: PG&E requested \$19.266 million for corrective maintenance expenses in 2007. TURN recommended a disallowance of \$0.539 million based on historical costs during 2000-2005. Although the Commission found some merit to TURN's recommendation, it ultimately determined that other historical measures of costs demonstrated that PG&E's forecast was reasonable.

Gas Supply Administration: PG&E requested \$3.344 million in 2007 for gas administration expenses, consisting of labor (excluding overhead) and computer system costs. TURN recommended that these expenses be reduced. The GRC Settlement reflected TURN's position on these issues.

4.2.3. Electric Generation O&M Expenses

Diablo License Renewal Feasibility Study: PG&E requested \$16.8 million for a license renewal feasibility study to analyze Diablo Canyon equipment and

operations to determine whether to apply for a 20-year extension of the Diablo Canyon licenses. DRA, Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility/Sierra Club (ANR/SC) and TURN all opposed the study on the grounds that it was premature. TURN alternatively proposed that the cost of the feasibility study be deferred as a regulatory asset. Funding for the study was subsumed in the GRC Settlement. TURN, along with ANR/SC, opposed this settlement provision. TURN recommended that certain conditions be attached to any funding. D.07-03-044 adopted the settlement provision, but included the conditions advocated by TURN.¹³

Fossil Operations: TURN challenged a number of spending proposals associated with PG&E's Humboldt power plant on the grounds that PG&E was unlikely to spend the money due to the plant's projected closure in 2009 or earlier. As support, TURN pointed out that actual capital spending for Humboldt and Hunters Point was 37% less than what had been forecasted in PG&E's 2003 GRC. In response to TURN's arguments, the GRC Settlement provides for a one-way balancing account of certain costs that PG&E may be able to avoid depending on the timing of the plant closures.¹⁴

TURN also proposed that the Commission modify the GRC Settlement to reduce Fossil Generation O&M expenses by \$2.58 million. Although the Commission agreed with TURN that PG&E improperly included \$0.6 million for boiler recertification costs in 2008, it concluded that the GRC Settlement had subsumed that reduction in the overall adjustment to Generation O&M costs.

¹³ *Id.*, pp. 102-104.

¹⁴ *Id.*, p. 107; settlement, ¶ 30.

The Commission declined to adopt the remainder of TURN's proposed disallowances on the grounds that TURN had failed to make a showing that they were warranted.¹⁵

Hydro Expenses: TURN opposed PG&E's requested amounts for "other regulatory fees" (OR fees), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and Other Federal Agency (OFA) fees on the grounds that the forecasted amounts were speculative and recommended that the funding be removed. Alternatively, TURN recommended that the Commission adopt balancing account treatment for OFA fees. Although the Commission did not adopt TURN's recommendations, D.07-03-044 requires PG&E to "report on the amount of actual payment of OR fees and OFA fees over the duration of this GRC cycle and provide a forecast of future OR and OFA costs based on its actual payment history" as part of its next GRC.¹⁶

TURN also recommended that the Commission modify the GRC Settlement to exclude \$0.791 million for lead paint and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB) abatement expenses on the grounds that PG&E had received funding for these expenses in its last GRC. The Commission agreed with TURN that PG&E had received funding for these expenses in its last GRC. However, it declined to modify the GRC Settlement on the grounds that the reduction in O&M expenses already excluded PG&E's lead paint and PCB abatement costs.¹⁷

Electric Supply Administration: PG&E requested \$42.3 million to plan for and acquire electric supply-side and demand-side resources. TURN

¹⁵ *Id.*, pp. 109-110.

¹⁶ *Id.*, p. 92.

¹⁷ *Id.*, pp. 94-95.

recommended that PG&E's request be reduced by \$5.2 million, while DRA recommended a reduction of \$4.3 million. DRA's recommended reduction is subsumed in the settlement outcome for Generation O&M expenses. The Commission declined to adopt TURN's recommended reduction, but considered TURN's recommendation in its determination of the reasonableness of the GRC Settlement.¹⁸

Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Dues: TURN recommended that the Commission disallow 50% of NEI membership dues. The Commission agreed this was consistent with its decision in SCE's recent GRC. The GRC Settlement included recovery of only 50% of NEI dues.

4.2.4. Common and Miscellaneous Revenues, Expenses, and Capital

Other Operating Revenues (OOR): PG&E's initial forecast of \$113.9 million for OOR was subsequently revised to \$114.8 million to incorporate several minor increases proposed by TURN. The GRC Settlement further increased OORs to \$116.2 million. TURN recommended that the GRC Settlement be modified to increase the OORs for several items. The Commission declined to adopt TURN's recommendation, noting that "it is reasonable to assume that the amount of OORs adopted by the [GRC] Settlement in excess of PG&E's litigation position can only be attributed to TURN."¹⁹

Administrative & General (A&G) Expenses: PG&E requested \$742.2 million for A&G expenses. TURN raised numerous issues regarding the requested expenses and proposed various adjustments. The GRC Settlement

¹⁸ *Id.*, pp. 113-117.

¹⁹ *Id.*, p. 135.

provided \$709.4 million for A&G expenses, a reduction of \$32.8 million.

Although this amount was less than TURN's recommendations, the Commission concluded that the outcome reflected the Settling Parties' resolution of all issues raised by TURN.²⁰

Transportation Services Capital Expenditures: TURN recommended removing \$54.1 million in fleet capital spending, comprised of two separate adjustments. PG&E and TURN agreed that PG&E would reduce fleet spending by \$15.8 million to correct cost estimating errors. TURN's recommendation to reduce PG&E's rate base by \$37.5 million due to improper accounting of rental savings was reportedly incorporated into the Comparison Exhibit.

Company Airplane: PG&E requested \$18 million to replace its Company airplane. TURN, along with Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet) and DRA, opposed this request. TURN further recommended that if PG&E were allowed to acquire a replacement plane, then PG&E should lease rather than buy the plane, that certain policies governing use of the Company airplane be adopted, and that rate base be reduced to include PG&E's estimated salvage value for the existing airplane. The Commission agreed with TURN's recommendation concerning salvage value, and concluded that it was reflected in the GRC Settlement.²¹ Further, the settlement established a written policy concerning personal use of the company airplane, as recommended by TURN.

²⁰ *Id.*, p. 150.

²¹ *Id.*, p. 181.

4.2.5. Transfer of Customer Advances for Construction (CAC) to Contributions in Aid of Construction (CIAC)

Although PG&E forecasted CAC based on 2004 recorded data, it did not forecast CIAC on the grounds that the CAC to CIAC transfer has no effect on rate base. TURN argued that by ignoring the cumulative effect of this transfer, PG&E's forecasted rate base was too high and recommended that the 2007 rate base be reduced by \$3.784 million. Although the Commission agreed with TURN, it declined to reduce the 2007 rate base, noting that the associated reduction in PG&E's 2007 revenue requirement was *de minimis*.²²

4.2.6. Working Cash

TURN points out the following major contributions in the area of working cash. First, TURN, along with Aglet, recommended that customer deposits be included in the calculation of working cash. Although the Commission found some of the arguments raised by TURN and Aglet to have merit, it did not find them sufficient to overcome the presumption of reasonableness of the GRC Settlement outcome.²³ TURN next proposed that the lead-lag calculation of working cash be adjusted to use a longer period to calculate the revenue lag and to adjust the savings fund contribution lag computation be accorded the same number of lag days as payroll. Although the Commission agreed with the logic of TURN's proposal, it did not adopt the recommendation due to technical objections raised by PG&E. However, the Commission directed PG&E to

²² *Id.*, p. 193.

²³ *Id.*, p. 202.

incorporate into the calculation of working cash a lag for employer savings-fund contributions in its next GRC proceeding.²⁴

4.2.7. Depreciation Expense

Regulatory Liability for Removal Costs: TURN proposed that the Commission create a regulatory liability for ratemaking purposes for the already collected for, but not yet spent, removal costs. The Commission adopted TURN's recommendation and ordered PG&E to classify pre-funded removal costs as a regulatory liability for ratemaking purposes.²⁵

Normalized Net Salvage Proposal: TURN objected to the way future removal costs were estimated in the GRC Settlement as current removal costs were based on future-year dollars. In particular, TURN criticized the method for estimating inflation to calculate future-year dollars. Instead, TURN recommended that removal costs be based on a rolling three-year or five-year average of PG&E's recorded removal costs, which it called the "normalized net salvage approach." Although the Commission did not adopt TURN's approach, it did express concern about the growing balance of pre-funded removal costs. Consequently, PG&E was required to provide certain information in its next GRC proceeding to permit TURN, DRA and others to carefully analyze pre-funded removal costs.²⁶

While we find that TURN made a substantial contribution on this issue, we note that it had made a similar proposal in SCE's GRC proceeding (A.04-12-014/I.05-05-024). TURN did not prevail in the SCE proceeding and the

²⁴ *Id.*, p. 206.

²⁵ D.07-03-044, pp. 216-218.

issue is no longer novel. Accordingly, we shall disallow half of the time TURN spent addressing this issue.

4.2.8. Taxes

TURN objected to PG&E's income tax treatment of the deduction for dividends paid on PG&E Corporation stock held in the Employee Stock Ownership Plan (ESOP). It recommends that the tax deduction for dividends paid to the ESOP should be passed through to ratepayers, consistent with the treatment for ESOP dividends in SCE's GRC. The Commission declined to adopt TURN's proposal, noting that the GRC Settlement, which reduced PG&E's requested revenue requirement by \$181 million, represented a reasonable approximation of the likely litigation outcome of all issues raised by TURN and other parties regarding ESOPs.²⁷

4.2.9. Discussion

As summarized above, although we did not adopt TURN's recommendations in most instances, we agreed with many of the concerns expressed by TURN and incorporated aspects of its recommendations as requirements in PG&E's future GRC filings. Further, while TURN's compensation request addressed a limited number of issues, there are many other issues and sub-issues where TURN's participation contributed to the resolution of issues in this proceeding. For example, TURN worked with PG&E and Western Manufactured Housing Communities Association to propose the

²⁶ *Id.*, pp. 228-229.

²⁷ *Id.*, p. 238.

agreement for billing-related services to mobile home park owners who have submetered tenants.²⁸

As TURN points out, the Commission has previously awarded full compensation even where the intervenor's position on certain issues was not adopted in full.²⁹ Here, TURN provided important contributions on the issues it raised. Indeed, in the areas where we did not adopt TURN's position in whole or in part, we benefited from TURN's analysis and discussion.

TURN further asserts that its efforts critiquing and opposing the GRC Settlement should also constitute substantial contribution. We agree. TURN, along with Aglet and ANR, were the only parties to oppose the settlement. In many instances, TURN was the sole party to oppose certain settlement provisions. Although we ultimately adopted the GRC Settlement, these protests assisted us in developing a full record on the settled issues and determining the reasonableness of the settlement provisions.

For these reasons, we find that TURN made a substantial contribution to D.07-03-044. Accordingly, with the exception of the disallowances discussed herein, TURN's contribution warrants full compensation for all the reasonable hours and expenses incurred.

4.3. D.07-05-058

TURN claims substantial contribution to D.07-05-058, as it actively participated in settlement negotiations and helped shape the Front Counter Settlement. It notes that its advocacy reduced the number of front counter closures from 84 to 9 and included provisions to mitigate the impacts of closure

²⁸ *Id.*, pp. 18-22.

²⁹ *See, e.g.*, D.98-04-028, 79 CPUC 2d 570, 573-74.

on the nine affected communities. Further, it points out that the Front Counter Settlement reduced PG&E's revenue requirement by a total of \$2.757 million through 2010.

TURN's participation on this issue clearly contributed to a settlement agreement which fairly balanced the interests at stake. As D.07-05-058 notes, all active parties on this issue, including TURN and PG&E, compromised their litigation positions concerning the number of front counters to be closed.³⁰ Further, with respect to the front counters that will be closed, the Front Counter Settlement provides that the resultant savings will be passed through to PG&E ratepayers and that the customers who use the nine front counters to be closed will have reasonably comparable alternatives.³¹ Clearly as a party to the settlement agreement, TURN helped shape this outcome. Consequently, we find that TURN made a substantial contribution to D.07-05-058.

4.4. Contributions of Other Parties

Section 1801.3(f) requires an intervenor to avoid participation that unnecessarily 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 if its participation materially supplements, complements, or contributes to that of another party if that participation makes a substantial contribution to the Commission order.

In its May 21st Request, TURN states that it coordinated closely with other parties with similar interests in order to maximize issue coverage and minimize

³⁰ D.07-05-058, p. 12.

³¹ *Id.*, p. 14.

any duplication. It points out that many of its recommendations on issues in D.07-03-044 were unique and did not overlap with the recommendations of DRA or Aglet. Further, TURN notes that where its recommendations did overlap with those of other parties, it sought to bolster the other party's showing by emphasizing different points. In its July 30th Request, TURN states that while it and DRA represented overlapping interests, TURN's specific recommendations regarding front counter closures did not overlap with the recommendations proposed by DRA.

We recognize that even with coordination among parties, it would be virtually impossible to avoid completely some duplication in a proceeding involving numerous interconnected issues and multiple participants. In this instance, TURN took all reasonable steps to keep duplication to a minimum and to ensure that its work served to supplement, compliment or contribute to the showing of other parties. Thus, we find that there was no unnecessary duplication.

5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

After we have determined the scope of a customer's substantial contribution, we then look at whether the compensation request is reasonable. 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 substantial contribution. Thus, only those fees and costs associated with the customer's work that the Commission concludes made a substantial contribution are reasonable and eligible for compensation.

TURN requests \$482,720.09 for its participation in D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044, as follows:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2005	4.75	\$270	\$1,282.50
	2006	260	\$280	\$72,800.00
	2007	35.75	\$300	\$10,725.00
Hayley Goodson ³²	2005	4.5	\$190	\$855.00
	2006	216.25	\$195	\$42,168.75
	2007	20.75	\$210	\$4,357.50
Robert Finkelstein	2005	5	\$395	\$1,975.00
	2006	227	\$405	\$91,935.00
	2007	19.25	\$435	\$8,373.75
Michel P. Florio	2006	5.75	\$485	\$2,788.75
Marcel Hawiger	2006	94.25	\$280	\$26,390.00
	2007	17.75	\$300	\$5,325.00
Nina Suetake	2006	59	\$195	\$11,505.00
	2007	11.5	\$210	\$2,415.00
Outside Expert Fees				
<i>JBS Energy</i>				
William Marcus	2005-06	38	\$210	\$7,980.00
	2006-07	160	\$220	\$35,200.00
Gayatri Schilberg	2005-06	62.3	\$165	\$10,279.50
	2006-07	35	\$175	\$6,125.00
Jeff Nahigian	2005-06	68.75	\$155	\$10,656.25
	2006-07	25.5	\$165	\$4,207.50
Greg Ruzovan	2005-06	10.66	\$155	\$1,652.30
<i>Snavely King</i>				
Michael Majoros	2005-06	258.5	\$240	\$62,040.00
Margaret Kenney	2005-06	203.75	\$160	\$32,600.00
David Geissler	2006	111	\$160	\$17,760.00
Mark Sam	2006	37	\$75	\$2,775.00

³² Goodson's 2006 and 2007 hourly rates reflect the revision made by TURN on July 30, 2007.

Work on Proceeding				
Subtotal:				\$474,171.80
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request³³				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2007	5.75	\$150	\$862.50
Haley Goodson	2006	2	\$97.50	\$195.00
	2007	2	\$105	\$210.00
Robert Finkelstein	2007	15	\$217.50	\$3,262.50
Subtotal:				\$4,530.00
Total Hourly Compensation:				\$478,701.80
Costs				\$4,018.29
Total Requested Compensation				\$482,720.09

TURN requests \$27,883.10 for its participation in D.07-05-058 as follows:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Hayley Goodson	2006	48.5	\$195	\$9,457.50
	2007	11.5	\$210	\$2,415.00
Robert Finkelstein	2006	1.5	\$405	\$607.50
	2007	0.75	\$435	\$326.25
Outside Expert Fees				
Gayatri Schilberg	2005-06	61.89	\$165	\$10,211.85
	2006-07	22.1	\$175	\$3,867.50
Subtotal:				\$26,885.6
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request³⁴				

³³ Hourly rates are reduced 50% for preparation of the NOI and compensation request.

³⁴ Hourly rates are reduced 50% for preparation of the NOI and compensation request.

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Haley Goodson	2007	9.5	\$105.00	\$997.50
Subtotal:				\$997.50
Total Requested Compensation				\$27,883.10

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.

TURN documented its claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of its attorneys and consultants, accompanied by a brief description of each activity. The hourly breakdown reasonably supports the claim for total hours.³⁵

As discussed above, we disallow time spent on the late payment fee issue. Goodson's time records indicate that 4.25 hours were spent specifically on this

³⁵ TURN's May 21st Request includes time (1.5 hours for Goodson and one hour for Freedman) spent to meet with PG&E prior to the GRC application's filing. Since these pre-filing meetings helped shape PG&E's application, we find that TURN's participation in this proceeding prior to December 2005 substantially contributed to D.07-03-044. Thus, consistent with prior decisions, we find that TURN's work prior to the proceeding beginning should be compensated. (See, e.g., D.05-05-046.)

issue. In response to an ALJ request for the proportionate amount of general (non-allocable) time spent on this issue, TURN estimates that Goodson spent three hours, Freedman spent two hours and Schilberg spent 11.5 hours. Accordingly, we reduce Goodson's 2006 hours by 7.25, Freedman's 2006 hours by two hours and Schilberg's 2005-2006 hours by 11.5 to reflect this disallowance.

We also disallow half of TURN's time spent addressing the net salvage depreciation proposal for the reasons previously discussed. TURN estimates that approximately 45% of its time spent on depreciation expenses was related to net salvage. Based on this estimate, Finkelstein spent 1.46 hours ($3.25 \text{ hours} \times .45$) on this issue in 2005 and 73.58 ($163.5 \text{ hours} \times .45$) in 2006. Accordingly, we reduce Finkelstein's time by 0.78 hours in 2005 and 36.79 hours in 2006. Additionally, we reduce Majoros' time by 58.2 hours ($258.5 \text{ hours} \times .45 \times .5$), Kenney's time by 45.8 hours ($203.75 \text{ hours} \times .45 \times .5$), Geissler's time by 25 hours ($111 \text{ hours} \times .45 \times .5$) and Sam's time by 8.3 hours ($37 \text{ hours} \times .45 \times .5$).

In addition to the disallowances discussed above, we correct the following mathematical errors in the compensation requests:

- In TURN's May 21st Request, Finkelstein's 2007 hours for preparing the compensation request should be 19.
- In TURN's May 21st Request, the hours for JBS consultants Marcus and Schilberg are incorrectly allocated. Marcus' hours should be 125.75 hours for work performed from 2005 through May 1, 2006 and 72.25 hours for work performed after May 1, 2006 through the issuance of D.07-03-044. Schilberg's hours should be 84.3 hours for work performed from 2005 through May 1, 2006 and 13 hours for work performed after May 1, 2006 through the issuance of D.07-03-044.

Finally, TURN states that its July 30th Request includes 0.75 hours for Goodson and 4.13 hours for Schilberg that were devoted to implementing the

new service quality standard adopted by D.07-03-044.³⁶ TURN indicated that if needed, it would file an amendment to its May 21st Request to include these additional hours and remove the hours from its July 30th Request. We have confirmed that TURN has not included this time in its compensation request of D.07-03-044. Given the *de minimis* number of hours, we do not require TURN to file an amendment to its May 21st Request, but we include these hours in the July 30th Request.

5.2. Intervenor Hourly Rates

We next consider 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.

We previously approved all of the 2005 and 2006 rates TURN requested for its own staff³⁷ and adopt those rates here. For 2007 work, TURN seeks an 8% increase of the approved 2006 rates, rounded to the nearest \$5 increment, consistent with D.07-01-009. With the exception of Florio, who did not record any time for 2007,³⁸ we find the 2007 hourly rates sought by TURN to be reasonable and adopt them here.

We previously approved the 2005-2006 rates TURN requested for JBS consultants Marcus, Schilberg and Nahigian in D.06-10-018 and adopt those rates here. For JBS consultant Marcus, TURN requests an hourly rate of \$220 for work

³⁶ See Request of The Utility Reform Network for an Award of Compensation for Substantial Contribution to Decision 07-05-058, filed July 30, 2007, p. 11, fn. 4.

³⁷ See D.05-12-088; D.06-04-012; D.06-07-011; D.06-10-018; D.06-11-032; D.07-05-018.

³⁸ Although Florio did not record time for 2007, TURN requests that we adopt a 2007 hourly rate of \$525 for him. Since no work was performed in 2007, we decline to adopt a 2007 rate for Florio here.

performed after May 1, 2006. We previously approved this rate in D.07-05-018 and adopt it here.

TURN seeks to increase consultants Schilberg's and Nahigian's hourly rates by \$10 to \$175 and \$165, respectively, for work performed after May 1, 2006 and in 2007. TURN states that the \$175/hour for Schilberg and the \$165/hour for Nahigian are the same rates that JBS billed TURN for their work during that period. TURN submits that since JBS did not implement rate changes in early 2006, the \$10 increase is approximately equivalent to the 3% cost-of-living increase approved for 2006 rates in D.07-01-009. TURN also makes its request pursuant to D.05-11-031, which permits such an increase, because the requested rates are near the bottom of the range set in D.07-01-009 for even the most junior witnesses, while both Schilberg's and Nahigian's track records at the Commission demonstrate that they are two of the more qualified witnesses to work on energy utility issues. As TURN explains, Schilberg has over 20 years of experience and has testified before the Commission, the California Energy Commission, the Nevada Public Service Commission and the Nevada County Superior Court since joining JBS in 1987. Further, she is the JBS lead on service quality-related issues. Nahigian has over 15 years of experience analyzing utility operations and rate design issues and is the firm's expert witness in the area of line and service extensions. Further, he often serves as TURN's expert witness in a wide range of regulatory proceedings, particularly those addressing line extensions and demand response issues. In light of these considerations under D.05-11-031, we find the requested rates for Schilberg and Nahigian for work after May 1, 2006 to be reasonable and adopt them here.

TURN requests an hourly rate of \$155 for work performed by JBS consultant Ruzovan in 2006. This is the same rate adopted in D.06-10-018 for

work performed in 2005. We find the requested rate reasonable and adopt it here.

For depreciation-related issues, TURN engaged the services of Snavely, King, a consulting firm of economists, accountants, engineers and cost accountants. TURN requests that the Commission adopt the same rates for work performed by Snavely King consultants Majoros, Kenney and Geissler in 2006 as were adopted in 2005.³⁹ We find the requested rates reasonable and adopt them here.

TURN requests that a rate of \$75 be adopted for Snavely King analyst Sam for work performed in 2006. This is the first time we have reviewed a request for compensation for Sam. In evaluating the proper hourly rate, we look to the experience of the individual and the rates awarded to peers practicing before the Commission. TURN claims that Sam provides technical and analytical assistance in the development of expert professional testimonies in the utility and transportation industries, including aiding in citation and editing of testimonies and presentation of exhibits. The requested hourly rate for Sam is lower than rates we have awarded other intervenors for paralegal and analyst work. Accordingly, we find the requested rate reasonable and adopt it here.

5.3. Productivity

D.98-04-059 directed customers to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. The costs of a customer's participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the

³⁹ TURN also requested that the Commission adopt the 2005 rates for work performed by Majoros, Kenney and Geissler in 2007. However, none of these consultants recorded

Footnote continued on next page

benefits realized through its participation. This showing assists us in determining the overall reasonableness of the request.

TURN estimates that the concessions made by PG&E in response to TURN's efforts prior to the close of hearings resulted in approximately \$8.2 million of reduced revenue requirement. TURN also points out that many of its recommendations were subsumed in the GRC Settlement adopted in D.07-03-044 and, thus, while not quantifiable, should be considered a benefit resulting from TURN's participation. Similarly, TURN contends that while it is difficult to establish specific monetary benefits associated with TURN's participation in front counter issues, its participation should be considered productive due to the qualitative customer service benefits adopted in D.07-05-058.

We agree. TURN's participation in PG&E's GRC application produced both quantitative and qualitative benefits to ratepayers. Accordingly, we find that its efforts have been productive.

5.4. Direct Expenses

The itemized direct expenses submitted by TURN in its May 21st Request include the following:⁴⁰

any work done in 2007 in this proceeding. Accordingly, we decline to adopt 2007 rates for Majoros, Kenney and Geissler here.

⁴⁰ No expenses were included in the July 30th Request.

Litigation Support/Research	\$362.00
Printing & Photocopying	\$1,426.00
Postage & Delivery	\$25.00
Telephone & Fax	\$64.00
Travel	\$9.00
Snavelly King Expenses	\$1,976.54
JBS Expenses	\$155.75
Total Expenses	\$4,018.29

TURN requests \$9 related to late-night travel for TURN's attorneys. While it is the Commission's policy to not compensate intervenors for travel within the Bay Area that would normally be considered commuting, we have stated that an intervenor may be compensated for extraordinary travel costs that are reasonable and justified.⁴¹ We find TURN has justified this extraordinary expense. Accordingly, we find this travel expense reasonable. We find all of TURN's other direct expenses to be reasonable.

JBS Energy's travel expenses include \$94 for mileage from Yolo County to San Francisco. In its August 28, 2007 response to an ALJ inquiry concerning this expense, TURN indicates that the mileage was calculated based on 200 miles at the rate of \$0.47/mile. We find this rate to be excessive and limit mileage to the 2006 standard mileage rate of \$0.445/mile set by the Internal Revenue Service. We find all of JBS Energy's other expenses to be reasonable.

Snavelly King's roundtrip airfare for Majoros to travel from Baltimore to San Francisco is \$1,138.69. In its August 28, 2007 response to an ALJ inquiry on the airfare, TURN could not recall why this amount was higher than normal and

⁴¹ See D.07-04-010, p. 12.

suggested reducing this expense by half, to \$569.34. We adopt TURN's suggestion. We find all of Snavely King's other expenses to be reasonable.

6. Award

As set forth in the tables below, we award TURN \$436,920.55 for substantial contribution to D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044 and \$27,883.10 for substantial contribution to D.07-05-058.

Work on D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2005	4.75	\$270	\$1,282.50
	2006	258	\$280	\$72,240.00
	2007	35.75	\$300	\$10,725.00
Hayley Goodson	2005	4.5	\$190	\$855.00
	2006	209.00	\$195	\$40,755.00
	2007	20.75	\$210	\$4,357.50
Robert Finkelstein	2005	4.22	\$395	\$1,666.90
	2006	190.21	\$405	\$77,035.05
	2007	19.25	\$435	\$8,373.75
Michel P. Florio	2006	5.75	\$485	\$2,788.75
Marcel Hawiger	2006	94.25	\$280	\$26,390.00
	2007	17.75	\$300	\$5,325.00
Nina Suetake	2006	59	\$195	\$11,505.00
	2007	11.5	\$210	\$2,415.00
Outside Expert Fees				
<i>JBS Energy</i>				
William Marcus	2005-06	125.75	\$210	\$26,407.50
	2006-07	72.25	\$220	\$15,895.00
Gayatri Schilberg	2005-06	72.8	\$165	\$12,012.00
	2006-07	13	\$175	\$2,275.00
Jeff Nahigian	2005-06	68.75	\$155	\$10,656.25
	2006-07	25.5	\$165	\$4,207.50

Work on D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044				
Greg Ruzovan	2005-06	10.66	\$155	\$1,652.30
<i>Snavely King</i>				
Michael Majoros	2005-06	200.3	\$240	\$48,072.00
Margaret Kenney	2005-06	157.95	\$160	\$25,272.00
David Geissler	2006	86	\$160	\$13,760.00
Mark Sam	2006	28.7	\$75	\$2,152.50
Subtotal:				\$428,076.50
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request⁴²				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2007	5.75	\$150.00	\$862.50
Haley Goodson	2006	2	\$97.50	\$195.00
	2007	2	\$105.00	\$210.00
Robert Finkelstein	2007	19	\$217.50	\$4,132.50
Subtotal:				\$5,400.00
Expenses				
TURN Direct Expenses				\$1,886.00
Snavely King Expenses				\$1,407.30
JBS Expenses				\$150.75
Total Expenses				\$3,444.05
TOTAL AWARD				\$436,920.55

Work on D.07-05-058				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Hayley Goodson	2006	48.5	\$195	\$9,457.50
	2007	11.5	\$210	\$2,415.00
Robert Finkelstein	2006	1.5	\$405	\$607.50
	2007	0.75	\$435	\$326.25
Outside Expert Fees				

⁴² Hourly rates are reduced 50% for preparation of the NOI and compensation request.

<i>JBS Energy</i>				
Gayatri Schilberg	2005-06	61.89	\$165	\$10,211.85
	2006-07 (after May 1, 2006)	22.1	\$175	\$3,867.50
Subtotal:				\$26,885.60
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request⁴³				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Hayley Goodson	2007	9.5	\$105.00	\$997.50
Subtotal:				\$997.50
TOTAL AWARD				\$27,883.10

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 the 75th day after TURN filed its respective compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made. For TURN's May 21st Request, the 75th day is August 4, 2007 and for TURN's July 30th Request, the 75th day is October 13, 2007. This award is to be paid by PG&E as the regulated entity in this proceeding.

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. TURN's records should identify specific issues for which it requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant,

⁴³ Hourly rates are reduced 50% for preparation of the NOI and compensation request.

the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed.

7. 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.

8. Assignment of Proceeding

John A. Bohn is the assigned Commissioner, and Timothy Kenney is the assigned ALJ in these proceedings.

Findings of Fact

1. TURN has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.
2. TURN made a substantial contribution to D.06-06-014, D.07-03-044 and D.07-05-058 as described herein.
3. TURN's time spent analyzing the late payment fee portion of the uncollectibles factor did not substantially contribute to the resolution of issues in D.07-03-044.
4. TURN's time spent addressing the normalized net salvage depreciation proposal is excessive, since the proposal had been previously presented in another proceeding and is no longer novel.
5. TURN requested hourly rates for its representatives that are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.
6. TURN requested related expenses that are reasonable, as adjusted herein, and commensurate with the work performed.

7. The total of the reasonable compensation for D.06-06-014 and, D.07-03-044 is \$436,920.55 and for D.07-05-058 is \$27,883.10.

8. The appendix to this opinion summarizes today's award.

Conclusions of Law

1. TURN 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.06-06-014, D.07-03-044 and D.07-05-058.

2. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 8103(a), TURN should not receive compensation for time spent on issues where it did not make a substantial contribution.

3. Pursuant to Pub. Util. Code § 8103, TURN should not receive compensation for half of the time spent addressing the normalized net salvage depreciation issue.

4. TURN should be awarded \$436,920.55 for its contribution to D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044 and \$27,883.10 for its contribution to D.07-05-058.

5. This order should be effective today so that TURN may be compensated without further delay.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Utility Reform Network (TURN) is awarded \$436,920.55 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decisions (D.) 06-06-014 and D.07-03-044. TURN is awarded \$27,883.10 as compensation for its substantial contributions to D.07-05-058.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay TURN 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 the 75th day after the filing date of TURN's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made. For TURN's compensation request for D.06-06-014 and D.07-03-044 filed on May 21, 2007, the 75th day is August 4, 2007 and for TURN's compensation request for D.07-05-058 filed on July 30, 2007, the 75th day is October 13, 2007.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 20, 2007, 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:	D0712026	Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0606014; D0703044; D0705058	
Proceeding(s):	A0512002; I0603003	
Author:	ALJ Kenney	
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	5/21/07	\$482,720.09	\$436,920.55	No	Failure to make substantial contribution; unproductive effort; arithmetic errors; inappropriately claimed expenses.
The Utility Reform Network	7/30/07	\$27,883.10	\$27,883.10	No	

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$270	2005	\$270
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$280	2006	\$280
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$300	2007	\$300
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$190	2005	\$190
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$195	2006	\$195
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$210	2007	\$210
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	The Utility Reform	\$395	2005	\$395

			Network			
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$405	2006	\$405
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$435	2007	\$435
Michael	Florio	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$485	2006	\$485
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$280	2006	\$280
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$300	2007	\$300
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$195	2006	\$195
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$210	2007	\$210
William	Marcus	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$210	2005-06	\$210
William	Marcus	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$220	2006-07 (after 5/1/06)	\$220
Gayatri	Schilberg	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$165	2005-06	\$165
Gayatri	Schilberg	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$175	2006-07 (after 5/1/06)	\$175
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$155	2005-06	\$155
Jeff	Nahigian	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$165	2006-07 (after 5/1/06)	\$165
Greg	Ruszovan	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$155	2005-06	\$155
Michael	Majoros	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$240	2005-06	\$240
Margaret	Kenney	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$160	2005-06	\$160
David	Geissler	Expert	The Utility Reform Network	\$160	2006	\$160
Mark	Sam	Analyst	The Utility Reform Network	\$75	2006	\$75

(END OF APPENDIX)