

Decision 08-12-017 December 4, 2008

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Develop
Additional Methods to Implement the California
Renewables Portfolio Standards Program.

Rulemaking 06-02-012
(Filed February 16, 2006)

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK AND THE UNION OF CONCERNED
SCIENTISTS FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 06-10-019,
DECISION 07-05-028, AND DECISION 07-07-044**

This decision awards The Utility Reform Network (TURN) \$81,089.24 and the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) \$12,645.25 in compensation for their substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 06-10-019, D.07-05-028, and D.07-07-044. TURN's award reflects a \$607.50 reduction in the requested amount for work performed a year prior to the start of this proceeding. UCS' award reflects a \$210 reduction to correct an arithmetic error and a reduction of \$1,182 in the award for work on UCS's compensation request. Today's award payment will be allocated to the affected utilities. This proceeding remains open.

1. Background

These decisions are part of our implementation of the renewables portfolio standard (RPS) program. D.06-10-019 established ground rules for the participation of energy service providers (ESPs) and community choice aggregators (CCAs) in the RPS program. It also examined contracting requirements for all RPS-obligated load-serving entities (LSEs), and briefly addressed the use of unbundled renewable energy credits (RECs) for RPS

compliance. D.07-05-028 implemented the requirements of new Pub. Util. Code § 399.14(b),¹ regarding the use of contracts of less than 10 years' duration for the procurement of electricity from eligible renewable resources under the RPS program. D.07-07-044 modified D.07-05-028 to ensure that nonmarket participants are eligible to receive confidential RPS compliance filings submitted by any RPS-obligated LSE, subject to approved confidentiality procedures.

Intervenors TURN and UCS actively participated in this proceeding. TURN requests compensation for substantial contributions to D.06-10-019, D.07-05-028, and D.07-07-044. UCS requests compensation only for substantial contributions to D.07-05-028.

2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

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

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

2. The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction. (§ 1802(b).)
3. The intervenor must file and serve a request for a compensation award within 60 days of our final order or decision in a hearing or proceeding. (§ 1804(c).)
4. The intervenor must demonstrate “significant financial hardship.” (§§ 1802(g) and 1804(b)(1).)
5. The intervenor’s presentation must have made a “substantial contribution” to the proceeding, through the adoption, in whole or in part, of the intervenor’s contention or recommendations by a Commission order or decision or as otherwise found by the Commission. (§§ 1802(i) and 1803(a).)
6. The claimed fees and costs must be reasonable (§ 1801), necessary for and related to the substantial contribution (D.98-04-059), comparable to the market rates paid to others with comparable training and experience (§ 1806), and productive (D.98-04-059).

In the discussion below, the procedural issues in Items 1-4 above are combined and a separate discussion of Items 5-6 follows.

2.1. Preliminary Procedural Issues

Under § 1804(a)(1) and Rule 17.1(a)(1), a customer who intends to seek an award of intervenor compensation must file an NOI before certain dates.

In a proceeding in which a PHC is held, the intervenor must file and serve its NOI between the date the proceeding was initiated until 30 days after the PHC is held. (Rule 17.1(a)(1).) The first PHC in this matter was held on April 7, 2006. TURN and UCS each filed their NOIs on May 8, 2006.

In their NOIs, TURN and UCS asserted financial hardship. On September 14, 2006, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled that UCS met the financial hardship condition pursuant to § 1802(g). In the same ruling, the ALJ

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 September 14, 2006, the ALJ issued a ruling that found TURN and UCS customers pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C).

Regarding the timeliness of the request for compensation, TURN filed its request for compensation on August 17, 2007, within 60 days of D.07-07-044 being issued.² UCS filed its request for compensation on August 19, 2007, UCS filed its request for compensation on September 19, 2007 within 60 days of D.07-07-044 being used. No party opposed these requests. In view of the above, we affirm the ALJ’s ruling and find that TURN and UCS have satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make its request for compensation in this proceeding.

3. Substantial Contribution

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, we look at several things. First, we look at whether the Commission adopted one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the customer. (§ 1802(i).) Second,

if the customer's contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, we look at whether the customer's participation unnecessarily duplicated or materially supplemented, complemented, or contributed to the presentation of the other party. (§§ 1801.3(f) and 1802.5.)

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

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

With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions TURN and UCS made to the proceeding.

3.1. D.06-10-019

TURN identifies three areas of substantial contribution: reporting and compliance issues; use of short-term contracts; and use of unbundled RECs. TURN made a number of contributions in these areas.

With respect to reporting and compliance issues, the decision adopted several of TURN's positions.⁴ The decision agreed with TURN's argument that penalties for noncompliance with RPS procurement obligations should be the

² D.07-07-044 was issued on July 27, 2007 and mailed on July 31, 2007.

³ D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

⁴ Some of these arguments were made in comments filed jointly with UCS. UCS received an award of intervenor compensation for its contribution to D.06-10-019 in D.07-06-032. We refer only to TURN in the text.

same for all RPS-obligated LSEs. The decision also adopted TURN's view that ESPs and CCAs should use the same flexible compliance and confidentiality rules as other LSEs, and be subject to the same potential penalties. TURN's contribution on these issues was substantial.

With respect to the use of short-term contracts, TURN sponsored testimony that provided valuable information about contracting for renewable power in other states. TURN's arguments about the importance of long-term contracts to support development of renewable generation in California and the need for further work on the legal prerequisites to the use of short-term contracts were adopted by the decision.

With respect to unbundled RECs, TURN's argument that use of unbundled RECs would not, in itself, solve the problems facing development of new renewable resources contributed to our decision not to authorize unbundled REC transactions in D.06-10-019, though several parties argued in favor of unbundled RECs. This contribution was substantial.

3.2. D.07-05-028

In response to the enactment of SB 107 (Simitian), Stats. 2006, ch. 464, the Commission sought comments from parties on the appropriate implementation of newly modified Section 399.14(b). This section requires the Commission to establish certain minimum requirements in order to authorize the eligibility of short-term contracts for RPS compliance. TURN made a number of contributions toward setting minimum requirements.

With respect to minimum requirements, the decision adopted many of TURN's positions. The decision agreed with TURN's argument that the requirement should be a single minimum quantity of either contracts with new resources or long-term contracts with existing resources. The decision also

adopted TURN's view that it would be inappropriate to adopt a 0% standard under Section 399.14(b). TURN's arguments about the minimum requirements applying equally to all RPS-obligated retail sellers was adopted and the decision rejected exceptions based on the individual circumstances of certain retail sellers. The decision agreed with TURN's proposal that Energy Division should have access to any underlying contracts that involve "repackaged" renewable resources and adopted TURN's position that short-term contracts executed prior to the effective date of the order should not be grandfathered. TURN's contribution on these issues was substantial.

With respect to targets for long-term contracts or short-term contracts with new facilities and penalties for noncompliance, we benefited from TURN's analysis and discussion of all of the issues which it raised.

Like TURN, UCS made a number of contributions. The decision adopted a number of UCS' arguments including that minimum long-term contracting requirement should be significantly greater than zero and applied annually, that actual delivered energy should remain the ultimate basis for meeting RPS requirements, and that energy deliveries from any short-term contracts with existing facilities signed in that year may count toward RPS obligations in any year. UCS' contributions on these issues was substantial.

3.3. D.07-07-044

In its Application for Rehearing of D.07-05-028 filed on June 4, 2007, TURN joined with the Green Power Institute (GPI) and UCS to assert that the adopted treatment of confidential information submitted by non-utility retail sellers was inconsistent with the broader confidentiality rules adopted in R.05-06-040. In D.07-07-044, the Commission made modifications to D.07-05-028 to make the treatment of confidential information consistent with the rules

adopted in R.05-06-040. TURN made a substantial contribution to D.07-07-044. We do not address in this decision the contributions of GPI or UCS to D.07-07-044.

4. Contributions of Other Parties

Section 1801.3(f) requires an intervenor to avoid participation that duplicates that of similar interests otherwise adequately represented by another party, or participation unnecessary for a fair determination of the proceeding. Section 1802.5, however, allows an intervenor to be eligible for full compensation where its participation materially supplements, complements, or contributes to the presentation of another party if that participation makes a substantial contribution to the Commission order.

Regarding contributions by other parties, we agree with TURN and UCS that in a proceeding involving multiple participants, it is virtually impossible to completely avoid some duplication of the work of other parties. TURN and UCS state that they took all reasonable steps to keep duplication to a minimum and to ensure that the work of each served to supplement, complement, or contribute to the showing of the other active parties in this proceeding. (§ 1802.5.) TURN and UCS state that they collaborated closely with other parties throughout this proceeding, coordinating analysis, preparation of comments, and discussions with other parties. TURN and UCS jointly prepared an Application for Rehearing of D.07-05-028. TURN and UCS would have found it counterproductive to have taken any additional steps to reduce duplication in a proceeding such as this where high-quality, quickly delivered analysis and recommendations were critically important.

After we have determined the scope of a customer’s substantial contribution, we then look at whether the amount of the compensation request is reasonable.

5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

TURN requests \$81,696.74 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2005	10.25	\$270	\$2,768
Matthew Freedman	2006	228.75	\$280	\$64,050
Matthew Freedman	2007	31.25	\$300	\$9,375
Robert Finkelstein	2006	0.5	\$405	\$203
Michel P. Florio	2006	7	\$485	\$3,395
Subtotal:				\$79,791
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2006	0.75	\$140	\$105
Matthew Freedman	2007	11	\$150	\$1,650
Subtotal Hourly Compensation:				\$1,755
Expenses				\$151.74
Total Requested Compensation				\$81,696.74

UCS requests \$14,307.25 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Alan Nogee	2006	0.40	\$240	\$96.00
John Galloway	2006	15.55	\$125	\$1,943.75
John Galloway	2007	8.20	\$130	\$1066.00
Cliff Chen	2006	8.20	\$115	\$943.00 ⁵
Clyde Murley	2006	17.30	\$180	\$3,114.00

⁵ UCS made an arithmetic error in its request for compensation for analyst Chen’s participation, and we correct it here. (Chen’s 8.20 hours multiplied by his hourly rate of \$115 yields \$943 instead of \$1,153.)

Clyde Murley	2007	18.50	\$195	\$3,607.50
Subtotal:				\$10,770.25

Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request

Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Cliff Chen	2007	3.50	\$60.00	\$210.00
Clyde Murley	2007	29.20	\$97.50	\$2,847.00
Subtotal Hourly Compensation:				\$13,827.25
Expenses				\$0
Total Requested Compensation				\$13,827.25

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 and UCS each documented their claimed hours by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours of their attorneys and analysts, accompanied by a brief description of each activity.

TURN’s hourly breakdown reasonably supports the claim for total hours. We noticed, however, that Matthew Freedman’s timesheet includes an entry of February 6, 2005, which was almost a year prior to the commencement of this proceeding, and at the time when R.04-04-026, a proceeding-predecessor of the present rulemaking, was well under way. Unfortunately, TURN does not provide in its request any detail that would explain how that rather remote in

time entry related specifically to this proceeding. We, therefore, disallow 2.25 hours of Freedman's time in 2005.

UCS has reasonably supported its compensation request with respect to the hours spent on substantive matters. The hours spent on the NOI and intervenor compensation request itself, however, appear to be out of proportion to the work on the substance of the proceeding. UCS spent almost 33 hours on compensation matters, for a proceeding in which it spent about 68 hours on substantive matters. It is not reasonable for an experienced intervenor such as UCS to spend approximately one-third of its time on compensation matters. We therefore reduce the compensation-related hours for which compensation will be awarded to 20 hours.

5.2. Intervenor Hourly Rates

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

TURN seeks hourly rates for Freedman for work performed in 2005, 2006 and 2007 that we previously adopted in D.06-07-011, D.08-08-026 and D.07-10-002 respectively and we adopt them here. TURN seeks an hourly rate for Finkelstein for work performed in 2006 that has been previously adopted in D.06-10-018. TURN seeks an hourly rate for Florio for work performed in 2006 that has been previously adopted in D.06-11-032 and we adopt it here.

UCS seeks an hourly rate of \$240 for work performed by Noguee in 2006. We previously approved an hourly rate for Noguee of \$232 for work performed in 2006. UCS asserts that this rate was adopted prior to issuance of D.07-01-009, which permitted intervenors to seek a 3% increase in hourly rates for work performed in 2006. The requested rate (\$240/hour for 2006) is consistent with

the guidelines set forth in D.07-01-009, and is adopted here. UCS seeks an hourly rate of \$260 for work performed by Nogee in 2007. However, UCS's request does not detail any work performed by Nogee in 2007. We decline to set a 2007 hourly rate for Nogee.

UCS seeks an hourly rate of \$125 for work performed by Galloway in 2006. We previously approved this rate in D.07-06-032, and adopt it here. UCS seeks an hourly rate of \$130 for Galloway for 2006, an increase of 3% above previously approved 2006 hourly rates. This rate is consistent with the guidelines set forth in D.07-01-009, and is adopted here.

UCS seeks an hourly rate of \$115 for work performed by Chen in 2006. We previously approved this rate in D.07-06-032, and adopt it here. UCS seeks an hourly rate of \$120 rate for Chen for 2007, an increase of 3% above previously approved 2006 rates. This rate is consistent with the guidelines set forth D.07-01-009, and is adopted here.

UCS requests an hourly rate of \$180 for Murley for work performed in 2006. UCS argues that while we previously adopted a rate of \$173 for work performed by Murley in 2006 in D.07-06-032, the previously adopted rates does not reflect the increase of 3% for 2006 work deemed reasonable in D.07-01-009. The requested hourly rate for 2006, \$180, is consistent with D.07-01-009 and is adopted here.

UCS requests an hourly rate of \$195 for Murley for work performed in 2007 to reflect an annual 3% increase and a 5% "step" increase. UCS argues that in addition to specifying 3% annual increases for hourly rates in 2006 and 2007, D.07-01-009 allows intervenor representatives up to two annual 5% "step" increases within each experience level. We agree with UCS that it is appropriate

to grant Murley both the 3% annual increase and a 5% “step” increase, resulting in an hourly rate of \$195 which we adopt for work performed by Murley in 2007.

5.3. Direct Expenses

The itemized direct expenses submitted by TURN include the following:

Photocopying	\$150.20
Telephone	\$1.54
Total Expenses	\$151.74

The cost breakdown included with the request shows the miscellaneous expenses to be commensurate with the work performed. We find these costs reasonable. UCS did not submit any expenses.

6. Productivity

D.98-04-059 directed customers to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. (D.98-04-059, pp. 34-35.) The costs of a customer’s participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through its participation. This showing assists us in determining the overall reasonableness of the request.

TURN and UCS state that they argued for positions in this proceeding intended to reduce the total cost of RPS compliance by ensuring the development of an efficient and cost-effective renewable development market. Since no rate issues were specifically involved in these decisions, TURN and UCS argue that it would not be reasonable to require a more detailed demonstration of specific monetary benefits. We agree that to the extent an efficient renewable market lowers compliance costs, ratepayers benefit monetarily from TURN’s and UCS’s positions. Thus, we find that TURN’s and UCS’s efforts have been productive.

7. Award

As set forth in the table below, we award TURN \$81,089.24:

Work on Proceeding

Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2005	8.00	\$270	\$2,160.00
Matthew Freedman	2006	228.75	\$280	\$64,050.00
Matthew Freedman	2007	31.25	\$300	\$9,375.00
Robert Finkelstein	2006	0.5	\$405	\$203.00
Michel P. Florio	2006	7	\$485	\$3,395.00
Work on Proceeding Total:				\$79,182.50

Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request

Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Matthew Freedman	2006	0.75	\$140	\$105.00
Matthew Freedman	2007	11	\$150	\$1,650.00

NOI and Compensation Total **\$1,755.00**

CALCULATION OF FINAL AWARD

Work on Proceeding	\$79,182.00
NOI and Compensation Request Preparation	\$1,755.00
Expenses	\$151.74
TOTAL AWARD	\$81,089.24

As set forth in the table below, we award UCS \$13,827.25.

Work on Proceeding

Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Alan Nogee	2006	0.40	\$240	\$96.00
John Galloway	2006	15.55	\$125	\$1,943.75
John Galloway	2007	8.20	\$130	\$1,066.00
Cliff Chen	2006	8.20	\$115	\$943.00
Clyde Murley	2006	17.30	\$180	\$3,114.00
Clyde Murley	2007	18.50	\$195	\$3,607.50
Subtotal:				\$12,645.25

Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request

Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Cliff Chen	2007	2.00	\$60.00	\$160.00
Clyde Murley	2007	18.00	\$97.50	\$1,755.00
NOI and Compensation Total				\$1,875.00

CALCULATION OF FINAL AWARD

Work on Proceeding	\$10,770.25
--------------------	-------------

NOI and Compensation Request Preparation	\$1,875.00
Expenses	\$0
TOTAL AWARD	\$12,642.25

Pursuant to § 1807, we order Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) to pay these awards. 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 October 31, 2007, the 75th day after TURN filed its compensation request and commencing on December 3, 2007, the 75th day after UCS filed its compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

We direct PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to allocate payment responsibility among themselves based upon their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2006 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated.

We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. TURN's and UCS's records should identify specific issues for which it requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation should be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

8. Waiver of Comment Period

This is an intervenor compensation matter. Accordingly, as provided by Rule 14.6(c)(6) of our Rules of Practice and Procedure, we waive the otherwise applicable 30-day comment period for this decision.

9. Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the assigned Commissioner and Anne E. Simon is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. TURN and UCS has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.

2. TURN and UCS made a substantial contribution to D.06-10-019, D.07-05-028, and D.07-07-044 as described herein.

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

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

5. The total of the reasonable compensation, as adjusted herein, is \$81,089.24 for TURN and \$12,645.25 for UCS.

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

Conclusions of Law

1. TURN and UCS have fulfilled the requirements of §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and is entitled to intervenor compensation for its claimed expenses incurred in making substantial contributions to D.06-10-019, D.07-05-028, and D.07-07-044.

2. TURN should be awarded \$81,089.24 for its contribution to D.06-10-019, D.07-05-028, and D.07-07-044.
3. UCS should be awarded \$12,645.25 for its contribution to D.07-05-028.
4. This order should be effective today so that TURN and UCS may be compensated without further delay.
5. This proceeding should remain open.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Utility Reform Network (TURN) is awarded \$81,089.24 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 06-10-019, D.07-05-028, D.07-07-044.
2. Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS) is awarded \$12,645.25 as compensation for its substantial contributions to D.07-05-028.
3. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall pay TURN and UCS their respective shares of the award. We direct PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE to allocate payment responsibility among themselves, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2006 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning October 31, 2007, the 75th day after the filing date of TURN's request for compensation and December 3, 2007, the 75th day after the filing date of UCS's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

4. Rulemaking 06-02-012 remains open.

This order is effective today.

Dated December 4, 2008, 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:	D0812017	Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision(s):	D0610019, D0705028, D0707044	
Proceeding(s):	R0602012	
Author:	ALJ Simon	
Payer(s):	PG&E, SDG&E, and SCE	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	8/17/2007	\$81,696.74	\$81,089.24	No	Failure to justify work performed a year prior to the start of this proceeding.
Union of Concerned Scientists	9/19/2007	\$14,037.25	\$12,645.25	No	Correction of arithmetic error, excessive hours claimed for work on compensation matters.

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
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$405	2006	\$405
Michael P.	Florio	Attorney	The Utility Reform Network	\$485	2006	\$3,395
Nogee	Alan	Policy Expert	Union of Concerned Scientists	\$240	2006	\$240
Galloway	John	Policy Expert	Union of Concerned Scientists	\$125	2006	\$125
Galloway	John	Policy Expert	Union of Concerned Scientists	\$130	2007	\$130
Chen	Cliff	Policy Expert	Union of Concerned Scientists	\$115	2006	\$115
Murley	Clyde	Economist	Union of Concerned Scientists	\$180	2006	\$180
Murley	Clyde	Economist	Union of Concerned Scientists	\$195	2007	\$195

(END OF APPENDIX)