

Decision 09-01-034 January 29, 2009

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

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902M) for authority to update its gas and electric revenue requirement and base rates effective January 1, 2008.

Application 06-12-009  
(Filed December 8, 2006)

And Related Matters.

Application 06-12-010  
Investigation 07-02-013

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION  
TO AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE  
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 08-07-046**

This decision awards Aglet Consumer Alliance \$99,902.82 in compensation for its substantial contribution to Decision 08-07-046. This represents a decrease of \$7,091 [7%] from the amount requested due to the disallowance of travel compensation and related expenses. Today's award payment will be paid by San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company. This proceeding remains open to address other matters.

**1. Background**

San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) filed Application (A.) 06-12-009, a general rate case (GRC) application, and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) filed A.06-12-010, also a GRC application. They are related companies with some shared services. This decision adopts for each company a Test Year 2008 revenue requirement, a mechanism for attrition adjustments until the next GRC, and performance and safety incentive

mechanisms, which are reasonable and necessary to provide safe and reliable service to ratepayers.

The Test Year 2008 settlements adopted in this decision provide a gas and electric revenue requirement of \$1.361 billion for SDG&E and a gas revenue requirement of \$1.685 billion for SoCalGas.

## **2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation**

The intervenor compensation program, set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,<sup>1</sup> requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if that party makes a substantial contribution to the Commission's proceedings. The statute provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

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

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

---

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

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.

The PHC in this proceeding was held on February 9, 2007. Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet) timely filed its NOI on March 9, 2007.

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 April 24, 2007, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Long issued a ruling that found Aglet a customer pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C), because of its status as an organization authorized pursuant to its articles of organization and bylaws to represent the interests of residential and small commercial customers of electrical, gas, water, and telephone utilities.

Regarding the timeliness of the request for compensation, Aglet filed its request for compensation on August 18, 2008, within 60 days of Decision (D.) 08-07-046 being issued. No party opposed the request. In view of the above, we affirm the ALJ's ruling and find that Aglet has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make its request for compensation in this proceeding.

## **2.2. Financial Hardship**

In its NOI, Aglet asserted financial hardship. On March 7, 2006, in A.05-12-002 et al., the ALJ ruled that Aglet met the financial hardship condition pursuant to § 1802(g). Because this proceeding commenced within one year of the date of our prior finding of significant financial hardship regarding Aglet, we extend that finding to Aglet's participation in this proceeding through a rebuttable presumption of eligibility pursuant to § 1804(b)(1).

## **3. Substantial Contribution**

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

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

In assessing whether the customer meets this standard, the Commission typically reviews the record, composed in part of pleadings of the customer and, in litigated matters, the hearing transcripts, and compares it to the findings, conclusions, and orders

in the decision to which the customer asserts it contributed. It is then a matter of judgment as to whether the customer's presentation substantially assisted the Commission.<sup>2</sup>

With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions Aglet made to the proceeding.

Aglet focused its showing on: (1) the financial health of SDG&E and SoCalGas; (2) post-test year ratemaking, also called attrition; (3) the impact of a collection of utility initiatives known as the Utility of the Future (UoF) on post-test year ratemaking; and (4) performance incentive mechanisms. These issues are within the scope of the proceeding. Aglet also participated with other intervenors in pleadings addressing the effective date of revenue requirements authorized in D.08-07-046 (Identified as "Memorandum account" in Aglet time records.) To further investigate Aglet's claim of substantial contribution, we turn to the record.

### **3.1. Financial Health**

Aglet was the only party to oppose the contention of SDG&E and SoCalGas that they "need" the resources requested in their applications to plan, build, and maintain their operating facilities. Through Aglet's exhibits, they pointed out that SDG&E and SoCalGas in past years earned more than their authorized returns on equity despite Commission disallowance of requested revenue requirements. Aglet presented substantial evidence that SDG&E and SoCalGas are financially healthy. Aglet requested that the Commission find – as it previously did for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Edison Company – that the applicants are financially healthy.

---

<sup>2</sup> D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

In D.08-07-046, the Commission cited the previous finding of fact for PG&E but declined to issue a finding for SDG&E and SoCalGas. The Commission endorsed Aglet's contention (set forth in its opening brief of October 11, 2007, at 11) that SDG&E and SoCalGas did not need all of their test year and attrition requests to maintain the financial health required to provide adequate utility service. In discussion of earnings sharing mechanisms, the Commission stated:

"In these proceedings, where SDG&E and SoCalGas proposed settlements for Test Year 2008 and post-test year ratemaking, we believe the companies would not have settled if the expert opinions of SDG&E and SoCalGas management thought that doing so would harm the financial health of either company." (D.08-07-046, at 42.)

### **3.2. Attrition, UoF and Earnings Sharing**

Attrition, UoF and earnings sharing issues are closely linked and are incorporated in this discussion of Aglet's efforts.

SDG&E and SoCalGas proposed a six-year rate case cycle, covering Test Year 2008 and five attrition years. Aglet's attrition year revenue requirement adjustments focused on four components: (1) expense increases based on a collection of utility cost escalation factors, customer growth rate, and annual productivity factors; (2) capital-related cost increases based on averages of recent year plant additions, escalated using construction cost indices; (3) separate escalation of medical costs; and (4) a z-factor adjustment for extraordinary costs that have revenue requirement impacts that exceed \$5 million. (Summarized in Aglet opening brief, at 9.) The Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) supported a five-year case term, escalation of operating expenses using the Consumer Price Index (CPI), separate escalation of medical costs capped at 8%, plant additions proposed by the utilities, and z-factor adjustments.

(Exhibit DRA-25, summary at 25-2 through 25-4.) The Utility Reform Network (TURN) and Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN) did not present independent analyses or recommendations regarding post-test year ratemaking, but supported Aglet's presentation.

Prior to reaching the two post-test ratemaking settlements, Aglet made a full showing on attrition and UoF issues. (Exhibit Aglet-1, at 9-28.) Aglet reviewed utility attrition proposals and recommended 2009 and 2010 attrition adjustments based on forecast changes to the CPI, applied to all base rate revenue requirements. Aglet opposed special escalation factors for medical costs and z-factor protections. (Aglet opening brief, summary items on at 2.) Aglet calculated the impact of UoF costs and benefits on future utility earnings, and analyzed the effect of the GRC cycle on those earnings. (Exhibit Aglet-1, at 13-17; supporting documents in Exhibit Aglet-2, at 1-3.)

After hearings were completed and briefs were filed, Aglet settled post-test year ratemaking issues with SDG&E, SoCalGas, DRA, and TURN. The settlements include fixed dollar amounts for revenue requirement changes in the attrition years, without specific separation of the dollar amounts between expenses and capital-related costs. The settlements continue existing electric and gas sales mechanisms, revenue balancing accounts similar to the defunct Electric Revenue Adjustment Mechanisms to ensure that the utilities collect the full authorized revenue requirement, regardless of a variance in sales and volumes and existing z-factor tariffs. They do not allow separate escalation of medical expenses, or any earning sharing mechanism. All settling parties agreed on attrition allowances for 2009, 2010, and 2011 (a four-year rate case cycle). The utilities and DRA separately agreed on attrition allowances for 2012 (a five-year rate case cycle). The Commission approved the two settlements, with a four-year

rate case cycle. (D.08-07-046, Discussion at 34-40; Findings of Fact 29-34 at 91-92; Conclusions of Law 5-7, 9-10, 17-18, 25-27, at 97-99.) The Rules of Practice and Procedure prohibits public disclosure of the details of the settlement negotiations. (Rule 12.6.) However, the adopted settlements include several features first proposed by Aglet.

Aglet clearly made a substantial contribution to resolution of post-test year ratemaking issues, as expressed in the findings and conclusions cited above. Aglet added to the evidentiary record, represented TURN and UCAN in hearings and settlement talks, took a lead role in negotiating the adopted settlements, and assisted in drafting and editing necessary settlement pleadings.

### **3.3. Performance Incentives**

Aglet submitted evidence on several policy issues related to utility performance incentives; non-optimal resource allocation induced by incentives; histories of SDG&E and SoCalGas incentive rewards; financial community recognition of incentive revenues; causality between incentives and performance; existing management compensation incentives; and cost effectiveness. (Exhibit Aglet-1, at 31-37; supporting documents in Exhibit Aglet-2, at 7, 18-32.) Based on this showing, Aglet recommended that the Commission deny SDG&E and SoCalGas requests for approval of incentive mechanisms. Aglet did not review or analyze the details of the many proposed mechanisms.

In D.08-07-046, the Commission briefly discussed Aglet's position, but it did not adopt Aglet's recommendation or make any finding or conclusion in support of Aglet's policy determinations. (D.08-07-046, Discussion, at 51-52.) Therefore, Aglet voluntarily excludes 57.8 of its hours assigned to performance incentives from its request for compensation.

### **3.4. Memorandum Account**

Aglet participated with other customers parties in litigation of the effective date of GRC revenue changes. TURN and Aglet filed joint comments on the proposed decisions that preceded D.07-12-053, which established revenue requirements memorandum accounts pending issuance of D.08-07-046, and in response to an invitation for further comments. (Comments filed December 10 and 17, 2007, and January 10, 2008.)

SDG&E and SoCalGas favored making test year revenue requirement changes effective January 1, 2008. TURN and Aglet argued that procedural delays caused by SDG&E and SoCalGas, specifically related to late disclosure of UoF evidence, justified a delay in the effective date of revenue requirement changes.

The Proposed Decision of ALJ Long found for customers on the issue. ALJ Long recommended that revenue requirement changes should become effective February 1, 2008. ALJ Long quoted from TURN and Aglet comments in the Proposed Decision, “Intervenors argue there was harm” and “Intervenors were delayed and distracted by the applicants’ omission of Utility of the Future information from the rate case.” (Proposed Decision, at 84.)

The Commission adopted several minor corrections and revisions that Aglet recommended. (Aglet Opening Comments on Proposed Decision, June 30, 2008, pp. 5-6.) The Proposed Decision of ALJ Long was rejected and instead the Commission adopted an alternate, which included the position of SDG&E and SoCalGas. The effective date of revenue requirement changes was January 1, 2008. Nevertheless, the Commission should award Aglet compensation for contributions to the Proposed Decision on this issue, in accordance with Commission practices. Based on a review of Aglet’s participation in D.08-07-046,

its efforts made a substantial contribution in these proceedings and the decision reflects the significant impacts of Aglet's advocacy.

#### **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.

Aglet contributed to the proceeding in a manner that was efficient and did not repeat the work of other parties. Specifically, Aglet coordinated its efforts with DRA, TURN, and UCAN. (*See* D.08-07-046, at 12, that TURN, UCAN, and Aglet "appear to have coordinated on many issues.") Aglet also participated in settlement negotiations that were ultimately successful.

The time sheets submitted by Aglet for James Weil indicate coordination efforts (conference calls and joint filings of joint motions) with DRA, TURN, and UCAN. To avoid duplication issues, Aglet, TURN, and UCAN agreed that Aglet would focus on attrition issues, which allowed TURN and UCAN to devote their resources to other issues. TURN submitted very little testimony regarding attrition or post-test year ratemaking. UCAN's showing concentrated on SDG&E, leaving SoCalGas attrition issues to Aglet and other customer representatives. The Commission affirms Aglet's assertion that it made significant efforts to avoid duplication in this proceeding.

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

Aglet requests \$106,993.82 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:

<b>Work on Proceeding</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
James Weil	2007	280.20	\$280	\$78,456.00
James Weil	2008	59.20	\$300	\$17,760.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>				<b>\$96,216.00</b>
<b>Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
James Weil	2007	3.10	\$140	\$ 434.00
James Weil	2008	17.70	\$150	\$ 2,655.00
<b>Subtotal:</b>				<b>\$ 3,089.00</b>
<b>Travel Expenses</b>				
James Weil	2007	43.30	\$140	\$ 6,062.00
<b>Subtotal Work on Proceeding</b>				<b>\$96,216.00</b>
<b>Subtotal Compensation Preparation</b>				<b>\$ 3,089.00</b>
<b>Subtotal Travel</b>				<b>\$ 6,062.00</b>
<b>Expenses</b>				<b>\$ 1,612.82</b>
<b>Total Compensation (as requested)</b>				<b>\$106,993.82<sup>3</sup></b>
<b>Total Compensation (as corrected)</b>				<b>\$106,979.82</b>

---

<sup>3</sup> Aglet makes a minor mathematical error when it calculates "Weil travel and compensation time" (year 2007) at 46.5 hours. It should be 46.4 hours (3.10 hours spent on NOI preparation, plus 43.30 hours spent on travel). The corrected requested compensation should be \$106,979.82 not \$106,993.82, a difference of \$14.00. We use the corrected amount when calculating our award.

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.

Aglet documented its claim by presenting a breakdown of the hours for its attorneys with a brief description of each activity. The Commission awards fees and expenses for reasonable travel time and does not compensate for routine travel. As such, travel expenses and compensation requests for Weil are reduced accordingly to reflect this policy. With the exception of travel time and related travel expenses,<sup>4</sup> all other hours and direct expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

### **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.

Aglet seeks an hourly rate of \$280 for Weil, for work performed in 2007. We previously approved this rate for Weil in D.07-05-037, and adopt it here.

---

<sup>4</sup> Compensation for travel expenses disallowed. See D.07-04-010, at 12.

Aglet seeks an hourly rate of \$300 for Weil, for work performed in 2008. We previously approved this rate for Weil in D.08-05-033, and adopt it here.

### **5.3. Direct Expenses**

The itemized direct expenses submitted by Aglet include the following:

<b>Printing &amp; Photocopying</b>	\$ 436.74
<b>Postage &amp; Delivery</b>	\$ 132.08
<b>Telephone &amp; Fax</b>	\$ 29.00
<b>Travel (mileage, bridge tolls, and parking)</b>	\$1,015.00
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>\$1,612.82</b>

Exclusive of Aglet's request for travel expenses, all other expenses are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

### **6. Productivity**

Aglet's participation reduced attrition revenues provided to the applicant utilities. The settled increases average slightly more than 3.0% annually. The average of revenue requirement increase requested by SDG&E and SoCalGas for 2009, the first attrition year, was 3.9%. The two utilities requested total revenue increases of \$649 million during 2009, 2010, and 2011. The comparable settled value is \$566 million. The difference between the overall request and the overall settled amount is \$83 million. In this proceeding, Aglet led settlement negotiations on behalf of Aglet and TURN, and was more actively involved in settlement negotiations than DRA. In some cases, the settled amounts are lower than DRA positions. The savings to ratepayers that was achieved by Aglet's participation will greatly exceed the compensation costs to be paid by SDG&E and SoCalGas customers.

**7. Award**

As set forth in the table below, we award Aglet \$99,902.82:

<b>Work on Proceeding</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
James Weil	2007	280.2	\$280	\$78,456.00
James Weil	2008	59.2	\$300	\$17,760.00
<b>Work on Proceeding Total:</b>				<b>\$96,216.00</b>

<b>Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request</b>				
<b>Attorney/Staff</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Hourly Rate</b>	<b>Total</b>
James Weil	2007	3.1	\$140	\$ 434.00 <sup>5</sup>
James Weil	2008	17.7	\$150	\$2,655.00
<b>NOI and Compensation Request Total:</b>				<b>\$3,089.00</b>

**CALCULATION OF FINAL AWARD**

<b>Work on Proceeding</b>	<b>\$96,216.00</b>
<b>NOI and Compensation Request Preparation</b>	<b>\$ 3,089.00</b>
<b>Expenses</b>	<b>\$ 597.82<sup>6</sup></b>
<b>TOTAL AWARD</b>	<b>\$99,902.82</b>

We direct SDG&E and SoCalGas to each pay one-half of this award, as required under § 1807.

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 November 1, 2008, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after Aglet filed its compensation request, and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

---

<sup>5</sup> Amount reduced to disallow travel time.

<sup>6</sup> Amount reduced to disallow travel expenses.

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. Aglet'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 shall 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), we waive the otherwise applicable 30-day public review and comment period for this decision.

#### **9. Assignment of Proceeding**

John A. Bohn is the assigned Commissioner, and Douglas M. Long is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

#### **Findings of Fact**

1. Aglet has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding. Aglet made a substantial contribution to D.08-07-046 as described herein.
2. Aglet requested hourly rates for its representatives are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.
3. Exclusive of the request for travel compensation and expenses, Aglet's hourly compensation and direct expenses, adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of the reasonable compensation is \$99,902.82.

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

### **Conclusions of Law**

1. Aglet has fulfilled the requirements of §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and is entitled to intervenor compensation for its claimed expenses, as adjusted herein, incurred in making substantial contributions to D.08-07-046.

2. Aglet should be awarded \$99,902.82 for its contribution to D.08-07-046.

3. Exclusion of routine travel costs is consistent with Commission policy as found in D.07-04-010.

4. This order should be effective today so that Aglet may be compensated without further delay.

5. This proceeding remains open to address other matters.

## **O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet) is awarded \$99,902.82 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 08-07-046.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, we direct San Diego Gas & Electric Company and Southern California Gas Company to each pay one half of the 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 November 1, 2008, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing date of Aglet's request for compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. Application (A.) 06-12-009, A.06-12-010, and Investigation 07-02-013 remain open to address other matters.

This order is effective today.

Dated January 29, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY  
President  
DIAN M. GRUENEICH  
JOHN A. BOHN  
RACHELLE B. CHONG  
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON  
Commissioners

**APPENDIX**

**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>	D0901034	<b>Modifies Decision?</b> N
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D0807046	
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A0612009, A0612010, I0702013	
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Long	
<b>Payer(s):</b>	San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Southern California Gas 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>
Aglet Consumer Alliance	08-18-08	\$106,993.82	\$99,902.82	No	Disallow routine travel expenses; minor mathematical error

**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>
James	Weil	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$280	2007	\$280
James	Weil	Expert	Aglet Consumer Alliance	\$300	2007	\$300

**(END OF APPENDIX)**