

Decision 09-03-043 March 26, 2009

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate
Procurement Policies and Consider Long-Term
Procurement Plans.

Rulemaking 06-02-013
(Filed February 16, 2006)

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 07-12-052**

This decision awards Women's Energy Matters (WEM) \$51,912.50 in compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 07-12-052. This amount represents a decrease of \$16,237.50 from the amount requested due to mathematical errors in the compensation request, an hourly rate being awarded that is lower than that requested for WEM's consultant, and a reduction being made to the hours allowed for travel and preparation of the compensation request. Today's award payment will be allocated to the affected utilities. This proceeding shall remain open pending resolution of related matters.

1. Background

In Decision (D.) 07-12-052 this Commission reviewed, critiqued and adopted, with modifications, Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company's (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company's (SDG&E) Long-Term Procurement Plans (LTPP), for the 10-year period 2007-2016, and provided direction to the utilities on preparing their conformed 2006 LTPPs compliance filings.

Our primary focus in reviewing the LTPPs was whether the utilities are procuring preferred resources as set forth in the Energy Action Plan, in the order of energy efficiency, demand response, renewables, distributed generation and clean fossil-fuel. In addition, we affirmed California's position as the pioneer in the nation, and in some areas of the world, by emphasizing and implementing policies that promote the reduction of greenhouse gases (GHG), especially in the production and delivery of electric resources by the utilities we regulate. Each utility prepared different candidate plans that indicated how the utility would meet its renewable portfolio standard targets, demand response as a percentage of resource adequacy requirements, energy efficiency savings from committed and uncommitted programs,¹ and then showed how each plan minimized environmental impacts, at what cost to ratepayers, and at what reliability level.

2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, which is set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,² 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 See D.06-07-029, fn. 1, for a full discussion of the different usages of the terms "committed" and "uncommitted," and their agency specific meanings.

² All subsequent statutory references are to the Public Utilities Code unless otherwise indicated.

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 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 PHC in this matter was held on February 28, 2006. Women's Energy Matters (WEM) timely filed its NOI on March 30, 2006.

In its NOI, WEM asserted financial hardship. WEM meets the financial hardship condition pursuant to § 1804(b)(1) through a rebuttable presumption of eligibility because the Commission found WEM met this requirement in another proceeding within one year of the commencement of this proceeding (see D.08-01-017). Moreover, Rule 17.2 states that a party found eligible in one phase of a proceeding remains eligible in later phases, including rehearing, in the same proceeding. WEM was found eligible for compensation in a prior request for compensation in this proceeding and is therefore eligible now.³

Like the NOI, the request for compensation must be timely filed. WEM filed its request for compensation on February 19, 2008, within the statutorily allowed 60 days of D.07-12-052 being issued. On March 20, 2008, PG&E filed its opposition to WEM's request for compensation. PG&E's opposition raises several issues but does not question whether or not WEM satisfied the procedural requirements antecedent to its request for compensation in this proceeding. WEM has satisfied the necessary procedural steps to make its claim for compensation.

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

³ See D.08-10-035 at 5.

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.⁴

With this guidance in mind, we turn to the contributions WEM claims to have made to the proceeding.

WEM was an active party in this proceeding. In addition to attending workshops, WEM cross-examined several witnesses, and filed testimony, briefs, and comments on the Draft Decision. The LTPPs submitted by PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E showed the utilities, for the most part, filling and planning to fill their projected net short positions with conventional resources without providing a highly developed analysis to support this strategy. The analysis by WEM addressed issues related to long-term procurement by these utilities.⁵

WEM's analysis examined PG&E's greenhouse gas emissions, raised questions about energy efficiency in the load forecasts, questioned PG&E's use of Energy Commission forecasts, and identified errors in PG&E's load projections

⁴ D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d 628 at 653.

⁵ While WEM's analysis focused on PG&E's long-term procurement plan, the majority of WEM's arguments are relevant to all the investor-owned utilities.

for Community Choice. On cross-examination WEM raised issues related to PG&E's compliance with Assembly Bill 32 greenhouse gas reduction requirements, utilization of energy efficiency as procurement resources, uncertainty about meeting energy efficiency targets, and PG&E's commitment to meet loading order requirements.

PG&E argues that WEM did not make a substantial contribution to D.07-12-052 and asserts the following: 1) The fact that WEM is only referred to once in D.07-12-052 shows that WEM did not make a substantial contribution to the proceeding; 2) The testimony WEM submitted consisted of unsupported and speculative statements that was neither cited nor referred to in D.07-12-052; 3) WEM often focused on issues that were outside the scope of the hearing and did not make a substantial contribution during hearings; 4) The arguments made by WEM in briefs were either implicitly rejected by D.07-12-052, or were duplicative of other parties' positions; and 5) WEM claims to have made substantial contributions on issues that were either outside the scope of the proceeding, were not adopted by D.07-12-052, or that were only briefly addressed by WEM.⁶

The flaw we find in PG&E's argument is three-fold. First, PG&E parses and selectively reviews WEM's participation. By way of example, PG&E disputes WEM's claim to have made a contribution on the issue of GHGs where it asserts that "WEM ignores the fact that GHG issues were determined to be outside the scope of the hearing and were instead reserved for briefing."

⁶ WEM disputes PG&E's claims and notes that it identified no less than 11 major findings in the decision and 1 important procedural issue where the Commission adopted WEM's recommendations.

However, PG&E does not dispute that WEM properly raised this issue in its brief.

Second, the fact that WEM is not specifically credited with making a substantial contribution on a particular issue does not mean that a substantial contribution was not made. Where a decision states a position that is consistent with that asserted by a party we may infer that the party made a contribution on that issue. Here for example, WEM notes that it pointed out errors in PG&E's rebuttal to the National Resource Defense Counsel (NRDC) and that D.07-12-052 stated that "[i]t is reasonable to direct the IOUs to correct their LTPPs to indicate how they should fill their net short positions..." Similarly, WEM made a procedural recommendation to broaden the scope of hearings to include energy efficiency. Though WEM was not specifically identified as the source of this proposal, the proceeding was broadened in a manner consistent with WEM's recommendation. Related, it was WEM that raised the question of whether or not PG&E would fully utilize energy efficiency as procurement resources and identified uncertainty about whether PG&E would meet the energy efficiency targets.

Finally, as WEM notes, "an intervenor may make a substantial contribution by 'providing a unique perspective that enriched the Commission's deliberations and the record' even if it did not adopt any of the customer's recommendations. (WEM Request for Compensation, at 4, citing D.05-06-027.) Among other things, WEM is a network of women and men who look at energy issues from a woman's point of view and work for a rapid transition to an efficient, renewable energy system. WEM's criticism of PG&E's efforts in that area is consistent with WEM's community base and organizational mission. While WEM may not be as skilled an advocate as PG&E or other intervenors, it

brings an important, valuable perspective to the proceeding. This perspective, coupled with the more tangible contributions identified above, leads us to conclude that WEM substantially contributed to the proceeding.

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 note that in a proceeding involving multiple participants, it is virtually impossible to completely avoid some duplication of the work of other parties. WEM states that it took all reasonable steps to keep duplication to a minimum and to ensure that its work served to complement and assist the showings of other parties where there was overlap.

PG&E disputes WEM's assertion and explicitly and implicitly alleges that there was an unnecessary duplication of efforts. PG&E's explicit arguments include the claim that parties other than WEM contributed to the planning reserve margin and 1 in 2 year demand forecast requirement. However, WEM identifies eight distinct arguments it made on this issue. Similarly, PG&E asserts that the Center for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Technologies (CEERT) and NRDC addressed GHG issues in their briefs, and that it was the work of these parties, rather than WEM, that contributed to D.07-12-052. WEM points out that it went further than CEERT or NRDC by identifying errors in PG&E's rebuttal to

NRDC and in PG&E's reply brief on this issue. Thus, in both instances above, rather than being duplicative, WEM's work supplemented and/or complimented the work done by the other parties.

PG&E also argues that WEM should not be allowed to claim fees for work done by Local Power because Local Power was acting as a separate party and was itself required to comply with the statutory requirements above in order to receive compensation. PG&E's claim that Local Power was acting as a separate party is rooted in three events. First, PG&E claims that Local Power requested and was granted party status on behalf of Local Power at the June 4, 2007 hearing. Second, some witnesses were cross-examined by both Robert Freehling and WEM's Barbra George; PG&E asserts that this evidences Local Power's participation as a separate entity.⁷ Finally, PG&E notes that Local Power and WEM submitted joint briefs that had separate sections for WEM and Local Power with each entity separately addressing identical issues from the master briefing outline. In its response to these claims, WEM notes that it asked the Commission's process office to add Freehling as an appearance on behalf of WEM in advance of the June 4, 2007 hearing, on May 21, 2007. This request was forwarded to PG&E and all other parties on the service list.⁸ Moreover, when asked by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) about his appearance prior to his first cross-examination, Freehling noted that he was working with both Local Power and WEM. WEM argues that PG&E was obliged to raise any objection to,

⁷ Freehling is the Director of Local Power Research.

⁸ The official service list for the proceeding lists Freehling as having party status for WEM/Local Power.

or seek clarification of Freehling's status well in advance of the request for compensation. Having failed to do so, WEM asserts that PG&E's present claim should be deemed waived.

While we see no reason why PG&E waited until the request for compensation was filed to question Local Power's status as a consultant and/or party, we do not think it appropriate to deem PG&E's claim waived. Instead, we reiterate the finding above, that WEM is a customer within the meaning of § 1801. Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801 et seq. affords customers the ability to compensate experts that assist them. As set forth therein:

The purpose of this article is to provide compensation for reasonable advocate's fees, reasonable expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs to public utility customers of participation or intervention in any proceeding of the commission. (Pub. Util. Code § 1801.)

Similarly, Pub. Util. Code § 1802(c) defines expert witness fees to mean "recorded or billed costs incurred by a customer for an expert witness." Nothing in §§ 1801 et seq. precludes a customer from using the director of another organization as an expert witness. Moreover, PG&E's concern that allowing WEM to use Local Power as a consultant would afford parties an opportunity to do an end-run around intervenor compensation statutes ignores the statutory requirement that the claimed fees must be reasonable. We consider the efficiency of WEM's work and the reasonableness of its costs, including those incurred by Local Power on WEM's behalf, below.

Finally, PG&E implies that WEM's work was duplicative where it claims that "Local Power and WEM separately addressed identical issues from the

master briefing outline.”⁹ We disagree with PG&E’s assertion.¹⁰ PG&E’s claim goes to only two of the thirty-two pages in the brief submitted by WEM/Local Power. On the pages PG&E cites, WEM argues that PG&E opposed Community Choice Aggregation (CCA), whereas Local Power argues that decisions made in the Community Choice Proceeding should allow the Long Term Procurement Proceeding decision to be adjusted to facilitate development of CCA. These arguments are complimentary and neither duplicative nor wasteful.

5. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

WEM requests \$68,150.00 for its participation in this proceeding, as follows:¹¹

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Barbara George	2007	224.75	\$170	\$38,207.50
Robert Freehling	2007	103	\$225	\$23,175.00
Subtotal:				\$61,382.50
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Barbara George	2007	36.5	\$ 85	\$ 3,102.50
Robert Freehling	2007	6	\$112.50	\$ 675.00
Subtotal Hourly Compensation:				\$ 3,777.50
Expenses (Travel/transport)	2007	14/16	85/112.50	\$ 2,990.00

⁹ While PG&E also asserts that WEM and Local Power cross-examined the same witness, it does not claim that this questioning was duplicative or redundant.

¹⁰ We do however caution intervenors against mixing time claims for eligible and non-eligible participants in billing requests.

¹¹ WEM’s request contained two mathematical errors that increased the request by \$141.00 to \$68,291.00.

Total Requested Compensation

\$68,150.00

In general, the components of this request must constitute the 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 a substantial contribution to the Commission's decision are reasonable by determining to what degree the hours and costs are related to the work performed and necessary for the substantial contribution.

In support of its request for compensation WEM provided daily listings of the specific tasks performed by George and Freehling and their daily hours in connection with the proceeding. These documents evidence WEM's having attended workshops and PHCs, written testimony, testified in hearings, cross-examined witnesses, and reviewed and drafted comments. Given the scope and depth of these activities, with the three exceptions below, the hours claimed by WEM are reasonable.

First, WEM seeks \$2,990 for the travel time of George and Freehling to and from Fairfax, California where WEM is located. Though the Commission awards fees and expenses for reasonable travel time, we do not believe it is reasonable to compensate an intervenor for routine commuting to San Francisco. If an intervenor has extraordinary travel costs that are reasonable and justified, such as might be incurred to attend hearings in another area of the state or to bring in a consultant with special expertise from another part of the country, we will continue to compensate them. Here however George seeks travel compensation

for commuting to San Francisco and Freehling seeks compensation for commuting from Local Power's Berkeley office to WEM's office in Fairfax. Consistent with D.07-04-010, we disallow these costs.

Second, WEM claims a total of 42.5 hours spent preparing its Request for Award of Intervenor Compensation. WEM argues that the time required to put together the compensation request reflects the unusually large number of issues on which WEM's positions prevailed, and time incorporating new language and formatting from the Commission June 11, 2007 Intervenor Compensation workshop. In contrast to WEM's 42.5 hours, Aglet Consumer Alliance (an intervenor in this same proceeding, that prevailed on an equal if not greater number of issues), required only 28.4 hours to prepare a compensation request that sought 30% more than WEM's request. Similarly, Green Power Institute (another intervenor in this same proceeding) required only 16 hours to compile a compensation request with a comparable dollar amount to WEM's. In both of the aforementioned instances, the requests were prepared using the same format. Thus we are not persuaded by WEM's argument and find the hours WEM spent preparing the request to be excessive. We therefore reduce the compensation time for George's preparation of the request from 36.5 to 15 hours.

Finally, both George and Freehling seek compensation for 4.5 hours (each) spent at a May 22, 2007 joint agency meeting in Sacramento. This joint agency meeting, though perhaps important, was not part of the proceeding now at issue. We therefore disallow the compensation claims related to these costs.

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.

WEM seeks an hourly rate of \$170 for George, for work performed in 2007. We previously approved this rate for George in D.08-01-017, and adopt it here. In addition, WEM seeks an hourly rate of \$225 for work done by Freehling in 2007. WEM attempts to justify this rate on claims that the requested rate represents “the average rate for ‘Consultant’ in PG&E’s Intervenor Compensation Data Sets for 2004-2006” and is “in the mid-range of rates for experts with his years of experience set by D.07-01-009.” WEM fails to acknowledge that in D.06-05-037 the Commission set a rate of \$120 per hour for work by Freehling in 2005. We escalate \$120, the rate established for Freehling in D.06-05-037 by 3% for 2006 and another 3% for 2007 (see D.07-01-009), each time rounding the sum to the nearest \$5.00. The result is \$130 and we approve this rate for Freehling’s 2007 work. We caution WEM that by failing to recognize and report the hourly rates the Commission has set in the past it risks sanction, particularly where the rates sought are higher than the rates the Commission previously found to be reasonable.

5.3. Direct Expenses

WEM is not requesting recovery of any direct 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.

WEM asserts that it has contributed substantial dollar benefits to ratepayers but notes that it would be impossible to assign an exact ratepayer dollar value to its participation. In particular, WEM asserts that it encouraged

more accurate conservation need estimates; advocated for greater use of preferred resources (such as reasonably priced renewables and the lowest cost resource, energy efficiency) to avoid future penalties for unnecessary GHG emissions and to avoid higher costs (and GHG emissions); proposed that utilities cover “contingencies” with a short delay in aging power plant retirements as an alternative to building expensive new fossil-fuel power plants; and urged the Commission to prevent over-procurement by utilities. WEM claims, its focus on policies that ensure a reliable, affordable and environmentally sustainable energy resource portfolio should have lasting benefits to ratepayers. We agree that ratepayers benefit where a greater use of preferred resources is encouraged. We also agree that the outcome of the proceeding was improved by WEM’s participation. Thus, we find that WEM’s efforts have been productive.

7. Award

As set forth in the table below, we award WEM \$51,912.50:

Work on Proceeding				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Barbara George	2007	220.25	\$170	\$37,442.50
Robert Freehling	2007	98.5	\$130	\$12,805.00
Subtotal:				\$50,247.50
Preparation of NOI and Compensation Request				
Attorney/Staff	Year	Hours	Hourly Rate	Total
Barbara George	2007	15	\$85	\$1,275.00
Robert Freehling	2007	6	\$65	\$ 390.00
Subtotal:				\$1,665.00
Expenses (Travel/transport)	2007			\$0
CALCULATION OF FINAL AWARD				
Work on Proceeding				\$50,247.50
NOI and Compensation Request Preparation				\$ 1,665.00

Expenses	\$0
TOTAL AWARD	\$51,912.50

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 May 4, 2008, the 75th day after WEM 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 gas and electric revenues for the 2007 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. WEM'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 comment period for this decision.

9. Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the assigned Commissioner, and Douglas M. Long is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. WEM has satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.
2. WEM made a substantial contribution to D.07-12-052 as described herein.
3. WEM requested hourly rates for its representatives that, as adjusted herein, are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.
4. The total of the reasonable compensation is \$51,912.50.
5. The appendix to this decision summarizes today's award.

Conclusions of Law

1. WEM 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.07-12-052.
2. WEM should be awarded \$51,912.50 for its contribution to D.07-12-052.
3. This order should be effective today so that WEM may be compensated without further delay.
4. This proceeding should remain open pending resolution of related issues.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Women's Energy Matters (WEM) is awarded \$51,912.50 as compensation for its substantial contributions to Decision 07-12-052.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall pay WEM 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 gas and electric revenues for the 2007 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 May 4, 2008, the 75th day after the filing date of Women's Energy Matters' Request for Compensation, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. This proceeding shall remain open pending resolution of related matters.

This order is effective today.

Dated March 26, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY

President

DIAN M. GRUENEICH

JOHN A. BOHN

RACHELLE B. CHONG

TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON

Commissioners

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D0903043	Modifies Decision?
Contribution Decision(s):	D0712052	
Proceeding(s):	R0602013	
Author:	ALJ Long	
Payer(s):	Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Women's Energy Matters	2/19/08	\$68,291.00	\$51,912.50	None	Mathematical errors, an hourly rate being awarded that is lower than that requested for WEM's consultant, and a reduction to the hours for preparation of the compensation request; inappropriately claimed travel expenses.

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Barbra	George	Expert	Women's Energy Matters	\$170	2007	\$170
Robert	Freehling	Expert	Women's Energy Matters	\$225	2007	\$130

(END OF APPENDIX)