

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**FILED**11/12/21
12:18 PM**November 12, 2021****Agenda ID #20085
Ratesetting**

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 21-03-007:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Hallie Yacknin. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's December 16, 2021 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Electronic copies of comments should also be sent to the Intervenor Compensation Program at **Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov**.

/s/ ANNE E. SIMON

Anne E. Simon

Chief Administrative Law Judge

AES:jnf

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ YACKNIN** (Mailed 11/12/2021)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Small Business Utility
Advocates for Award of Intervenor
Compensation for Substantial Contribution to
Resolution E-5073.

Application 21-03-007

**DECISION DENYING COMPENSATION TO
SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES**

Intervenor: Small Business Utility Advocates	For contributions to Decision (D.) 21-06-041
Claimed: \$4,531	Awarded: \$0.00
Assigned Commissioner: Martha Guzman Aceves	Assigned ALJ: Hallie Yacknin

BACKGROUND

Sections 1801-1812 of the Public Utilities Code define the requirements for compensation provided to intervenors that significantly contribute to decisions or other formal actions that are ratified by the full Commission. On August 20, 2021, Small Business Utility Advocates filed a request for intervenor compensation for its contribution to Decision 21-06-041, which is the decision on the application for rehearing Resolution E-5073. Small Business Utility Advocates was previously awarded compensation for its contributions to Resolution E-5073.

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision (D.) 21-06-041 modifies Finding 42 of Resolution E-5073 to clarify that Pacific Gas and Electric Company’s (PG&E) new electric water heating thermal energy storage program called WatterSaver was approved as an Assembly Bill (AB) 2868 (Gatto, Stats. 2016, Ch. 681) energy storage program, not a demand response program pursuant to D.12-04-045,
--	---

	and denies the application for rehearing of the resolution (Application 21-02-016).
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	No Prehearing Conference was held for this matter.	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	See Comment 1 below.	Verified
3. Date NOI filed:	March 15, 2021	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		The NOI was timely filed as an attachment to the instant application in accordance with our guideline. ²
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.20-08-020	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 23, 2020	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.20-08-020	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 23, 2020	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

² See the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide published at www.cpuc.ca.gov, at 27.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.21-06-041	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	June 24, 2021	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	August 20, 2021	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
Comment #1	<p>Pursuant to Rule 17.2 of the Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure, a party found eligible for an award of compensation in one phase of a proceeding remains eligible in later phases, including any rehearing. D.21-06-041 was issued in A.21-02-016, which was the rehearing phase of the above-captioned proceeding, A.21-03-007.</p> <p>SBUA submitted an NOI in A.21-03-007 in conjunction with its Intervenor Compensation Claim and Decision on Intervenor Compensation Claim on March 15, 2021.</p>	Verified

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):**

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)
<p>1. Denying the Application for Rehearing and Approving the WatterSaver Program</p> <p>SBUA opposed the Application for Rehearing in its entirety, arguing that a rehearing was unnecessary and the Commission could easily clarify that the WatterSaver program was approved as a demand response pilot. The Commission agreed and denied rehearing of the Resolution. D.21-06-041 at Ordering Paragraph 2.</p> <p>SBUA further argued that the Commission sufficiently addressed the cost-effectiveness requirement with respect to the WatterSaver program. The Commission found that to be the case.</p>

Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)

“In their responses, PG&E and Small Business Utility Advocates recommended that the Commission deny Cal Advocates’ rehearing application in its entirety.” D.21-06-041, at 2.

“The Commission had the discretion to approve WatterSaver as a pilot program,” D.21-06-041 at 4, and “we appropriately approved WatterSaver as an AB 2868 behind-the-meter energy storage pilot and determined that a specific cost-effectiveness requirement was not necessary.” D.21-06-041 at 5, Ordering Paragraph 1 (“[i]t is reasonable to approve the WatterSaver program as a pilot...”).

“We have determined that good cause has not been demonstrated to grant rehearing of Resolution E-5073.” D.21-06-041 at 8.

As to whether the Resolution approves the WatterSaver as a DR pilot, SBUA argued this issue can be easily clarified by the Commission without the need for rehearing. Response of SBUA to Application for Rehearing of Resolution E-5073 (SBUA Response), dated March 2, 2021, at 1-2.

SBUA further argued that aligning the WatterSaver program’s cost-effectiveness requirements with the cost-effectiveness requirements adopted in Decision (D.) 17-12-013 and requiring PG&E to provide annual progress reports that include a cost-effectiveness showing— represents the best available tradeoff between urgency and cost-effectiveness, and therefore a hearing is unnecessary. SBUA Response at 2.

CPUC Discussion

D.21-06-041 denied the application for rehearing on the basis that WatterSaver is an energy storage pilot program, not a demand response pilot program, and not required to precisely adhere to the cost-effectiveness requirements in D.12-04-045.

Contrary to SBUA’s characterization of its claimed contribution, D.21-06-041 does not clarify that WatterSaver was approved as a demand response pilot nor did SBUA opine on the issue. SBUA’s discussion on this issue consists of the sentence, “As to whether the Resolution approves the WatterSaver as a DR pilot, this issue can be easily clarified by the Commission without the need for rehearing.” (SBUA response, p.2.) This statement did not contribute to the Commission’s analysis of the issue.

Contrary to SBUA’s characterization of its claimed contribution, D.21-06-041 does not consider or find that “the Commission sufficiently addressed the cost-effectiveness requirement with respect to the WatterSaver program.” To the contrary, D.21-06-041 finds that the Commission approved the program without a cost-effectiveness showing. (D.21-06-041 at 4.)

The decision’s acknowledgement of SBUA’s participation and position does not demonstrate substantial contribution. (See D.14-03-040 at p. 11.)

The alignment between SBUA’s statements of opposition to the application for rehearing and the decision’s denial of the application does not demonstrate substantial contribution absent persuasive analysis, reasons and discussion. (See D.00-06-082 [2000 Cal. PUC LEXIS 305 at *9].)

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding? ³	Yes	Noted
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Noted
c. If so, provide name of other parties: No intervenors other than SBUA participated in this proceeding. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) filed a response to the Application.		Noted
<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</p> <p>Like SBUA, PG&E also opposed Cal Advocates’ Application for Rehearing (Application). PG&E argued that the Application should be denied because it was, in effect, a late application for rehearing of D.19-06-032 and because, even if timely, it cites no facts or law that render the Resolution contrary to law in its evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of PG&E’s BTM Thermal Storage Program. SBUA argued that the Commission had the authority to approve the program as a pilot and already sufficiently addressed cost-effectiveness requirements—which, ultimately, is what the Commission found.</p> <p>So, although SBUA and PG&E both opposed Cal Advocates’ application, they did so on behalf of different interests (utility versus ratepayer interests) with differing reasoning, and the Commission should find that SBUA’s participation contributed to the Commission decision in a way that was not duplicative. Therefore, SBUA’s perspectives and goals were necessarily</p>		<p>SBUA’s participation did not duplicate that of PG&E.</p> <p>SBUA’s contribution to D.21-06-041 is as discussed above.</p>

³ The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
	different from those of Cal Advocates' and supplemented—not duplicated—any of Cal Advocates' efforts on common issues.	

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>SBUA was the only intervenor in this proceeding representing ratepayers. SBUA intervened on behalf of small business ratepayers, in particular. SBUA opposed the Application for Rehearing that the Commission ultimately denied. SBUA's compensation request seeks an award of \$4,531.00, and we submit that the Commission should find that SBUA's efforts here have been reasonable and valuable input on behalf of ratepayers.</p>	<p>SBUA's interest and participation in this matter is noted.</p> <p>SBUA's contribution to D.21-06-041 is as discussed above.</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>The hours claimed are relatively small and provide a tangible, focused contribution to the Decision to deny Cal Advocates' application for rehearing.</p>	<p>SBUA's contribution to D.21-06-041 is as discussed above.</p>
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>All of SBUA's time was spent with respect to one issue: denying the Application for Rehearing and approving the WatterSaver Program.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Itzel Hayward	2021	2.0	\$610.00	Res. ALJ-393 and Market Rate Study; <i>see</i> comment 1 below	\$1,220.00	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Paul Chernick	2021	2.8	\$465.00	Res. ALJ-393 and Market Rate Study; <i>see</i> comment 2 below	\$1,302.00	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
James Birkelund	2021	1.0	\$770.00	Res. ALJ-393 and Market Rate Study; <i>see</i> comment 3 below	\$770.00	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$3,292.00						Subtotal: \$0.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
James Birkelund	2021	1	\$385	50% of 2021 rate	\$385.00	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Itzel Berrio Hayward	2021	2.8	\$305	50% of 2021 rate	\$854.00	0 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$1,239.00						Subtotal: \$0.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$4,531.00						TOTAL AWARD: \$0.00		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§ 1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ⁴	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation					
James M. Birkelund	March 2000	206328	No					
Itzel Berrio Hayward	December 1997	192385	No					

⁴ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Timesheets with Allocation of Hours by issue for D.21-06-041
Attachment 3	Resumé / Professional Qualifications of Itzel Berrio Hayward
Attachment 4	Resumé / Professional Qualifications of Paul L. Chernick
Attachment 5	Resumé / Professional Qualifications of James M. Birkelund
Comment 1	<p><u>2021 Hourly Rate for Attorney Itzel Berrio Hayward</u></p> <p>Per Resolution ALJ-393 and the Market Rate Study, the hourly rate for an attorney with Ms. Berrio Hayward’s experience (23 years) is placed at Level V with a 2021 hourly rate range of \$486.31 (low) to \$699.03 (high). SBUA requests a 2021 hourly rate for Ms. Berrio Hayward of \$610, which is the median rate of \$610 (\$606.13 rounded up to the nearest ten).</p> <p>The requested rate reflects Ms. Berrio Hayward’s 23 years of experience as an attorney, including experience before this and other states’ public utilities commissions.</p> <p>Ms. Berrio Hayward first appeared before the California Public Utilities Commission in 1997 after receiving a fellowship from the Greenlining Institute. She served as Law and Policy Fellow at Greenlining Institute from 1997 to 1998. After that, she worked at a major San Francisco law firm where she served as outside counsel for an Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier. Then in 1999 she took a position as a Government and Industry Affairs Attorney for NorthPoint Communications, a Competitive Local Exchange Carrier. While there, she appeared at different state public utilities commissions across the country. After NorthPoint dissolved in 2000, Ms. Berrio Hayward returned to Greenlining and served as its Deputy General Counsel for five years. In D.04-10-033, the Commission approved an hourly rate of \$300 for Ms. Berrio Hayward for work performed in 2004.</p> <p>From 2005 to 2010, Ms. Berrio Hayward served as an executive staff member in the State Bar of California—a highly complex, open, and transparent public setting tasked with protecting consumers, enhancing justice, and balancing the needs of multiple constituencies. While there, she assisted in matters before the State Bar Court all the way up to appeals before the California Supreme Court.</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>In 2010, Ms. Berrio Hayward started her own business and continued working with attorneys in a variety of ways, including by becoming a certified as a Minimum Continuing Legal Education (MCLE) Provider by the State Bar of California.</p> <p>In 2017, Ms. Berrio Hayward opened her own legal practice with a focus on advising electric and telecommunications utilities on a broad range of commercial, regulatory, and policy issues. She also served as a subcontractor for a law firm doing contract work for an Investor-Owned Utility.</p> <p>A copy of Ms. Berrio Hayward’s professional qualifications is included herewith as Attachment 3.</p> <p>Ms. Berrio Hayward’s requested rate of \$610 falls in the middle of the approved range of rates for her experience level set forth in Res. ALJ-393. For these reasons, the Commission should find Ms. Berrio Hayward’s requested rate for her attorney work in 2021 to be reasonable.</p>
Comment 2	<p><u>2021 Hourly Rate for Public Policy Expert Paul L. Chernick</u></p> <p>Res. ALJ-393 provides that a public policy expert with over 15 years of experience is placed at Level V with a 2021 hourly rate range of \$491.99 (low), \$650.89 (middle), to \$868.71 (high).</p> <p>Mr. Chernick has been an expert, consultant, and analyst since 1977 – a period of over 43 years – specializing throughout that time in utility and energy matters. He is a leading expert in the field with exceptionally strong credentials. Mr. Chernick has testified or submitted reports as an expert over three hundred and fifty times on utility issues before various regulatory, legislative, and judicial bodies, including utility regulators in thirty-seven states, six Canadian provinces, and three U.S. federal agencies. He has a national and international reputation for providing expert support to companies and organizations in utility matters at Public Utility Commissions. Additionally, Mr. Chernick is the author or co-author of over 40 publications or articles dealing with utility and energy issues.</p> <p>Since 1986, Mr. Chernick has served as the President of Resource Insight, Inc. (RII). RII is a nationally recognized consulting firm that specializes in the regulation of electric and gas utilities and provides policy and technical analysis, strategic advice, assistance in settlement negotiations, and expert testimony. Mr. Chernick supervises several other experts and provides SBUA with expertise on a range of issues, including analyzing complex</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>public policy and economics matters. Prior to his position at RII, Mr. Chernick served as a Research Associate at Analysis and Inference, Inc. from 1981-1986, and he started his career from 1977-1981 as a Utility Rate Analyst for the Massachusetts Attorney General. In these capacities, he has advised a variety of clients on utility matters.</p> <p>Mr. Chernick received a Master of Science degree in Technology and Policy from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in February 1978 with as focus on the role of technology in public policy formulation, analysis, and evaluation. He received a Bachelor of Science degree from the Civil Engineering Department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in June 1974.</p> <p>A copy of Mr. Chernick’s professional qualifications is included herewith as Attachment 4.</p> <p>Based on Mr. Chernick’s experience, education, and current role, SBUA submits that it is reasonable for the Commission to consider Mr. Chernick to have qualifications as a Level V Public Policy Analyst. Mr. Chernick also performs economic analysis for SBUA, and economists with over 15 years of experience are placed at Level V with a 2021 hourly rate range of \$188.53 (low), \$268.89 (middle), to \$370.45 (high). Therefore, SBUA submits that it is reasonable for the Commission to consider Mr. Chernick as a Public Policy Analyst that also performs economic analysis with over 40 years of directly relevant experience and set his 2021 rate at \$465 per hour.</p>
Comment 3	<p><u>2021 Hourly Rate for General Counsel James M. Birkelund</u></p> <p>Per Resolution ALJ-393 and the Market Rate Study, the hourly rate for a Legal Director with Mr. Birkelund’s years of experience (20+ years) ranges from \$529.38 (low) to \$884.06 (high). SBUA requests a 2021 hourly rate for James Birkelund of \$770, which is within the third quartile of this range and justified for Mr. Birkelund based on his credentials, labor responsibilities as General Counsel, and high level of experience with PUC, energy, and utility matters.</p> <p>Mr. Birkelund received his J.D. from the University of Michigan in 1999 and has over 21 years of legal experience. Mr. Birkelund has been acting as</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>General Counsel for SBUA for over 8 years since 2012.⁵</p> <p>As General Counsel, Mr. Birkelund squarely meets each of the requirements for a Level V Legal Director. His responsibilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overseeing the legal work of the organization, including providing strategic direction; • coordinating and supervising SBUA’s legal team, including attorneys and experts; • participating in the most complex legal actions; and • overseeing legal operations including case assignments, hiring, supervision and professional development of the legal staff, and budgeting. <p><i>See</i> Market Rate Study, Legal Director labor role (“Oversees the legal work of the organization, including providing strategic direction. Alternate title may be General Counsel. Responsible for coordinating and supervising a legal team. Participates in the most complex legal actions. Oversees all legal operations including case assignment, hiring, supervision and professional development of the legal staff, as well as budgeting”). We understand the new rates are intended to cover overhead.</p> <p>Mr. Birkelund has dedicated his legal career to energy, environmental, and utility law. His experience as an energy attorney is broad and includes advising on PUC matters in California, Oregon, Washington, D.C., Idaho, South Dakota, and Colorado, as well as in-house counsel experience at a major utility (with over \$1.5 billion in annual revenues) where he advised and routinely commented on energy regulatory issues. Mr. Birkelund also has extensive litigation experience practicing in federal and California courts and before administrative agencies. He formerly held positions as a Senior Project Attorney at the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) and as an attorney at Morrison & Foerster, LLP. Along with a law degree, Mr. Birkelund has a Master of Science in Resource Policy (1999) from the University of Michigan School of Natural Resources.</p> <p>Mr. Birkelund’s professional activities also are extensive and have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acting as a <i>Judge Pro Tem</i> at the San Francisco Superior Court of

⁵ *See, e.g.*, A.12-11-009, D.15-06-016 (Decision Granting Compensation to Small Business Utility Advocates for Substantial Contribution to Decision 14-08-032), June 11, 2015, at 17 (Mr. Birkelund acting as SBUA’s General Counsel in 2012).

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>California;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • serving as an <i>Executive Committee Member</i> at the California Lawyers Association, Environmental Law Section; and • teaching as an <i>Adjunct Professor</i> at Hastings College of Law in San Francisco. <p>A copy of Mr. Birkelund’s professional qualifications is included herewith as Attachment 5.</p> <p>Based on Mr. Birkelund’s 20+ years of professional experience, dedication to the fields of energy and utility law, and responsibilities as General Counsel, SBUA submits that the requested rate of \$770 hour is reasonable and well justified under Resolution ALJ-393.</p>

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Disallowance of hours claimed	The hours claimed are disallowed for SBUA’s failure to substantially contribute to D.21-06-041.
[2] Hourly rates	Because we disallow all of the hours claimed, we do not reach the issue of the reasonableness of requested hourly rates for 2021.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (see § 1804(c))

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No

PART V: COMMENTS ON AND REVISIONS TO PROPOSED DECISION

PART VI: ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDING

Martha Guzman Aceves is the assigned Commissioner and Hallie Yacknin is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

FINDING OF FACT

1. Small Business Utility Advocates has not made a substantial contribution to D.21-06-041 as described herein.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim should be denied.

ORDER

1. The intervenor compensation claim of Small Business Utility Advocates for contribution to Decision 21-06-041 is denied.
2. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.
3. Application 21-03-007 is closed.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, 2021, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2106041		
Proceeding(s):	A2103007		
Author:	ALJ Yacknin		
Payer(s):	N/A		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Small Business Utility Advocates	August 20, 2021	\$4,531.00	\$0.00	N/A	See CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments above.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Itzel	Berrio Hayward	Attorney	\$610.00	2021	N/A
Paul	Chernick	Expert	\$465.00	2021	N/A
James	Birkelund	Attorney	\$770.00	2021	N/A

(END OF APPENDIX)