



Decision _____

FILED

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

09/19/22

04:59 PM

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Policies, Processes, and Rules to Ensure Safe and Reliable Gas Systems in California and perform Long-Term Gas System Planning.

Rulemaking 20-01-007
(Filed January 16, 2020)

R2001007

**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND
AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND**

NOTE: After electronically filing a PDF copy of this Intervenor Compensation Claim (Request), please email the document in an MS WORD and supporting EXCEL spreadsheet to the Intervenor Compensation Program Coordinator at Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Intervenor: Environmental Defense Fund	For contribution to Decision (D.) 22-07-002 and D.22-04-042
Claimed: \$ 94,072.75	Awarded: \$
Assigned Commissioner: Rechtschaffen	Assigned ALJ: Fogel and Bemederfer
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information, and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).	
Signature:	/s/ Joon Hun Seong
Date: Sep 19, 2022	Printed Name: Joon Hun Seong

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision on Track 1A and 1B Issues of the Order Instituting Rulemaking to Establish Policies, Processes, and Rules to Ensure Safe and Reliable Gas Systems in California and Perform Long-Term Gas System Planning (D.22-07-002) and; Decision Implementing Southern California Gas Company Rule 30 Operational Flow Order Winter Compliance Penalty Structure Year-Round for Southern California Gas Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (D.22-04-042)
--	--

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:	March 24, 2020	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	April 9, 2020	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
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.12-06-013	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	February 25, 2013	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	D.21-11-017	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 19, 2021	

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/As	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.22-07-002	
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	July 20, 2022	
15. File date of compensation request:	9/19/2022	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

C. Additional Comments on Part I: (use line reference # as appropriate)

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
9 / 10	In D.20-09-007, the CPUC found that EDF had demonstrated customer status and significant financial hardship.	

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059): (For each contribution, support with specific reference to the record.)

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>EDF argued for enforcement via the use of penalties, instead of adjustment to the return on equity allowed to the utilities.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 10.</p> <p>Opening Comments of Environmental Defense Fund on Workshop Report (“Opening Comments”, 11/2/2020) at 5.</p>	<p>The Decision imposes a fixed monetary penalty on the utilities of \$50,000 per day for each day of non-compliance (up to twelve months) and \$75,000 per day (for each day beyond twelve months) for failure to comply with capacity standards.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 50.</p>	
<p>EDF supported the use of 1-in-10 cold and dry year backbone capacity as minimum design standard detailed in the staff proposal for core and necessary electric generation loads.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 13.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 6.</p> <p>While the Commission ultimately did not adopt EDF’s recommendation, it was asked for in an ALJ ruling and the concept was fully considered in the Decision.</p>	<p>The Decision requires Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) to “maintain adequate backbone capacity to meet the average a 1-in-10 cold and dry year standard”.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 16.</p> <p>The Decision considered but ultimately declined to make changes to the current infrastructure design standards.</p> <p>D.22-07-022 at 21.</p>	
<p>EDF supported the adoption of a citation program to enforce compliance with the requirement to maintain adequate backbone capacity.</p> <p>Opening Brief of Environmental Defense Fund (“Opening Brief”, 10/15/2021) at 5.</p>	<p>The Decision directs the Commission’s Utility Enforcement Branch (UEB) to propose a citation program consistent with the citation framework for failure to meet minimum design standards established by D.06-09-039.</p> <p>D.22-07-022 at 15 and 50.</p>	

<p>EDF supported a nine-month frame of determining a “sustained failure” gas transmission and storage.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 11.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 5.</p>	<p>The Decision provides guidance to the Energy Division to refer to the UEB for determination of appropriate action “if the utility has not restored backbone capacity above the minimum standard within nine months”.</p> <p>D.22-07-022 at 15.</p>	
<p>EDF requested that Staff notify the service list of any citations issued under the program.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 14.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to adopt EDF’s proposal; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 15.</p>	
<p>EDF supports the Commission’s proposal to implement force majeure standards in the implementation of minimum transmission system design standards.</p> <p>Reply Comments of Environmental Defense Fund on Proposed Decision (“Proposed Decision Reply Comments”, 6/14/2022) at 18.</p>	<p>The Decision modifies the force majeure clause to include factors beyond utilities’ reasonable control.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 15.</p>	
<p>EDF proposed the nine-month cure period for system outages should begin upon the filing of an advice letter or an interruption of service.</p> <p>Opening Brief at 3.</p>	<p>The Decision adopts the use of the utility’s daily available backbone capacity, instead of the nine-month rolling average, as the appropriate standard for compliance with minimum design standards.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 14.</p> <p>The Decision requires utilities to make notifications on the first day the backbone capacity fails to meet minimum design standards.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 17.</p>	

<p>EDF argued that “information in advice letters on critical components should not receive confidential treatment”.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 34.</p>	<p>The Decision does not carve out any confidential information for the advice letters.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 17.</p>	
<p>EDF argued for a more detailed definition of “gas reliability” than that proposed by the Staff to include intraday gas demand fluctuations; and to distinguish “core” and “non-core demand”.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 8.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to adopt additional details specified in EDF’s proposal; however, EDF developed record on this matter.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 23 and 51.</p>	
<p>EDF found that no modifications to core supply standards for SoCalGas and PG&E were necessary at this time.</p> <p>Proposed Decision Reply Comments at 18.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to make any changes to the core supply standards for SoCalGas and PG&E.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 25.</p>	
<p>EDF questioned the necessity of introducing a uniform, 1-in-10 standard for PG&E local noncore reliability.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 7.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to adopt a uniform design standard for SoCalGas and PG&E; and maintains all existing infrastructure designs for both utilities.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 26.</p>	
<p>EDF recommended updating reliability standard specifications to acknowledge temperature impacts on potentially more rapid drawdowns of gas from EG during spring and summer months.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 10.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to adopt a separate summer reliability standard; however, EDF developed record on this matter.</p> <p>D.22-07-022 at 32.</p>	

<p>EDF supported the requirement for gas corporations to demonstrate compliance with minimum design standards through an advice letter, including adequate slack capacity.</p> <p>Opening Brief at 2.</p>	<p>The Decision instructs utilities to file advice letters on slack capacity on a biannual basis and include information on system capacity.</p> <p>D.22-07-022 at 34.</p>	
<p>EDF argued against requiring electric generators to hold firm pipeline capacity.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 38.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 14.</p>	<p>The Decision decided not to require Commission-regulated electric generators “to secure long-term, firm interstate gas contracts”; however, EDF developed the record on this matter and the Commission left open the possibility of revisiting this matter in the future.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 39.</p>	
<p>EDF argued for the adoption of gas-fired electric generator (EG) balancing tariffs—referred to as “Renewable Balancing Tariffs” (SoCalGas) or “Inventory Management service” (PG&E) by utilities—and highlighted key principles to guide that effort.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 11 and at 22.</p> <p>Proposed Decision Reply Comments at 2.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to adopt the proposal for a “Renewable Balancing Tariff” or comment on the issues around EG balancing tariffs as proposed by EDF; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p> <p>The Decision allows for SoCalGas to propose an analogous “Renewable Balancing Tariff” concept “with sufficient implementation details in a future rulemaking, or cost allocation proceeding.”</p> <p>D.22-07-002 at 44.</p>	
<p>EDF highlighted reclassifying EG load from noncore to core would not solve issues such as over-pressurization; and recommended the Commission to focus on ways to prioritize gas service based on electric grid conditions.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 15.</p>	<p>The Decision declined to reclassify gas for electric generation from noncore to core demand.</p> <p>D.22-07-002 41.</p>	

<p>EDF recommends the nine-month cure period not apply where more than one interruption occurred in the defined period.</p> <p>Opening Brief at 3.</p>	<p>The Decision did not include EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p>	
<p>EDF recommended the gas utilities be required to provide forecasts for core and non-core customers, including projected summer and winter peaks; and deliverability trends and challenges from the “peaky” use of the gas system for the California Gas Report.</p> <p>Proposed Decision Reply Comments at 4.</p>	<p>The Decision did not include EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p>	
<p>EDF encouraged the Commission to adopt a variety of additional strategies to help achieve reliability standards, including non-pipeline alternatives.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 8.</p>	<p>The Decision did not include EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p>	
<p>EDF encouraged the Commission to revisit existing policies around gas demand, gas line extension allowances, incentive mechanisms, and residential gas hookups.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 9.</p>	<p>The Decision did not include EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p>	
<p>EDF encouraged the Commission to avoid making many new authorizations regarding investments in winter peak for a 1-in-10 standard.</p> <p>Opening Comments at 10.</p>	<p>The Decision did not include EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.</p>	

EDF encouraged staff to consider temperature impacts on pressure management and system operation maintenance. Opening Comments at 10.	The Decision did not include EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed the record on this matter.	
EDF recommended a requirement for investor-owned utilities (IOUs) to perform a root cause analysis of each operational flow order (OFO) and provide the information to the Commission. D.22-04-042 at 13.	The Decision declined to adopt EDF’s recommendation; however, EDF developed record on this matter. D.22-04-042 at 13.	
EDF supported uniform OFO procedures and penalties. Opening Comments at 23.	The Decision extended and implemented winter OFO penalty procedures year-round for SoCalGas, SDG&E, and PG&E territories. D.22-04-042 at 14.	

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?²	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Natural Resources Defense Council, California Environmental Justice Alliance, Sierra Club, and the Greenlining Institute		
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: EDF worked collaboratively with aligned intervenors to ensure non-duplication, including filing joint Reply Comments on the Amended Scoping Memo and Ruling on November 12, 2021, and Joint Ex Parte on November 19, 2021, with Natural Resources Defense Council, California Environmental		

² 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
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?²	Yes	
Justice Alliance, Coalition of California Utility Employees, and the Greenlining Institute. Further, EDF was more heavily engaged in this proceeding than other environmental intervenors. EDF presented environmental information no other party addressed, including the latest research demonstrating that natural gas leaks are positively correlated with the percentage of people of color in a community; Similarly, EDF was the sole staunch advocate for the development of a Gas-Fired Electric Generation Tariff (also called a Renewable Balancing Tariff).		

C. Additional Comments on Part II: (use line reference # or letter as appropriate)

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

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

	CPUC Discussion								
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: EDF requests a total intervenor compensation claim of \$93,885.25. This is reasonable for the scale of the proceeding, number of issues presented, and also given the fact that EDF addressed unique environmental issues in the proceeding that required research, evidence, testimony and briefing that could not otherwise be shared across intervenors.</p>									
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: <u>Attorney Time:</u> EDF devoted a total of approximately 151.4 hours of attorney time for work performed by EDF’s attorney, Elizabeth Kelly. This is reasonable for the scale of the proceeding and wide range of issues presented in the proceeding.</p> <p><u>Expert Time:</u> EDF utilized approximately 35.8 hours of the expert time of Mr. Colvin, EDF’s Director of Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, California Energy Program. This is reasonable in light of the issues presented, particularly the issues uniquely raised by EDF including:</p>									
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue: In this proceeding, the substantive issues of EDF were intertwined in the Staff Proposal and Proposed Decision.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="204 1465 1122 1682"> <thead> <tr> <th align="center">Issue</th> <th align="center">Allocation</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Track 1A Reliability Standards</td> <td align="center">30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Track 1B Market Structure</td> <td align="center">50%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Renewables Balancing Tariff</td> <td align="center">20%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Issue	Allocation	Track 1A Reliability Standards	30%	Track 1B Market Structure	50%	Renewables Balancing Tariff	20%	
Issue	Allocation								
Track 1A Reliability Standards	30%								
Track 1B Market Structure	50%								
Renewables Balancing Tariff	20%								

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Elizabeth Kelly – Attorney [1]	2020	68.90	\$420	D.21-11-026	28,938.00			
Elizabeth Kelly – Attorney [1]	2021	47.30	\$550	D.22-06-036; Intervenor Compensation Hourly Rate Chart Effective 1/1/2021 for Attorney with 15+ years of experience	26,015.00			
Elizabeth Kelly – Attorney [1]	2022	35.20	\$625	Intervenor Compensation Hourly Rate Chart Effective 1/1/2021 for Attorney with 15+ years of experience	22,000.00			
Michael Colvin – Expert [2]	2020	15.30	\$300	D20-02-066	4,590.00			
Michael Colvin – Expert [2]	2021	13.00	\$490	ALJ-393; Public Policy Analyst IV	6,370.00			
Michael Colvin – Expert [2]	2022	7.50	\$515	2021 rate and 5% step increase per D.07-01-009; please add escalation rate (a.k.a. COLA)	3,862.50			
Subtotal: \$91,775.50						Subtotal: \$		

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hour s	Rate \$	Total \$
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hour s	Rate \$	Total \$
Joon Hun Seong	2022	10.25	165	ALJ-393; Public Policy Analyst III with 5% increase per D.07-01-009 (divided by two)	1691.25			
Elizabeth Kelly	2020	1.1	210	½ of rate granted in D.21-11-026	231.00			
Elizabeth Kelly	2022	1.2	312.50	½ of rate requested above for 2022	375			
Subtotal: \$2,297.25						Subtotal: \$		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$94,072.75						TOTAL AWARD: \$		

*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.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

CLAIMED		CPUC AWARD	
ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Elizabeth Kelly	12/28/2009 (CA) 3/5/2007 (NY)	268401 (CA) 4488938 (NY)	No

**C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:
*(Intervenor completes; attachments not attached to final Decision)***

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Comment 1	Resume of Elizabeth Kelly
Comment 2	Resume of Michael Colvin
Comment 3	Resume of Joon Hun Seong
Comment 1	<p>Rate for Elizabeth Kelly, Attorney</p> <p>Ms. Kelly’s legal energy experience (15+ years) and expert energy economics and rate design experience prior to becoming an attorney are set forth on her resume, Attachment B.</p> <p>Above the midpoint of the range is appropriate for Ms. Kelly due to her unique and extensive energy and regulatory experience, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Her economics degree which allows for a greater degree of understanding of financial and technical matters before the Commission; • Her experience in energy economic and rate design consulting which contributes to her substantive knowledge in energy; • The extent and depth of her experience in energy and project finance transactions; • Her experience in launching MCE, California’s first Community Choice Aggregator, which required extensive legal and regulatory

³ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>advocacy, in many cases without specific precedent before the California Public Utilities Commission;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Her experience serving clients specifically before the California Public Utilities Commission; and • Her service within energy and legal groups that have advanced her knowledge and experience, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Founder of the San Francisco Women General Counsel Circle ○ 2018 National Association of Women Lawyers General Counsel Institute, Member of Planning Committee and Workshops Subcommittee ○ 2017 National Association of Women Lawyers General Counsel Institute, Member of Planning Committee, Workshops Subcommittee, and Logistics Subcommittee. ○ 2016 CAISO Energy Imbalance Market Governing Body Nominating Committee, Public Interest and Consumer Advocate Committee Member ○ 2015 CAISO Board of Governors Nominee Review Committee, End User and Retail Provider Committee Member
Comment 2	<p>Rate for Michael Colvin, Expert</p> <p>Michael Colvin spent over 10 years at the California Public Utilities Commission and another 4 at Environmental Defense Fund. Given his experience he is classified as public policy analyst IV</p>
Comment 3	<p>Rate for Joon Hun Seong, Expert</p> <p>Joon Hun Seong has received a Master’s in Public Policy from UC Berkeley and has two years of previous policy analysis experience working for American Solar Partners, a solar developer based in Mt. Vernon, New York. Given his academic qualifications and professional experience, he is classified as public policy analyst III.</p>

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments *(CPUC completes)*

Item	Reason

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?	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	
--	--

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

(Green items to be completed by Intervenor)

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND** [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to D.22-04-042 and D.22-07-002.
2. The requested hourly rates for **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND**'s representatives [, as adjusted herein,] are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses [, as adjusted herein,] are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$_____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, [satisfies/fails to satisfy] all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND** shall be awarded \$ _____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND** the total award. [for multiple utilities: “Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND** their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional [industry type, for example, electric] revenues for the ^ calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent [industry type, for example, electric] revenue data shall be used.”] Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning [date], the 75th day after the filing of **ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND**’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today’s decision [is/is not] waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D.22-07-002; D.22-04-042		
Proceeding(s):	R.20-01-007 (OIR for Long-term Gas System Planning)		
Author:			
Payer(s):			

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND	9/19/22	\$94,072.75		N/A	

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Labor Role	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Elizabeth	Kelly	Attorney	\$420	2020	
Elizabeth	Kelly	Attorney	\$550	2021	
Elizabeth	Kelly	Attorney	\$625	2022	
Michael	Colvin	Expert	\$300	2020	
Michael	Colvin	Expert	\$490	2021	
Michael	Colvin	Expert	\$515	2022	
Joon Hun	Seong	Expert	\$330	2022	

(END OF APPENDIX)