

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298**November 21, 2022****Agenda ID #21181  
Ratesetting****FILED**  
11/21/22  
11:10 AM  
R1810007

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 18-10-007:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Fogel. 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 January 12, 2023 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](mailto:Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov).

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE

Michelle Cooke

Acting Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC:mph

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ FOGEL** (Mailed 11/21/2022)

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implement  
Electric Utility Wildfire Mitigation Plans  
Pursuant to Senate Bill 901 (2018).

Rulemaking 18-10-007

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO WILLIAM B. ABRAMS FOR  
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS (D.) 19-05-036 AND  
D.19-05-037**

<b>Intervenor:</b> William B. Abrams	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.)</b> 19-05-036 and D.19-05-037 [4]
<b>Claimed:</b> \$87,865	<b>Awarded:</b> \$37,494.50
<b>Assigned Commissioner:</b> Alice Reynolds <sup>1</sup>	<b>Assigned ALJ:</b> Cathleen A. Fogel <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding was assigned to President Alice Reynolds on January 31, 2022.

<sup>2</sup> This proceeding was assigned to ALJ Cathleen A. Fogel on July 9, 2020.

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	The collective Decisions review and approve the Wildfire Mitigation Plans (WMP) that the utilities filed pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 901. D.19-05-036 is a “Guidance Decision” that addresses issues common to all of the WMPs. D.19-05- 037, -038 and -039 address issues specific to the WMPs of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E).
--	--

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812<sup>3</sup>:**

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	11/14/2018	2/26/2019
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	3/4/2019	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.18-12-005	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:		
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Supplement to NOI filed on 6/17/19 but no ruling issued	D.20-08-009
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes

<sup>3</sup> All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.18-12-005	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Filed Under Seal on 7/29/19 awaiting determination	D.20-08-009
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.19-05-036, D.19-05-037, D.19-05-038, D.19-05-039	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	6/3/19 (earliest issuance date)	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	7/30/2019	July 31, 2019
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**C. Additional Comments on Part I:**

<b>#</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comment(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
1	I am referencing Judge Thomas’ ruling on 6/14/19 defining the scope for phase 2 of this proceeding as it references my work prior supporting the decisions to date and the impacts it had on setting the scope for Phase 2. I filed the motion for an evidentiary hearing prior to the proposed decision and therefore it should be considered as contribution to the proceeding prior to the commission decisions referenced.	Noted. The referenced ruling denied the motion for evidentiary hearing but ordered PG&E to respond to Mr. Abrams’ outstanding discovery request.
2	I am a wildfire survivor and a professional providing direct subject matter expertise to these proceeding with a specific focus on strategic planning, quality assurance, metrics, safety and risk analysis. My personal and professional experience relative	Noted

	to this proceeding provides me with a unique and value-added perspective.	
3	I have 20 plus years of related experience and provided my resume with my notice for R.18-12-005 submitted on 7/29/19.	Noted

**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):**

<b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
I am presenting my substantial contributions to this proceeding and to these decisions in reverse chronological order (most recent first) in which the positions were presented:		Noted
1. Stipulated that proposed decision does not address “performance” metrics in-line with SB 901 and advocated that they should be incorporated. (WBA Comments to PD filed 5/20/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)	D.19-05-036 (pg. 3) D.19-05-036 (pg. 14-15) D.19-05-037 (pg. 44) “Similarly, Mr. William Abrams characterizes PG&E’s proposed metrics as focusing on activities, rather than risk” D.19-05-037 (pg. 2) “Better metrics for analyzing how PG&E’s proposed mitigation measures fit together, as well as the individual effectiveness of each measure;” D.19-05-037 (pg. 19) D.19-05-037 (pg. 25-26) D.19-05-037 (pg. 42-43)	Verified
2. I advocated for an increase use of reclosers in my comments. I was the only party to articulate after	D.19-05-037 (pg. 2-3) “Whether recloser disabling, along with other mitigations, could reduce the need for	Verified

<p>discovery that PG&amp;E did not complete SCADA enabled reclosers according to their 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment to bring attention from ALJ and other parties (WBA Comments to PD filed 5/20/19, Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>de-energization (Public Safety Power Shutoffs or PSPS)”</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 28)</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 53)</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 56)</p> <p>Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p> <p>Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 5) “Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition System (SCADA) Enabling: Revises SCADA enabling for line reclosers completion date from June 1, 2019, to as soon as feasible for locations impacted by weather or other external factors”</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p> <p>Verified. The Ruling on 6/14/19 denied Mr. Abrams’ motion for evidentiary hearing but ordered PG&amp;E to respond to discovery served by Mr. Abrams.</p> <p>Verified</p>
<p>3. Only party to demonstrate that IOU plans did not focus on outcomes regarding their communication plans and partnerships in keeping with SB901. This comment was picked up and incorporated by ALJ and Commission in next phase of proceeding. (WBA Comments to PD filed 5/20/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 14-15)</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 26)</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 35-36)</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 39)</p>	<p>Unverified. D.19-05-036 at 14-15 does not discuss communications plans, but instead cost recovery and the prudent manager standard. [3]</p> <p>Noted in D.19-05-037 at 44.</p>
<p>4. I described how “prioritization” as required by SB901 was not included in the IOU WMPs. I advocated that</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 14-15)</p> <p>D.19-05-036 (sec. 10, pg. 30-36)</p> <p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 55)</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

<p>the list of “activities” did not represent a prioritization and due to this advocacy is now included in the next phase of the proceeding. (WBA Comments to PD filed 5/20/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 59)</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>5. I advocated for increased use of current indices in WMPs. I was the only party to demonstrate through analysis and my discovery that PG&amp;E “Fire Index Areas” or FIAs were outdated and should not be the basis of a plan. This was further highlighted in other comments (WBA Comments to PD filed 5/20/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 25-26) D.19-05-037 (pg. 27) D.19-05-037 (pg. 47)</p>	<p>Verified Verified Verified</p>
<p>6. I provided analysis that “feasible procedures” required by the SB901 were not included in the PG&amp;E plan given that some of these activities (patrol of lines, reclosers, etc.) were shown to be not feasible. (WBA Comments to PD filed 5/20/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 14-15)  Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Verified  Verified</p>
<p>7. I provided a methodology to incorporate specific timeframes around key deliverables in a regulatory construct. I recommended more accountability around target dates. I was the only party to demonstrate that the PG&amp;E Second Amendment stripped away key due dates in a material manner. Due to my filed motions it was ruled by the ALJ that that is would be addressed in phase 2 of the proceeding. (WBA Motion to Compel 5/13/19, WBA</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43)  Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Unverified. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D.19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]</p>

<p>Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>		
<p>8. I recommended defining and quantifying “results” in my opening comments and provided methodology to do so. I was the only party to demonstrate that “results” was removed as a criteria for vegetation management in the PG&amp;E WMP as a material change that required a ruling on behalf of the ALJ. I advocated that a 50% failure rate by PG&amp;E should not be a basis to remove “results” and that specific criteria should be leveraged. (WBA Motion to Compel 5/13/19, Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 27)                  D.19-05-037 (pg. 2) “Further analysis and tracking of at-risk tree species”                  D.19-05-037 (pg. 3) “Analysis of data to determine whether PG&amp;E’s new vegetation-pole clearances have contributed to reduced ignitions, especially during critical weather conditions”                   Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 5-6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019” “Revises Target #4 to require completion of Quality Assurance (QA) audits for 100% of the enhanced vegetation management work and reworking of any trees that QA identifies as not having originally met program scope.”</p>	<p>Verified                  Verified                  Verified                  Verified</p>
<p>9. I advocated for specific criteria around de-energization and re-energization and proposed specific scientifically based measures to do so. Through my filed motions and discovery requests, I was the only party to advocate and demonstrate that changing patrol of all lines to “operational judgement” by PG&amp;E was a material change and in need of remedy. (WBA Motion to Compel 5/13/19, Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43)                  D.19-05-037 (pg. 28)                   Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 5-6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019” “Clarifies that patrol of distribution lines prior to re-energization in areas that do not experience the PSPS triggering conditions, but were only de-energized because of other lines, will be based on operational judgment.”</p>	<p>Unverified. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D.19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]                   Verified                  Verified</p>



<p>10. I was the only party to bring to the attention of the ALJ and Commission through filed motions that PG&amp;E materially filed amendments to their plans less than 2 hours after commission ruling awarding \$373M in ratepayer reimbursement (WBA Motion to Compel 5/13/19, Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43)  Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Unverified. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D.19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]</p>
<p>11. In my opening comments, I identified criteria for “last resort” definition. Through analysis of PG&amp;E findings, I was able to advocate that timing of the PG&amp;E second amendment was designed to alleviate their “last resort” burden for de-energization (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43)</p>	<p>Unverified. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D.19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]</p>
<p>12. I argued and provided evidence that the PG&amp;E Second Amendment materially reduced their readiness for wildfire season. I was the only party to demonstrate this. (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43)  Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Unverified. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D.19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]</p>

<p>13. I was the only party to argue and provided evidence that the PG&amp;E second amendment would leave customers at greater safety risk. This was also informed by lengthy discovery requests and analysis. (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43) Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Unverified. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D.19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]</p>
<p>14. In my opening comments, I provided analysis of the prudent manager standard relative to the IOU WMPs. I analyzed and provided evidence that the PG&amp;E Second Amendment demonstrated that PG&amp;E’s ability to meet the “prudent manager” standard was at issue. (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43) Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Verified, however, Abrams’ comments did not substantially contribute to the decision’s outcome. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D. 19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2.[3]</p>
<p>15. My opening comments defined risks and methodology for differentiating between internal QA controls. I was the only party that analyzed and provided evidence that the “external factors” described in the PG&amp;E Second Amendment were really internal intrinsic deficiencies leading to changes in their WMP (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43)</p>	<p>Verified, however, Abrams’ comments did not substantially contribute to the decision’s outcome. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D. 19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2 and does not reflect substantial contribution to the Decision. [3]</p>

<p>16. I was the only party to provide evidence that the snowfall which was pointed to by PG&amp;E as why due dates were eliminated for key mitigation was realized back in February despite their last-minute filing in April to avoid scrutiny (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43) Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Verified, however, Abrams’ comments did not substantially contribute to the decision’s outcome. Ordering Paragraph 8 only specifies that D. 19-05-036 does not act on PG&amp;E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan, which will be considered in Phase 2.</p> <p>We note the claim does not indicate where in discussion these comments were considered and substantially contributed to the Decision.</p>
<p>17. In my opening comments, I provided substantive methodology and tools for tracking on dates and deliverables from a regulatory framework perspective. I was the only party to provide evidence that the government shutdown that PG&amp;E pointed to regarding their inability to meet key deadlines was inaccurate regarding the timing and materially impacted readiness for wildfire season (WBA Motion for Evidentiary Hearing 4/29/19, WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (order 8 pg. 43) Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>18. I argued and advocated in my filed comments that plan approval should not be relied</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (section 5.1.2, pg. 17-20) D.19-05-036 (pg. 4)</p>	<p>Verified Verified</p>

<p>upon for any basis in cost recovery or ratepayer reimbursement if plans would not be significantly improved. This included analysis of the differences between “strategic plans” and “frameworks” relative to goals/objectives. These arguments were incorporated into the decisions and also into the next phase of the WMPs. (WBA Opening Comments filed 3/13/19)</p>		
<p>19. As a wildfire survivor, I uniquely argued that there needed to be more urgency built into the WMPs for citizen safety and financial implications (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 5)</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>We note the reference to a claimed contribution is the proceeding’s procedural background, which does not necessitate a substantial contribution to the Decision. We remind Mr. Abrams to indicate where in discussion these comments were considered and substantially contributed to the Decision.</p>
<p>20. As a Management Strategy Consultant, I uniquely demonstrated that strategic plans needed to have clear and measurable goals and objectives and pointed to a number of areas where the WMPs did not meet these criteria. I provided clear direction as to how these could be incorporated into the plans.</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 2-3)  D.19-05-036 (pg. 25-26)  D.19-05-036 (sec. 10, pg. 30-36)  D.19-05-036 (pg. 41)  D.19-05-037 (pg. 44)</p>	<p>Verified</p>

(WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)		
21. I was the only party to demonstrate how to quantify and qualify risks and that should be the basis of any “risk mitigation plan”. All activities should be seen through this lens. (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)	D.19-05-036 (pg. 2-3) D.19-05-036 (pg. 25-26) D.19-05-036 (sec. 10, pg. 30-36) D.19-05-036 (pg. 41) D.19-05-037 (pg. 44)	Part of Issue #20.
22. I was the only party to analyze the “customer objections” as represented in the WMPs with subsequent data requests and helped the ALJs understand that these are not a significant source of external risks (less than 1%) (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)	Ruling ALJ Thomas 6/14/19, (pg. 6) “One party, William Abrams (Abrams), sought hearings, as well as discovery, on the amended Plan in a motion filed on April 29, 2019”	Noted. The June 14 Ruling denied Mr. Abrams’ motion for evidentiary hearing but ordered PG&E to respond discovery served by Mr. Abrams.  This claim does not cite where in a decision this contribution was used.
23. As someone who has managed risk mitigation/QA programs, I was able to uniquely analyze and identify where the “bowtie methodology” proposed by the IOUs was flawed. I identified specific areas of risk mitigation (reactive and escalation controls) that needed to be included in the plans. (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)	D.19-05-036 (sec. 10, pg. 30-36) D.19-05-036 (pg. 41) D.19-05-037 (pg. 2) D.19-05-037 (pg. 12) D.19-05-037 (pg. 42)	Verified, however, part of issue #20.
24. I proposed R&D thinktanks and mutual assistance agreements that needed to be formed prior to wildfires to address the self-identified backlog of device/equipment testing by		Noted. No citation provided.

<p>the IOUs during workshops associated with this proceeding. This was to supplement and be in-line with GO 166. (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)</p>		
<p>25. As someone who has worked on product and market strategy in the tech and telecom space, I analyzed and advocated for leveraging innovation in adjacent industries including High Availability (HA) technology that similarly leverage failover and redundancy in design (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (sec. 10, pg. 30-36) D.19-05-037 (pg. 36)</p>	<p>Unverified. It is not clear what contribution Mr. Abrams is citing in either decision.</p>
<p>26. As a former ED/CEO for organizations serving individuals with disabilities, I advocated for stronger controls relative to ensuring equitable delivery of service particularly during de-energization events when vulnerable populations would be most at risk. I also attended the Norther California CPUC de-energization meeting for vulnerable populations. (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-037 (pg. 37)</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>27. I provided detailed analysis and methodology recommendations on how to develop and incorporate performance-based metrics and risk reduction ratios (RRR) as the basis of the WMPs going forward. I argued that these were very different than activity metrics put forward by the IOUs. (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)</p>	<p>D.19-05-036 (pg. 2-3) D.19-05-036 (sec. 14, pg. 39) “The “metrics” the respondent electrical corporations propose focus on activities or inputs such as the numbers of trees cut down or miles of covered conductors installed.” D.19-05-036 (pg. 40) “Many of the activities the electrical corporations label as “metrics” are program targets.” D.19-05-036 (pg. 41) D.19-05-037 (pg. 2)</p>	<p>Verified, however, claimed contribution already discussed in Issue #20 and #21.</p>

	D.19-05-037 (pg. 28) D.19-05-037 (pg. 42-48)	
28. I provided examples of scorecards and other tools and methodologies to tie performance to ratepayer reimbursement as a basis for wildfire mitigation incentives. These recommendations were incorporated into this decision and in other proceedings. (WBA Opening Comments, 3/13/19)	D.19-05-036 (section 5.1.2, page 17)	Unverified. The page cited is a discussion on cost recovery and the prudent manager standard, not a discussion of scorecards or similar tools.

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

	<b>Intervenor’s Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<b>a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?<sup>4</sup></b>	Yes	Yes
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	Some parties supported and had complementary positions but no other party had a wildfire survivor perspective. No other parties with my pertinent professional background.	As noted, other parties advocated for similar positions.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b></p>	<p>A non-exhaustive list includes: POC, TURN, Cal Advocates, MGRA, CLECA, CEJA, CCSF, CFBF, Malibu, GPI, SBUA, and LA County.</p>
<p><b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b> As a wildfire survivor and as the only individual that is a party to the proceeding, I brought a unique perspective to these decisions. Given this unique role, it was important that I provided an understanding of the on-the-ground implications of the Wildfire Mitigation Plans to residents. Additionally, my professional background managing private and public organizations with a heavy focus on risk mitigation and analytics provided additional important context along with experience in adjacent industries including tech, telecom, emergency management solutions and diverse nonprofits.</p>	<p>While we find some overlap with other parties, that duplication is not significant enough to penalize, especially given the tight deadlines Mr. Abrams references.</p>

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

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion
	<p>Attended Prehearing Conference on February 26, 2019 not included in these references.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>24, 27, 28</p>	<p>Attended and Actively participated in all workshops associated with this proceeding to contribute recommendations and many voting meetings relative to the proceeding.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>26, 9, 11</p>	<p>Attended and actively participated in CPUC/PG&amp;E meeting for vulnerable population related to de-energization and other community meetings to provide recommendations (not included in these references above)</p>	<p>Verified</p>

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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



	CPUC Discussion
<p><b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b></p> <p>My request for intervenor compensation is based upon the unique perspective and professional background I bring to these proceedings. While other parties have focused on cost to ratepayers, legal requirements and other important issues, I have first and foremost focused on wildfire prevention and preparedness as it relates to the proposed utility Wildfire Mitigation Plans. As a wildfire survivor, I bring a sense of urgency and focus on these issues that is unique given my personal experience with the Northern California wildfires of October 2017. Since the fires, I have been actively working within wildfire survivor groups and nonprofit organizations locally and at the state-level to impact community adaptation given the increasing threats of wildfires within Sonoma County and across our state.</p> <p>As a professional who has worked for 20 plus years within many of the private industries and social service areas impacted by this proceeding, I also bring a unique perspective and a unique ability to focus on strategy and outcomes relative to the wildfire mitigation plan tactics proposed by the IOUs (see resume). I believe my work associated with this proceeding has provided specific and practical recommendations regarding how to move forward with a positive regulatory structure that balances ratepayer and utility interests. As a management and analytics professional that has been at the intersection of nonprofit and business, I have looked for solutions that are a win-win for all stakeholders. I have advocated for methodologies and regulatory tools that can improve the Wildfire Mitigation Plans in this phase and for future phases of the proceeding. I have managed large-scale emergency management initiatives and managed organizations and teams of subject matter experts in QA, analytics and communications.</p> <p>The aggressive timeline associated with this proceeding has meant that I have had to put other professional and personal endeavors on hold. I have had to turn down other clients and forgo other compensation to participate in this proceeding. That said, I am very appreciative that the commission accepted me as a party to this important proceeding. I feel it is my duty given what my family went through the night of October 8, 2017 to participate and contribute as much as I can to these important issues. Additionally, I feel I have a professional obligation to engage given the urgency of climate change and ongoing wildfire threats. I know that it will take diverse subject matter experts coming together to address these issues on behalf of Californians to identify and drive solutions and strategies. I have appreciated the collaborative work with other parties from diverse perspectives through the workshops and other meetings.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

**b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:**

I am seeking compensation for my 293 hours of work on this proceeding which does not include travel expenses. My work on this proceeding includes but is not limited to the following activities:

- 1) Comments Filed – Response to Wildfire Mitigation Plans and Proposed Decisions
- 2) Motions – Motions for Evidentiary Hearing, Motion to Compel, Motion for Leave
- 3) Data Requests – Requests to PG&E, SDG&E, Edison
- 4) Analysis – I conducted detailed analysis of the proposed WMPs and associated rulings/law to ensure I could provide specific recommendations
- 5) Meetings – Attended CPUC Meetings related to proceeding, Met with IOU and Non-Utility Parties to Proceeding, Workshops

I am not claiming compensation on much of my work that has informed my recommendations for these proceedings. During this same period of time, I have been working at the state and local level to develop perspective and recommendations regarding these proceedings. I have met with local wildfire survivor groups, nonprofit executives, Fire Chiefs, Fire Marshals as well as Local/State Elected Officials. Additionally, I have met with subject matter experts and former colleagues from my work in risk mitigation, quality assurance as well as executives in adjacent industries that have perspectives on these proceedings. My prior work in government, nonprofit and corporate environments provided me contacts and context to provide broad-based recommendations related to many facets of these proceedings.

Additionally, I am requesting compensation for 15.0 hours devoted to preparation of this request for compensation. This is a reasonable number of hours for preparing a compensation request of this scope especially given that this is the first time I am preparing this document.

Summary: The Commission should find that the number of hours claimed is fully reasonable in light of the scope and complexity of issues addressed in the decisions and the impact I have made in this proceeding.

We note many of the references lacked a substantive connection to the correlating decisions, with a primary citation being D.19-05-036 (Ordering Paragraph (OP) 8), which does not act on PG&E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan and will be considered in Phase 2. Per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide, at 20, citations must indicate “that the CPUC has adopted in whole or in part your contentions or recommendations.” While contributions may not be adopted, neither citation of D.19-05-036, OP 8 or the 6/14/19 Ruling indicate consideration or adoption of the corresponding claimed contributions. Due to this, we find the claimed hours unreasonable and reduce the total hours by 20%. We remind Mr. Abrams to provide references to a substantial contribution that do

	not summarize comments or procedural background.
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b> I have provided detailed analysis and recommendations on many issues associated with this proceeding. The following provides a general breakdown of the hours devoted to each category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk Analytics – Provided analysis relative to how to apply risk reduction ratios and performance-based metrics to the associated Wildfire Mitigation Plans. This included analysis of submitted party comments and IOU mitigation plans. (30%)</li> <li>• Communication/Outreach Plans – I have provided recommendations on how to develop a communications plan that is targeted and based upon results (15%)</li> <li>• Plan Approval – I spent time providing context regarding what constitutes a strategic plan vs. a framework or other type of documents. I have outlined what is central to a risk mitigation plan (10%)</li> <li>• Mitigation Tactics – I have developed specific recommendations on how to manage, monitor and mitigate risks associated with infrastructure hardening, vegetation management, de-energization, and other tactics proposed by the utilities (40%)</li> <li>• Equity and Service to Vulnerable Populations – I have worked to articulate differences in WMP approaches that can best serve vulnerable populations including people with disabilities and low-income populations (5%)</li> </ul>	We find the allocation of hours to be reasonable.

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
William B. Abrams (expert)	2019	165	\$290	D.19-05-036	\$47,850	132.00 [3]	\$155 [1]	\$20,460.00
William B. Abrams (expert)	2019	128	\$290	D.19-05-037	\$37,120	102.40 [3]	\$155 [1]	\$15,872.00
<b>Subtotal: \$84,970</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$36,332.00</b>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								

Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
William B. Abrams	2019	15	\$145	D.19-05-036 D.19-05-037	\$2,175	15	\$77.50 [1]	\$1,162.50
<b>Subtotal: \$2,175</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$1,162.50</b>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.	Travel Expenses	6 Trips from Santa Rosa to San Francisco at \$120/trip			\$720	\$0.00 [2]		
<b>Subtotal: \$720</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$87,865</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$37,494.50</b>		
<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 <sup>5</sup>	Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation			
N/A								

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Timesheet
Comment #1	Quoted hourly rate of William B. Abrams is less than ½ his usual hourly rate.

<sup>5</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch> .

Comment #2	Hours worked with Wildfire Survivor Groups, Nonprofits and Local/State Governmental Organizations and other SME Stakeholders to inform my recommendations in this proceeding were not included in this claim.
------------	---

**D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments**

Item	Reason
[1] Reduction in hourly rate	D.20-08-009 approved a 2019 rate of \$155 for Abrams, which we utilize here.
[2] Travel not reimbursed	The Commission does not reimburse intervenors for trips between locations that are less than 120 miles apart. Santa Rosa is roughly 55 miles from San Francisco. <i>See</i> D.10-11-032.
[3] Disallowance of hours for Mr. Abrams	We note many of the references in the claim lacked a substantive connection to the correlating decisions, with a primary citation being D.19-05-036, OP 8, which does not act on PG&E’s second amended Wildfire Mitigation Plan and will be considered in Phase 2. Per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide, at 20, citations must indicate “that the CPUC has adopted in whole or in part your contentions or recommendations.” While contributions do not need to adopt a party’s position in total, neither citation of D.19-05-036, OP 8, or the 6/14/19 Ruling indicate consideration or adoption of the corresponding claimed contributions. Due to this, we find the claimed hours unreasonable and reduce the total hours by 20% for a lack of substantial contribution.
[4] Lack of Substantial Contribution to D.19-05-038 and D.19-05-039	The request for compensation included D.19-05-036, D.19-05-037, D.19-05-038 and D.19-05-039, however, the submitted timesheet and the specific references to the claimed contributions in Part II.A reference D.19-05-036 and D.19-05-037 only. As a result, we could not verify contributions to D.19-05-038 and D.19-05-039 and disallow based on a lack of substantial contribution to the respective decisions. We note that due to the referenced contributions and corresponding timesheet, the award is based on works towards D.19-05-036 and D.19-05-037. Furthermore, we remind Mr. Abrams to include all relevant references for contributions to claimed decisions.

**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))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No
---	----

<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	No
--	----

If not:

<b>Party</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. William B. Abrams made a substantial contribution to D.19-05-036 and D.19-05-037.
2. The requested hourly rates for William B. Abrams, 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 \$37,494.50.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

**ORDER**

1. William B. Abrams is awarded \$37,494.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., and PacifiCorp shall pay William B. Abrams the total award. 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 October 14, 2019, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of William B. Abrams’ request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX**

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1905036, D1905037		
Proceeding(s):	R1810007		
Author:	ALJ Fogel		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., and PacifiCorp		

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
William B. Abrams	7/30/19	\$87,865	\$37,494.50	N/A	<i>See</i> CPUC Part III.D, CPUC Comments, Adjustments and Disallowances.

## Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
William	Abrams	Expert	\$290	2019	\$155

**(END OF APPENDIX)**