



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

**FILED**

09/08/23

09:25 AM

A2102020

September 8, 2023

**Agenda ID #21858**  
**Ratesetting**

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 21-02-020:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Jason Jungreis. 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 October 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:nd3  
Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ JUNGREIS** (Mailed 9/8/2023)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

In the Matter of the Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority to Issue Recovery Bonds for Fire Risk Mitigation Expenditures Pursuant to Article 5.8 of the California Public Utilities Code. (U39E.)

Application 21-02-020

**DECISION DENYING COMPENSATION CLAIM OF  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK**

<b>Intervenor:</b> The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 21-06-030</b>
<b>Claimed:</b> \$69,891.25	<b>Awarded:</b> \$0.00
<b>Assigned Commissioner:</b> Alice Reynolds	<b>Assigned ALJ:</b> Jason Jungreis

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	In Decision (D.) 21-06-030, the Commission granted the request of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) for authority to issue Recovery Bonds and thereby to securitize certain capital expenditures the Commission previously found reasonable and otherwise eligible for rate recovery. The decision authorizes recovery of the bond-related principal, interest and costs via a Fixed Recovery Charge. It also approved creation of a Finance Team for ongoing review of the Recovery Bond and associated transactions and addressed the process for presentation and review of requests for future financing orders.
--	--

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812<sup>1</sup>:**

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verification</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	3/30/21	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	04/9/21	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:	Rulemaking (R.) 20-08-021	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	12/11/21	12/11/2020
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.20-08-021	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	12/11/21	12/11/2020
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.21-06-030	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	June 24, 2021	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	August 23, 2020	8/23/2021
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

**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>
<p><b>Overview:</b> The statutory definition of “substantial contribution” in Section 1802 of the PU Code states that a contribution results because the Commission “has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.” The Commission has interpreted the “in whole or in part” provision, in conjunction with Section 1801.3, so as to effectuate the legislature’s intent to encourage effective and efficient intervenor participation.</p> <p>The standard for an award of intervenor compensation is whether TURN made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s decision, not whether TURN prevailed on a particular issue, or on every issue. For example, the Commission has recently confirmed a series of earlier awards which recognized that TURN may be found to have “substantially contributed to the decision-making process because the Commission benefited from the legal and factual arguments TURN made,” even where the</p>		<p>The Commission did not find TURN’s participation D.21-06-030 constituted a substantial contribution.</p> <p>“Substantial Contribution” as defined in Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code § 1802(j) requires that the intervenor has substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the intervenor.</p> <p>D.21-06-030 found that TURN’s major positions regarding Fixed Recovery Charge exemption for CARE/FERA customers and implementation of an annual rate allocation reassessment for Recovery Bonds were not useful to the conclusions reached in D.21-06-030 and even contradicted TURN’s own position in a previous settlement (see D.21-06-030, page 80).</p>

<p><b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b></p>	<p><b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b></p>	<p><b>CPUC Discussion</b></p>
<p>decision did not adopt TURN’s position.</p> <p>TURN’s substantial contribution to D.21-06-030 appears in several ways. First, on one issue (the treatment of Construction Work in Progress, or CWIP), the Commission agreed with and adopted an outcome consistent with TURN’s position. However, TURN acknowledges that the Commission did not adopt its recommended outcome on many of the other issues addressed in the proceeding. For those issues, TURN is making a showing on substantial contribution based largely on its contribution to the decision-making process, even where the final decision did not agree with our recommended outcomes on the disputed issues. While unusual for TURN, the Commission has previously recognized that TURN may demonstrate its substantial contribution in this way (<i>see</i>, D.19-10-019 (in Aliso Canyon Section 455.5 Investigation), D.08-04-004 (in SCE Long Beach PPA application), and D.10-06-046 (in SCE carbon sequestration study funding application)). TURN more fully describes the basis for this approach in Attachment 5 to this request.</p>		

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CPUC Discussion</b></p>
<p><b>1. Preference for capital expenditures in rate base rather than CWIP to maximize securitization savings to ratepayers</b></p> <p>PG&amp;E’s application and supporting testimony indicated it was treating capital expenditures recorded as CWIP as indistinguishable from capital expenditures already in rate base for purposes of eligibility for securitization under AB 1054. TURN argued that the reduced return applicable to CWIP as opposed to rate base meant inclusion of CWIP could violate the statutory directive to achieve the maximum rate reduction possible, even on a present value basis. The Commission recognized the significance of the different levels of return on CWIP and rate base and directed PG&amp;E to take all practicable measures, as expeditiously as possible, to move CWIP expenditures into rate base in order to maximize the ratepayer savings.</p>	<p>TURN Protest, pp. 9-10; TURN Opening Brief, pp. 3-7.</p> <p>D.21-06-030, pp. 76-77 and Conclusion of Law 76.</p>	<p>The factual contentions of the CWIP issue were apparent on its face.</p> <p>TURN’s addressing the CWIP issue in D.21-06-030 was not enough to qualify as a “Substantial Contribution” since it did not substantially assist the commission in the making of its order or decision.</p>
<p><b>2. Development of extensive evidentiary record while avoiding the need for hearings.</b></p> <p>Section 1802(j) of the PU Code defines “substantial contribution” to include adoption in whole or in part of a specific policy or procedural recommendation</p>	<p>Joint Motion for the Admission of Evidence, submitted April 23, 2021.</p>	<p>The Commission did not find TURN’s participation D.21-06-030 constituted a substantial contribution.</p> <p>“Substantial Contribution” as defined in Pub. Util. Code § 1802(j) requires that the intervenor has substantially</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CPUC Discussion</b></p>
<p>presented by an eligible customer. Here, the effort to achieve an adequately-developed evidentiary record within the constraints of the 120-day period set by statute for such securitization applications represents such a substantial contribution. For example, TURN actively participated in the effort leading up to the Joint Motion for the Admission of Evidence, which identified the materials parties other than PG&amp;E were submitting in lieu of prepared testimony. The Commission cited this process and the GRC Phase II settlement material included in the Joint Motion as being particularly helpful for the resolution of the inter-class allocation issues regarding the Fixed Recovery Charge. (To be clear, TURN continues to not agree with the Commission’s interpretation of the proposed settlement as a basis for establishing allocation for the entire life of the bonds, a change made between issuance of the Proposed Decision and adoption of the final decision.) In addition to this specific example, TURN submits that its participation in this accelerated proceeding helped enable the Commission to have a sufficiently developed record as necessary to reach determinations on a financial transaction of this magnitude</p>	<p>D.21-06-030, pp. 8 and 78-79.</p>	<p>assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the intervenor. None of the conclusions reached in D.21-06-030 were based on factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by TURN.</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
within relatively severe time constraints.		

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<b>a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?<sup>2</sup></b>	Yes	Verified
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	Yes	Verified
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b> Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC), Wild Tree Foundation		Verified
<p><b>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:</b></p> <p>There were a number of active intervenors with positions that were similar to those TURN took on some but not all of the key issues in this proceeding. For example, Cal Advocates seemed to find PG&amp;E’s proposed securitization transaction generally reasonable, as the staff’s opening brief raised no objection to any element of PG&amp;E’s proposal. Wild Tree Foundation focused on the need for a “Finance Team,” and the reasonableness of specific servicer and administrative costs. EPUC addressed cost allocation issues at a high level, and the process for presenting future securitization requests.</p> <p>Given the array of issues addressed and positions taken among the intervenors, effective coordination among the parties would have been challenging at best. The accelerated timetable for this proceeding made it even more difficult than usual to closely coordinate with other intervenors holding similar positions on at least some of the issues TURN addressed in the proceeding. However, TURN sought to coordinate with other active intervenors on both substantive and procedural matters at relevant times during the proceeding.</p> <p>The Commission should find that TURN's participation was reasonably coordinated with the participation of the Public Advocates Office and other intervenors under the circumstances so as to avoid undue duplication, and to ensure that, whenever duplication occurred, it served to supplement,</p>		Noted

<sup>2</sup> The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.



	<b>Intervenor’s Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
	complement, or contribute to the showing of the other intervenors. And consistent with such a finding, the Commission should determine that all of TURN’s work is compensable consistent with the conditions set forth in Section 1802.5.	

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p><b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b></p> <p>TURN typically illustrates the cost reasonableness of its efforts by comparing the requested amount of compensation with the dollar value attributable at least in part to its efforts, usually in the form of reductions to the authorized revenue requirement or authorized cost recovery. Here, PG&amp;E’s application presented issues for which a direct revenue requirement impact is not immediately calculable, as the securitization transaction has not yet occurred. However, the Recovery Bond has a total principal amount of approximately \$1.2 billion for the “Initial AB 1054 CapEx,” with additional upfront financing costs forecast to be approximately \$13.3 million. TURN’s request for compensation totals approximately \$70,000 and is a very small fraction of just the associated fees and costs for the transaction. TURN’s efforts to ensure that the Commission-approved transaction would actually achieve rate reductions to the maximum extent possible and were allocated fairly among customer classes and to customers eligible for the CARE and FERA exemptions promoted important ratepayer protections. The Commission should find reasonable TURN’s requested amount of compensation here given the importance of the issues implicated in this proceeding.</p>	Noted
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>TURN’s attorneys and analysts recorded a reasonable number of hours for their work in this matter. The total hours of professional time included in this request for compensation (90 hours, excluding compensation-related entries) is the equivalent of just over two weeks of full-time work for a single attorney. TURN’s efforts covered the initial review and analysis of PG&amp;E’s application, coordination with other interested parties, preparation of a detailed and wide-ranging protest to</p>	Noted

	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p>the application, preparation for and participation in the prehearing conference as well as the informational meeting PG&amp;E conducted, preparation of an opening and reply brief, and review of the Proposed Decision and preparation of opening comments. This cumulative total should be found reasonable under the circumstances.</p> <p>The vast majority of the requested hours represent the work of Robert Finkelstein, TURN’s General Counsel, who served as the organization’s lead attorney in this proceeding. TURN staff attorneys Elise Borden and Matthew Freedman both assisted with cost allocation issues based on prior and concurrent experience on related issues in recent proceedings.</p> <p><u>Compensation Request Preparation Time:</u> TURN is requesting compensation for 5.5 hours devoted to compensation-related matters, of which 5.0 hours is for preparation of this request for compensation. Mr. Finkelstein prepared this request for compensation because his role as lead attorney for TURN for the majority of this proceeding enabled him to prepare the request in a far more efficient manner than if it were prepared by a TURN attorney less familiar with the proceeding and TURN’s work therein.</p> <p>TURN submits that the recorded hours are reasonable. Therefore, TURN seeks compensation for all of the hours recorded by our attorneys that are included in this request.</p>	
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>TURN has allocated all of our attorney time by issue area or activity, as evident on the timesheets attached to this request. TURN typically employs codes that relate to specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN in a proceeding, as well as general activities that are part of nearly all CPUC proceedings, such as tasks associated with general participation, and work undertaken after the Proposed Decision issues. Here, TURN has taken a slightly different approach. For much of the work, particularly with regard to preparing briefs and comments on the Proposed Decision, TURN’s efforts addressed a variety of issues associated with the determination of the reasonableness of PG&amp;E’s proposed securitization and associated ratemaking issues, but in a relatively compressed period that required near-simultaneous work on each issue. Therefore, TURN has included several categories that allocate the recorded time by period of work rather than specific issues (#, OB and RB). For each of these categories, TURN has provided an estimate of how the time would be allocated among specific issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

		CPUC Discussion
<b>Code</b>	<b>Stands for:</b>	
CWIP	Construction Work in Progress – issues regarding reasonableness of securitizing amounts treated as CWIP rather than rate base, particularly from maximum cost reduction perspective	
CostAlloc	Cost Allocation – issues associated with both general inter-class cost allocation	
CARE	Issues regarding implementation of CARE exemption in light of statutory cap on overall CARE reduction	
#	Time entries that cover substantive issue work that cannot easily be identified with a specific activity code. Here, the work on maximum reduction, cost allocation, process for future applications, and bill presentation issues often occurred during the same day and were hard to specifically identify. TURN proposes that the Commission allocate these entries as follows: 30% to inter-class allocation issues; 30% to CARE/FERA exemption issues; 20% to inclusion of CWIP issues; and 20% to other.	
OB	Opening Brief – again, the work on many of the issues covered in the opening brief is not easily identified by specific activity due to the interrelated work on reasonableness and cost sharing issues. TURN proposes that the Commission allocate these entries as follows: 30% to inter-class allocation issues; 30% to CARE/FERA exemption issues; 20% to inclusion of CWIP issues; and 20% to other.	
RB	Reply Brief. TURN proposes that the Commission allocate these entries as follows: 30% to inter-class allocation issues; 30% to CARE/FERA exemption issues; 20% to inclusion of CWIP issues; and 20% to other.	
GP	General Participation -- work that is essential to TURN’s participation but would not vary with the number of issues that TURN addresses, for the most part. This code appears most regularly during early stages of a proceeding, such as the initial review of the application and testimony, the preparation of the protest and participation in the prehearing conference, and other tasks throughout the course of the proceeding that are of a more general nature.	

		CPUC Discussion
Coord	Coordination with other parties –e-mails and phone calls w/ PG&E and Indicated Shippers re: procedural and substantive matters	
PD	Proposed Decision -- work on reviewing, analyzing, and commenting on the Proposed Decision and revisions thereto; preparing reply comments; and participating in <i>ex parte</i> meetings.	
Comp	Time devoted to compensation-related pleadings	

TURN submits that under the circumstances this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission’s rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein	2021	80.75	\$785.00	New 2021 Rate	\$63,388.75	0.00 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Matthew Freedman	2021	5.75	\$625.00	New 2021 Rate	\$3,593.75	0.00 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
Elise Torres	2021	1.5	\$500.00	New 2021 Rate	\$750.00	0.00 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal: \$67,732.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00 [1]</b>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein	2021	5.5	\$392.50	50% of 2021 rate	\$2,158.75	0.00 [1]	N/A [2]	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal: \$2,158.75</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00 [1]</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$69,891.25</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$0.00[1]</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</p>								

CLAIMED		CPUC AWARD	
adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor's 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			
ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>3</sup>	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Robert Finkelstein	June 1990	146391	No
Matthew Freedman	March 2001	214812	No
Elise Torres	December 2011	280443	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
Attachment 2	<b>Attorney Time Sheet Detail</b>
Attachment 3	<b>Justification for 2021 Hourly Rate for Robert Finkelstein, including resumé</b>
Attachment 4	<b>TURN Hours Allocated by Issue</b>
Attachment 5	<b>Substantial Contribution Discussion</b>
Comment 1	<p><b>2021 Hourly Rates for TURN Staff Members</b></p> <p><u>Robert Finkelstein</u>: TURN provides the justification for the requested hourly rate of \$785 for Mr. Finkelstein in Attachment 3, pursuant to the directions in Res. ALJ-393.</p> <p><u>Matthew Freedman</u>: TURN filed an intervenor compensation claim in Application (A.) 19-02-015 on February 19, 2021, that included a request that the Commission adopt an hourly rate of \$625 for Matthew Freedman's work in 2021, based on the Market Rate Study and guidance adopted in</p>

<sup>3</sup> 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>Res. ALJ-393. The Commission has yet to act upon that intervenor compensation claim. Rather than repeat the same showing here for the requested hourly rate for Mr. Freedman, TURN refers the Commission to the showing presented in A.19-02-015.</p> <p><u>Elise Torres</u>: TURN filed an intervenor compensation claim in A.19-10-012 on June 17, 2021, that included a request that the Commission adopt an hourly rate of \$500 for Elise Torres’s work in 2021, based on the Market Rate Study and guidance adopted in Res. ALJ-393. The Commission has yet to act upon that intervenor compensation claim. Rather than repeat the same showing here for the requested hourly rate for Ms. Torres, TURN refers the Commission to the showing presented in A.19-10-012.</p>

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

Item	Reason
[1] Disallowance of Hours Claimed	The hours claimed are disallowed for TURN’s failure to substantially contribute to D.21-06-030.
[2] Hourly Rates	Due to the disallowance of all the hours claimed, we do not reach the issue of the reasonableness of the requested hourly rates.

**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:</b> Did any party oppose the Claim?	No
<b>B. Comment Period:</b> Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Utility Reform Network has not made a substantial contribution to Decision 21-06-030.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above fails to satisfy all requirements of Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812.

**ORDER**

1. The Utility Reform Network request for intervenor compensation for contribution to Decision 21-06-030 is denied.
2. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_, California.

## APPENDIX

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D2106030		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	A2102020		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Jungreis		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	N/A		

## Intervenor Information

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Date Claim Filed</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/ Disallowance</b>
The Utility Reform Network	August 23, 2021	\$69,891.25	\$0.00	N/A	<i>See Part III.D, CPUC Comments, Disallowances and Adjustments</i>

## Hourly Fee Information

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Attorney, Expert, or Advocate</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	\$785	2021	N/A
Matthew	Freedman	Attorney	\$625	2021	N/A
Elise	Torres	Attorney	\$500	2021	N/A

(END OF APPENDIX)