



PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED

07/18/24

02:42 PM

R2305018

July 18, 2024

Agenda ID #22767
Quasi-legislative

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN RULEMAKING 23-05-018:

This is the proposed decision of Commissioner Karen Douglas. 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 August 22, 2024 Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

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

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE

Michelle Cooke

Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC:nd3

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF COMMISSIONER DOUGLAS** (Mailed 7/18/2024)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**Order Instituting Rulemaking to Update and
Amend Commission General Order 131-D.

Rulemaking 23-05-018

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO
ACTON TOWN COUNCIL
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 23-12-035**

Intervenor: The Acton Town Council	For contribution to Decision (D.) 23-12-035
Claimed: \$12,963.43	Awarded: \$7,920.00
Assigned Commissioner: Karen Douglas	Assigned ALJs: Rajan Mutialu and Sophia J. Park

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	The decision adopts modifications to Commission General Order 131-D to conform it to the requirements of Senate Bill 529 (Hertzberg; Stats. 2022, ch. 357) and to correct outdated references.
--	--

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:	none	Verified The Commission “[did] not find it

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
		necessary to set a prehearing conference in this proceeding.” ²
2. Other specified date for NOI:	August 30, 2023	Verified
3. Date NOI filed:	August 27, 2023	August 28, 2023
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
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:	C.21-11-019	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	Sept 27, 2022	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	C.21-11-019	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	Sept 27, 2022	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.23-12-035	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	December 18, 2023	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	January 19, 2023	January 19, 2024
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

² See Scoping Ruling at 6 (filed July 31, 2023).

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
2	The “Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Memo And Ruling” Issued July 31, 2023 directed parties to file a “Notice of Intent” within 30 days of the issuance of the scoping memo (page 9); the deadline was August 30.	The Commission’s Scoping Ruling within this proceeding issued on July 31, 2023 stated that the deadline for NOIs must be filed “within 30 days after the issuance of [the] scoping memo.” Therefore, the deadline for NOIs was on August 30, 2023. <i>See</i> Scoping Ruling at 9.
7	In the “Notice of Intent” filed by the Acton Town Council on August 27, 2023, a showing of eligible customer status was made (see page 2) but, insofar as we are aware, no ruling on this showing has been issued. The Acton Town Council has been granted eligible customer status in numerous other proceedings, most recently in Proceeding C.21-11-019.	Noted. The Acton Town Council “Notice of Intent” was filed on August 28, 2023.
11	In the “Notice of Intent” filed by the Acton Town Council on August 27, 2023, a showing of “significant financial hardship” was made (see pages 5-6) but, insofar as we are aware, no ruling on this showing has been issued. The Acton Town Council has been issued findings of “significant financial hardship” in numerous other proceedings, most recently in Proceeding C.21-11-019.	Noted. The Acton Town Council “Notice of Intent” was filed on August 28, 2023.

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

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

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. The Acton Town Council pointed out that every transmission project involves an “extension, expansion, or modification to existing	Acton Town Council (ATC) Reply Comments on PD [pg. 2]	Verified

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>transmission facilities” which is why such terms must be defined to establish “thresholds for determining which transmission projects must undergo the CPCN process and which are eligible to undergo the PTC process”. The Final Decision acknowledges this contribution: “<i>The Acton Town Council argues that every transmission project involves an extension, expansion, or modification to existing transmission facilities</i>”.</p>	<p>ATC Reply Comments on PD [pg. 3]</p> <p>D.23-12-035 [pgs. 13-14]</p>	
<p>2. The Acton Town Council, Sierra Club and CBD argued the Proposed Decision was ambiguous because critical terms were not defined; D.23-12-035 acknowledges this “<i>the Acton Town Council, CBD, and Sierra Club, argue that the terms “extension, expansion, upgrade, or other modification” are ambiguous and require further definition</i>”.</p>	<p>ATC Reply Comments on PD [pg. 3]</p> <p>D.23-12-035 [pg. 13].</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>3. D.23-12-035 agrees with the Acton Town Council, Sierra Club, and CBD that terms must be defined: “<i>We agree it would be useful to develop definitions or examples of the types of transmission projects that would qualify as an ‘extension, expansion, upgrade, or other modification’</i>”.</p>	<p>D.23-12-035 [pg. 14].</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>4. The OIR invited parties to provide input on whether</p>		<p>The claimed contributions on</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>GO 131-D should be amended to create a process for permitting battery storage facilities (Scoping Issue 2.c) and Attachment B of the OIR recommended that battery projects > 50 MW be approved via a Permit To Construct. The Acton Town Council was the only party to point out that this recommendation is contrary to AB 205 which expressly identifies the “Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity” (“CPCN”) process as the mechanism whereby the Commission asserts jurisdiction over battery storage facilities proposed by investor owned utilities. The ATC is also the only party to demonstrate that battery projects should always be subject to the highest levels of scrutiny because of the public safety hazards they pose (particularly in high fire hazard areas). The ATC is also the only party to argue that Battery projects should be subject to full CPCN notice procedures because of the dangers they pose. The Commission appears to have decided to not move forward with permitting battery facilities via the PTC process because it is not authorized in the Phase 1 decision and it is not identified as a scoping issue in Phase 2. The reasons for this decision are not stated, but it is believed that the ATC’s</p>	<p>ATC Opening Comments on OIR [pg.4]</p> <p>ATC Opening Comments on OIR [pg.5]</p> <p>ATC Opening Comments on OIR [pg.5]</p> <p>D.23-12-035</p> <p>Phase 2 Scoping Memo & Ruling</p>	<p>Issue 2.c did not substantially contribute to D.23-12-035 as the issue was outside the scope of Phase 1. <i>See</i> CPUC Comments in Part III.D [2].</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
arguments contributed to this decision.		
<p>5. The Acton Town Council was among the few parties in this proceeding to advocate that GO 131-D should be revised only to the extent necessary to implement SB 529 and update references and language to be consistent with current Commission policies and standards (Scoping Issues 1, 2.a, and 2.h). D.23-12-035 concurred: <i>“The scope of Phase 1 of this proceeding is limited to implementing changes to GO 131-D required by SB 529 and updating outdated references.”</i></p>	<p>ATC Reply Comments on OIR [pgs.4.5]</p> <p>D.23-12-035 [FOF #1].</p>	<p>The claimed contributions on Issues 2.a and 2.h did not substantially contribute to D.23-12-035 as the issues were outside the scope of Phase 1. <i>See</i> CPUC Comments in Part III.D [2].</p>
<p>6. The Acton Town Council opposed Attachment B of the OIR because it incorporated substantial changes to GO 131-D that went far beyond what was required to implement SB 529 and the Council generally supported Attachment A of the OIR. D.23-12-035 acknowledges this <i>“Acton Town Council, Transmission Owners, Long Beach, Large-Scale Solar Association, and CASMU expressed support for the modifications proposed in OIR Attachment A”</i>. In the end, D.23-12-035 did not adopt Attachment B and instead adopted Attachment A with some modifications.</p>	<p>ATC Opening Comments on OIR [pg.3]</p> <p>D.23-12-035 [pg. 6].</p> <p>D.23-12-035 [page 6]</p>	<p>Verified</p>

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?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Center for Biological Diversity and Sierra Club.		Verified
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Most parties in this proceeding had positions that were contrary to the Acton Town Council’s so collaboration was challenging; however, we did collaborate to the extent possible. For example, the Acton Town Council joined with Cal Advocates, CBD, and other parties in filing a response to a Joint Motion made by a majority of the parties to set aside submittal of this proceeding in favor of a proposed Settlement Agreement. Additionally, regarding the four issues that the ATC addressed during Phase 1, great care was taken to not offer duplicate arguments or repeat the positions taken by others. Instead, ATC’s comments and arguments reflected our unique perspectives as a small rural unincorporated community and our unique experiences with critical transmission projects in Southern California which are born from the fact that Acton is the crossroads for all critical transmission pathways serving southern California: it is the home of SCE’s Vincent substation; it is traversed by critical connections to Path 27 operated by LA Department of Water & Power; it is the Southern Terminus of Path 26; and it is traversed by more than 15 critical SCE transmission lines. The ATC’s “local perspective” on transmission development differs significantly from other parties in this proceeding; it is why our comments reflect a unique viewpoint. For example, though the Acton Town Council, Sierra Club, and CBD all argued that certain critical terms must be defined in GO 131, the foundation for the Acton Town Council’s arguments differed from that of Sierra Club and CBD. Specifically, our argument was based on our historic understanding of every CAISO’s Transmission Plan issued since at least 2006 and was rooted in the Commission’s own testimony before the legislature during the debate on SB 529. The Acton Town Council’s “local perspective” ensured that our comments were unique and non-duplicative of the arguments offered by other parties.		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>The Acton Town Council seeks an intervenor compensation award of \$12,963.79 as the reasonable cost of our participation in Phase 1 of this proceeding. The Acton Town Council requests that the Commission find these costs reasonable in light of our substantial contribution to the record (detailed in Part II above) as well as the importance of the issues that we raised in defense of the environment and to ensure that Senate Bill 529 would be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the Commission’s stance on SB 529 that was presented to the legislature.</p> <p>At every turn, the Acton Town Council provided substantive comments on the 4 issues that we addressed in Phase 1; we were also very judicious with our time and did not address issues that were not germane to our community (such as lead agency issues, cost transparency issues, local government notice issues, etc.). All of our comments regarding SB 529 implementation were solidly supported by facts, citations, and evidence and stand unrefuted in the record. Moreover, the information we provided broadened the Commission’s consideration of how SB 529 should be implemented because, among other things, we demonstrated why the Commission needed to define critical terms and thereby achieve the legislature’s intent that SB 529 would apply only to “environmentally responsible” transmission projects that are “least likely to pose rate concerns”. While it is not possible to assign a dollar value to ensuring that SB 529 is implemented as the legislature intended, D.23-12-035 indicates that the Acton Town Council did contribute to ensuring that SB 529 would be properly implemented in a manner that benefits all California ratepayers. Therefore, the Commission should find the Acton Town Council’s cost claims to be reasonable.</p>	<p>Noted. <i>See</i> CPUC Comments in Part III.D [2].</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>As indicated in the attached spreadsheet, the Acton Town Council expended 75 hours to participate in this proceeding and another 5 hours preparing the NOI and the ICOMP request. The majority of time was concentrated on Issue 1 (“What changes should be adopted to GO 131-D to conform it to the requirements of SB 529?”) and Issue 2h (Should the Commission modify GO 131 to adopt other changes to GO 131-D as needed”) and most of these efforts were expended in</p>	<p>Noted. <i>See</i> CPUC Comments in Part III.D [2].</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>addressing extensive and lengthy comments and motions filed by the majority of parties who sought to revise GO 131-D in a manner that did not comport with SB 529 or was unrelated to SB 529 or was contrary to the legislative intent behind SB 529. These comments and motions required time and effort to review, analyze, and prepare responses. For instance, a majority of the parties in this proceeding filed a motion to set aside submittal of this proceeding in favor of a “Settlement Agreement” that proposed a version of GO 131 that greatly exceeded the scope of SB 529; the Acton Town Council had to expend considerable effort to repudiate this Settlement Agreement. Fortunately, the analysis and comments that the Acton Town Council prepared in response to this Settlement Agreement provided the foundation for our comments on the Proposed Decision; this allowed us to efficiently and expeditiously prepare opening and reply comments on the Proposed Decision. The remaining hours were spent addressing 1) the OIR’s proposal for permitting battery storage projects (which the Acton Town Council addressed with a unique perspective) and 2) GO-131 revisions necessary to address CPUC changes since 1995 (which was presented in some detail in the OIR and therefore required a little time to address at the beginning of the Proceeding, but did not require subsequent effort). For all these reasons, the Acton Town Council believes that the number of hours we are claiming is reasonable.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>Issue 1: 52.2% Issue 2a: 5.9% Issue 2c: 7.5% Issue 2h: 28.1% NOI and ICOMP Request of 6 hours total: 6.3%</p>	Noted

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Jacqueline Ayer	2023	75	\$167.27	See Comment 1	\$12,545.25	45.75 [2]	\$165.00 [1]	\$7,548.75
Subtotal: \$12,545.25						Subtotal: \$7,548.75		

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Jacqueline Ayer	2023	5	\$83.64	Half of \$167.27 requested rate	\$418.18	4.5 [3]	\$82.50 [1]	\$371.25
<i>Subtotal: \$418.18</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$371.25</i>		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$12,963.43						TOTAL AWARD: \$7,920.00		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§ 1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation					
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A ⁴					

**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	Spreadsheet of Hours
Comment 1	The rate is based on the \$155 hourly rate for 2021 that was assigned to Ms. Ayer in D.23-03-040 with a 3.31% escalation rate for 2022 and a 4.46% escalation rate for 2023 as set forth in hourly rate chart effective 1/1/2021.

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

⁴ ATC had no attorneys present in this proceeding, so we labelled all parts of this section as not applicable (N/A).

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason																				
[1] Jacqueline Ayer (Ayer) 2023 Hourly Rate	Although ATC requested a 2023 intervenor rate of \$167.27 for Ayer, we ultimately adopt the rate of \$165. D.23-03-040 authorized a 2021 hourly rate of \$155 for Ayer. We applied the 2022 annual escalation rate of 3.31% and the 2023 annual escalation rate of 4.46% per Resolution ALJ-393 and rounded to the nearest \$5.																				
[2] Disallowance — Hours Claimed Outside Phase 1	<p>We disallow the following hours Ayer claimed addressing issues 2.a, 2.c, and 2.h as they are outside the scope of Phase 1 of the proceeding and the issues addressed in Decision (D.) 23-12-035.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="500 730 1406 1287"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="500 730 808 842">Issue</th> <th data-bbox="808 730 915 842">Year</th> <th data-bbox="915 730 1073 842">Total Claimed Hours</th> <th data-bbox="1073 730 1252 842">Hours Disallowed</th> <th data-bbox="1252 730 1406 842">Hours Awarded</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="500 842 808 1031">2a: “GO 131-D Revisions To Address CPUC Changes since 1995?”</td> <td data-bbox="808 842 915 1031">2023</td> <td data-bbox="915 842 1073 1031">4.75</td> <td data-bbox="1073 842 1252 1031">4.75</td> <td data-bbox="1252 842 1406 1031">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="500 1031 808 1178">2c: “GO 131-D Revisions for Permitting Battery Projects”</td> <td data-bbox="808 1031 915 1178">2023</td> <td data-bbox="915 1031 1073 1178">6.0</td> <td data-bbox="1073 1031 1252 1178">6.0</td> <td data-bbox="1252 1031 1406 1178">0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="500 1178 808 1287">2h: “GO 131-D Revisions to Address Other Needs”</td> <td data-bbox="808 1178 915 1287">2023</td> <td data-bbox="915 1178 1073 1287">22.5</td> <td data-bbox="1073 1178 1252 1287">18.5</td> <td data-bbox="1252 1178 1406 1287">4*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="500 1325 1427 1539">The Scoping Ruling states, “Phase 1 shall consider what changes to GO 131-D are necessary to conform it to the requirements of SB 529 and to update outdated references.” (See Scoping Ruling filed on July 31, 2023 at 4.) D.23-12-035 at Conclusion of Law 9 states, “[p]roposals to modify GO 131-D, which are not within the scope of Phase 1, should be considered during Phase 2.”</p> <p data-bbox="500 1577 1427 1749">Since D.23-12-035 only addressed Phase 1 issues, a finding cannot be made that the time spent by ATC on Phase 2 issues made a substantial contribution to D.23-12-035. This does not preclude ATC from filing a request for compensation for the hours disallowed above for issues 2.a, 2.c, and 2.h following the Phase 2 Decision.</p>	Issue	Year	Total Claimed Hours	Hours Disallowed	Hours Awarded	2a: “GO 131-D Revisions To Address CPUC Changes since 1995?”	2023	4.75	4.75	0	2c: “GO 131-D Revisions for Permitting Battery Projects”	2023	6.0	6.0	0	2h: “GO 131-D Revisions to Address Other Needs”	2023	22.5	18.5	4*
Issue	Year	Total Claimed Hours	Hours Disallowed	Hours Awarded																	
2a: “GO 131-D Revisions To Address CPUC Changes since 1995?”	2023	4.75	4.75	0																	
2c: “GO 131-D Revisions for Permitting Battery Projects”	2023	6.0	6.0	0																	
2h: “GO 131-D Revisions to Address Other Needs”	2023	22.5	18.5	4*																	

Item	Reason
	<p>*We allow the following hours which related to the drafting and completion of the comments on the proposed decision as these presentations fit within the scope of Phase 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11/15/2023: “Completed Opening Comments on Proposed Decision” — 1 • 11/15/2023: “Reviewed Other Party’s Opening Comments on the Proposed Decision” — 1 Hour • 11/20/2023: “Completed Reply Comments on Proposed Decision” — 2 hours
<p>[3] Incomplete Intervenor Compensation (IComp) Claim Preparation</p>	<p>To avoid any further disallowances in the future, we remind ATC to complete all sections of the IComp claim template highlighted in green (“<i>Green items to be completed by Intervenor</i>”). ATC did not complete Part IV and the Appendix of the claim, therefore we disallow 10% (0.5 hours) from their total IComp Claim Preparation hours.</p>

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

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

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Acton Town Council has made a substantial contribution to D.23-12-035.
2. The requested hourly rates of Acton Town Council’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 \$7,920.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Acton Town Council is awarded \$7,920.00.
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, Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC, and PacifiCorp d.b.a. Pacific Power shall pay Acton Town Council their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2023 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data are unavailable, the most recent 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 April 3, 2024, the 75th day after the filing of Acton Town Council's 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):	D2312035		
Proceeding(s):	R2305018		
Author:	ALJ Mutialu, ALJ Park		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric) LLC, and PacifiCorp d.b.a. Pacific Power		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/ Disallowance
The Acton Town Council	Jan. 19, 2024	\$12,963.43	\$7,920.00	N/A	See Part III.D, CPUC Comments, Disallowances and Adjustments.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Jacqueline	Ayer	Expert	\$167.25	2023	\$165

(END OF APPENDIX)