ALJ/VUK/rp4 **PROPOSED DECISION Agenda #17080**

Ratesetting

Decision

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of Energy Efficiency Rolling Portfolio Business Plan | Application 17-01-013 |
| And Related Matters | Application 17-01-014  Application 17-01-015  Application 17-01-016  Application 17-01-017 |

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION**

**D.18-01-004 AND D.18-05-041**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Intervenor: Natural Resources Defense Council | For contribution to Decision (D.) 18-01-004 & D.18‑05-041 |
| Claimed: $121,655.00 | Awarded: $121,987.50 |
| Assigned Commissioner: Peterman | Assigned ALJ: Fitch/Kao |

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. Brief description of Decision: | D.18-01-004 addresses the required process for third party solicitations in the context of the rolling portfolio energy efficiency programs.  D.18-05-041 approves the energy efficiency business plans of eight program administrators. |

1. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intervenor | CPUC Verified |
| Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)): | | |
| 1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC): | 3/16/18 | March 16, 2017 |
| 2. Other specified date for NOI: | n/a |  |
| 3. Date NOI filed: | 4/17/17 | Verified |
| 4. Was the NOI timely filed? | | Yes |
| Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)): | | |
| 5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number: | A.17-01-013 *et al*. | Verified |
| 6. Date of ALJ ruling: | May 3, 2017 | Verified |
| 7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify): | n/a |  |
| 8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status? | | Yes |
| Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)): | | |
| 9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number: | A A.17-01-013 *et al.* | Verified |
| 10. Date of ALJ ruling: | May 3, 2017 | Verified |
| 11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify): | n/a |  |
| 12. 12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship? | | Yes |
| Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)): | | |
| 13. Identify Final Decision: | D.18-01-004 and D.18-05-041 | Verified |
| 14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision: | 6/5/18 | 1/17/18 and 6/5/18 |
| 15. File date of compensation request: | 8/6/18 | Verified |
| 16. Was the request for compensation timely? | | Yes |

1. Additional Comments on Part I:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| # | Additional Comments |
| 1 | The substantive entries for each decision are divided into 2 tables. Table 1 covers D.18-01-004 and Table 2 covers D.18-05-041. |

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION:**

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

TABLE 1: D.18-01-004

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s) | Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s) | CPUC Discussion |
| Substantive Contribution to D.18-01-004 – This entry matches xls sheet “L.Ettenson D.18-01-004” | | |
| C. Overall Structure and Need for Procurement Review Group (PRG)  NRDC was primarily responsible for convening parties through the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) process to discuss the need for a PRG, how it should be structured, and how it should be implemented. In addition, NRDC drafted the documents for parties to review and presented to the subgroups and full CAEECC meetings.  The proposal for general structure (*e.g.*, there should be a PRG for all IOUs with an independent evaluator (IE)) was ultimately adopted by the final decision. | NRDC Comments:   * 3/3/17 pp.7-9 * 8/18/17 pp.2-4 and Attachment * 9/25/17 p.5 * 12/4/17 p.4-5   D.18-01-004  FOF 7, p.54  FOF 9, p.54  FOF 10, p.54  COL 11-12, p.57  OP 3-4, p.61 | Verified |
| D. Details of the PRG structure, such as the need for an independent evaluator  NRDC collaborated with numerous parties regarding the need for an independent evaluator specifically to ensure the process is going smoothly and to provide assessments to the PRG noting what is working and/or what needs to be adjusted. The Commission ultimately adopted this position. | NRDC Comments:   * 3/3/17 pp.7-9 * 6/22/17 p.11-12 * 6/29/17 (with CEDMC) p.6-7 * 8/18/17 p.5 and Attachment * 9/25/17 p.4 * 12/4/17 p.3-4 * 12/11/17 p.2-3   D.18-01-004  COL 14-16, p.58  OP 5, p.62 | Verified |
| E. Need for CPUC review of 3P contracts  NRDC continually argued that the CPUC does not have the capacity for the level of review and volume of contracts that might ensue as the IOUs shift to 60% third party programs under the new definition.  As an alternative, NRDC proposed that there be certain thresholds that would require a CPUC review. The Commission determined a threshold was reasonable. While it wasn’t specifically what NRDC proposed, NRDC’s comments contributed to the substantive record of discussion leading to similar outcome as proposed. | NRDC Comments:   * 3/3/17 pp.7-9 * 6/29/17 (with CEDMC) p.6-7 * 8/18/17 p.6-7 and Attachment * 9/25/17 p.6-7 * 12/11/17 p.3   D.18-01-004  FOF 8, p.54  FOF 9, p.54  COL 6, p.57  COL 8, p.57  OP 2, p.61 | Verified |

TABLE 2: D.18-05-041

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s) | Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s) | CPUC Discussion |
| Substantive Contribution to D.18-05-041 – This entry matches xls sheet “L.Ettenson D.18-05-041” | | |
| C. Business Plans/Sector Work  NRDC reviewed all business plans and provided input on select matters throughout the numerous comment opportunities in 2017. | * ABAL CLARIFICATION   *NRDC Response 3/3/17, p.11* “Clarify budget review and subsequent scope of annual advice letter to increase long-term funding certainty and ensure implementation of the rolling portfolio in line with the intent of D.14-10-046.”  *D.18-05-041, p.121*  “Here we discuss further guidance for PAs in submitting ABALs and for staff in reviewing the PAs’ ABALs.”   * STATEWIDE PROGRAMS   *NRDC Response 3/3/17, p.17* “Ensure all IOUs participate in statewide programs.”  *NRDC Response to Memo Cmts 6/22/17, p.3-4*  “SCE has not demonstrated sufficient rationale to cancel the K-12 program”  *D.18-05-041, p.83*  “We do not adopt SCE’s first request, however, to allow any PA to opt out of the statewide programs for cost-effectiveness or reliability reasons.”   * PILOTS   *NRDC Response 3/3/17, p.18*  “Allow pilots that may not be ready for statewide efforts”  *D.18-05-041, p.83*  “In requiring certain program areas to be administered statewide, the Commission did not intend to prohibit testing or piloting of new ideas on a local or regional basis that could later be expanded into a statewide offering.”   * LGSEC MOTION   *NRDC Response 3/3/17, p.19 & NRDC Response to Memo Cmts 6/22/17, p.9*  “NRDC recommends the Commission approve the BayREN and SoCalREN motions, but defer approval of the LGSEC proposal.”  *D.18-05-041, p.118*  “We are wary of adding an administrative layer on top of the overall LGP structure, particularly since the value of LGSEC’s proposal, and thus its likelihood of success, depends in large part on the number or proportion of LGPs that would participate in both the data collection and the contract standardization efforts.”   * PROGRAM INCENTIVES   *NRDC Opening Cmts on PD 4/24/18, p.7*  “NRDC requests clarification that the incentive ruling is intended to be guidance rather than mandatory requirements.”  *D.18-05-041, p.118*  “As requested by numerous parties in comments on the proposed decision, we clarify that these guidelines are intended as “best practices” and designs to strive for in the portfolio over the business plan period, but they are not absolute requirements to be applied to every program or measure.”   * IMPLEMENTATION PLANS   *NRDC Reply Cmts on PD 4/30/18, p.4*  “Given that third-parties will be designing the majority of new programs, there is little to no opportunity to vet implementation plans at CAEECC.”  *D.18-05-041, p.17*  “For programs that will be designed and implemented through third party solicitations in the future, we will require that the implementation plans be posted no later than 60 days after the third-party contract has been executed” – this was a clarification from the proposed decision that required all implementation plans to be vetted.   * SOLICITATIONS   *NRDC Response to Memo Cmts 6/22/17, p.10*  “In addition, how programs will better serve these customers will be determined by the third parties during the solicitation process in compliance with the new definition. This means there should not be any specifics in the BPs but the IOUs could include targeted RFPs to help reach this population.”  *D.18-05-041, p.52*  “We acknowledge and agree with NRDC’s more general point that “how programs will better serve these customers will be determined by the third parties during the solicitation process in compliance with the new definition...IOUs could include targeted RFPs to help reach this population.” | Verified  Verified  Page 82, Verified  Verified  Pages 118-119 Verified  Verified  Verified |
| D. Policy Issues  NRDC continually raises critical policy issues that need to be addressed, collaborating with stakeholders to coordinate responses and align positions wherever possible. | * DEFINITIONS   *NRDC Response 3/3/17, pp.13-15*  “NRDC requests Commission guidance on a number of implementation issues to be addressed after the topics noted above.” These include quality standards, disadvantaged community definition, and hard-to-reach definition  *NRDC Final Reply Comments 10/13/17, p.3*  “NRDC agrees with the need to clarify the definition of hard-to-reach in the final decision regarding the Business Plans.”  *NRDC Opening Cmts on PD 4/24/18, p.3*  “The Commission should expand the disadvantaged community definition to align with the proposed IOU definition that was vetted with numerous stakeholders.”  *D.18-05-041, pp.39-53* Disadvantage communities and hard-to-reach definitions were established   * COST-EFFECTIVENESS   *NRDC Response 3/3/17, p.15*  “Allow a 1.0 for cost-effectiveness and require review and problem-solving of non-cost-effective programs prior to elimination from the portfolio.”  *NRDC Opening Cmts on PD 4/24/18, p.3*  “NRDC urges the Commission to adopt an interim cost-effectiveness threshold for the ramp period to allow for a smooth transition to third-party programs while maintaining a focus on critical programs that reach underserved communities and improve the energy efficiency workforce.”  *D.18-05-041, p71, COL 36*  A TRC of 1.0 was established for 2019-2022.   * QUALITY STANDARDS   *NRDC Final Cmts 9/25/17, p.7-10*  “The Commission should set initial quality standard requirements for 2018”  *D.18-05-041, p.20-21; OP 7*  “All of these suggestions listed above are straightforward and readily implementable, providing high level guidance to the PAs to utilize in their general practices and in their workforce, education, and training activities specifically. We agree with these suggestions and will require the PAs to adhere to this high level guidance.” | Verified  Pages 176-177 Verified  Pages 21, Verified |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Intervenor’s Assertion | CPUC Discussion |
| a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?[[1]](#footnote-1) | Yes | Yes |
| b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours? | Yes | Yes |
| c. If so, provide name of other parties: For D.18-01-004, the primary parties with similar positions include SCE, PG&E, SDG&E, CEDMC, and Coalition for EE (CEE). For D.18-05-041, CEDMC, SBUA, Ecology Action, CLEAResult, CEE, Rising Sun, and at time the PAs held similar positions. | | Verified |
| d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:  NRDC worked extensively to avoid duplication both within our organization and with other parties. For D.18-01-004, NRDC and ORA took on the primary coordinator role at different times to ensure only one party was working on bringing people together, drafting talking points, and leading the discussion on strategy. In addition, NRDC is in a unique position being a co-chair of the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) process. This allowed NRDC to convene parties under this collaborative effort to work out additional issues, come to consensus where possible, and highlight differences for the Commission. This occurred through the CAEECC ad hoc meetings on the PRG/IE process as well as with NRDC’s submittal of a general summary of the proposed approach and areas that needed a CPUC decision. We also met Commissioner advisors as often as possible with other parties (sometimes just with ORA or with a broader coalition) not only to reduce time claimed but also to reduce the amount of time needed by advisors to meet with parties.  More generally for D.18-05-041, we worked closely with stakeholders to align or adjust our positions wherever feasible and shared drafts of comments to offer one another support as we wrote numerous comments over the business plan approval process. In addition, we offer supplemental as well as complementary participation as we are the main environmentally-focused organization in this proceeding, and the sole non-PA stakeholder besides ORA that participates in all aspects of energy efficiency at the Commission (*e.g.*, program planning, policy foundation, procurement planning, etc.).  We are also a national organization and bring the expertise on energy efficiency best practices from other states, regions, administrators, implementers, and think tanks to support the strong foundation in California and improve policies and programs where necessary. Therefore, we offer a unique perspective and represent a different constituency, not otherwise represented, further evidence that our participation is not duplicative.  Finally, while we strive for collaboration, we note the inherent tension that arises in two aspects of Commission policy and practice. On the one hand, a party’s “participation ... may be fully eligible for compensation if the participation makes a substantial contribution to a commission order or decision,” even if it “supplements [or] complements…the presentation of another party, including the commission staff.” Pub. Util. Codes. 1802.5. This clearly means that a party can receive full compensation for addressing an issue that other parties in the proceeding have addressed as well. On the other hand, the intervenor program “shall be administered in a manner that avoids unproductive or unnecessary participation that duplicates the participation of similar interests otherwise adequately represented…” Pub. Util. Codes. 1801(f); *see* also Commission Rule 17.4. At time, the Commission reduces claims on the basis that a party’s participation was deemed duplicative, making it challenging for parties to feel confident in collaboration.  Because of this tension, we took many efforts to reduce duplication (*e.g.*, when doing join comments, assign who writes what, omit hours for internal coordination, and omit hours for email communications, which at times were extensive) and worked to highlight our unique position in addition to joint filings. Therefore, NRDC’s hours should not be deducted for potential similar work or duplication. | | Noted  ORA is now known as Cal Advocates. |

1. Additional Comments on Part II:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| # | Intervenor’s Comment | CPUC Discussion |
| #1 | The majority of NRDC’s hours being claimed are from the planning and implementation of the California Energy Efficiency Coordinating Committee (CAEECC) process. These hours go back to 2016 during the launch of the CAEECC per D.15-10-028 and continue throughout 2018. These hours include time spent as co-chair of the committee as well as the main contact to connect with other stakeholders and the Energy Division on key decision-making items regarding the development of the CAEECC and subsequent strategy, planning, and implementation of the Commission’s intent expressed in various decisions. Only those hours pertaining to meetings and key document development were included. Although extensive, no hours are claimed for the numerous emails required during development and implementation of the CAEECC. | Noted |
| 2 | For D.18-01-004, NRDC played a pivotal role in bringing numerous parties together to develop an extensive proposal, both with consensus areas as well as defining differences and refining general positions on these different opinions of how to move forward. The most consistent parties included in the proposal develop were ORA, CEE, CEDMC, SCG, SCE, SDG&E, and PG&E. NRDC worked with the RENs and MCE to make sure the proposal was appropriately applied to them since they have a different mandate than the IOUs regarding bidding. Our hours are conservative and therefore should not be reduced. | Noted |

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION:**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:  NRDC contributed substantially to the issues adopted in this decision and much of our work described in this claim will have impact beyond the IOU programs (*e.g.*, establishing a fair and transparent process for bidding will help aid in the third-party company/non-profit industry growth, ensuring the funding is going to the best programs will help reduce greenhouse gas and other emissions beyond IOU territories and help meet California’s ambitious energy and climate goals).  In addition, ensuring an effective process to review how 60% of the $1billion of investment will be deployed will ensure the funding is used wisely, ensuring customer costs are prudent. The savings that will result from effective program will also substantially reduce energy costs as efficiency continues to be the cheapest resource and eliminate greenhouse gasses and other pollutants associated with conventional energy production.  NRDC was also conservative in how we claimed time, only claiming for formal meetings with parties and CPUC staff/advisors rather than all time for informal chats and emails, which amount to a much higher tally of hours than what is being claimed here | CPUC Discussion  Noted |
| b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:  *NRDC’s Claims are Reasonable and Conservative*  For D.18-01-004, Lara Ettenson was the sole NRDC staffer working on this effort. She has worked on developing collaboratives for over five years and participated on the existing Peer Review Group since 2007, which allotted her a unique perspective of how future oversight processes should be designed. We only claim for Ms. Ettenson even though she worked closely with multiple NRDC staff who consulted regularly on the issues in the proceeding, provided substantive work, technical support, and/or guidance particular to their area of expertise.  For D.18-05-041, Lara Ettenson was again the sole NRDC staff leading the effort, although numerous colleagues (e.g., Peter Miller, Mohit Chhabra, and Merrian Borgeson) helped extensively with brainstorming and substantive review of comments.  The rate requested by NRDC is purposefully conservative and low on the ranges approved by the Commission, even though the levels of expertise would justify higher rates. NRDC maintained detailed time records indicating the number of hours that were devoted to proceeding activities. All hours represent substantive work related to this proceeding.  The amounts claimed are further conservative for the following reasons: (1) No time is claimed for internal coordination within NRDC, only for substantive policy development; (2) although NRDC spent time developing and coordinating positions with other stakeholders, we only claim partial time for this coordination as noted above; (3) we do not claim time for substantive review by NRDC staff, even though their expertise was critical to ensuring productive recommendations; (4) we claim no time or costs for travel, and (5) we claim no times for writing ex parte notices (pre/post).  In sum, NRDC made numerous and significant contributions on behalf of environmental and customer interests, all of which required extensive research, analysis, and collaboration. We took every effort to coordinate with other stakeholders to reduce duplication and increase the overall efficiency of the proceeding. Since our work was efficient, hours conservative, and billing rates low, NRDC’s request for compensation should be granted in full. | Noted |
| c. Allocation of hours by issue:  D.18-01-004   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | A | General Issues (*e.g.*, review docs, attend wkshps, CPUC mtgs, general portion of cmts) | 30% | | B | Collaboration (*e.g.*, individual meetings with parties, mtgs with CPUC advisors) | 22% | | C | Overall structure/need for PRG | 20% | | D | Procurement Review Group details (*e.g.*, independent evaluator) | 22% | | E | 3P Contract review issue | 6% |   D.18-05-041   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | A | General Issues (*e.g.*, discussions with parties not about CAEECC specifically, review of application, general comments, etc.) | 18% | | B | Year 1 & 2 CAEECC development (*e.g.*, process around business plan review, implementation planning process, subcommittee process, Peer Review Group/Independent Evaluator, etc.) and document developments to support CAEECC (*e.g.*, review submittals, create review process, comment on conflict of interest, develop policy letter, develop comparison document, comment tracker, etc.) | 8% | | C | Business Plans/Sector work (*e.g.*, reading, commenting on sector draft plans, BPs, etc.) | 19% | | D | Policy issues (*e.g.*, alignment with state goals, EM&V, cost-effectiveness, hard to reach, etc.) | 3% | | E | CAEECC related meetings (*e.g.*, with ED, facilitator, co-chairs, party discussions specifically about CAEECC, CC meetings, subcommittee meetings, ad hoc meetings) | 47% | | F | Year 3 Facilitator process/CAEECC | 4% | | G | EE/PRG Participation | 1% | | Noted |

1. Specific Claim:\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Claimed | | | | | | CPUC Award | | |
| ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES | | | | | | | | |
| Item | Year | Hours | Rate $ | Basis for Rate\* | Total $ | Hours | Rate $ | Total $ |
| L. Ettenson D.18-01-004 | 2016 | 26.25 | $185 | D.17-01-026 | $4,948.75 | 26.75 [A] | $185.00 | $4,948.75 |
| L. Ettenson D.18-01-004 | 2017 | 53 | $190 | D.17-01-026; COLA from ALJ Res-345 | $10,070.00 | 53.00 | $190.00 | $10,070.00 |
| L.Ettenson D.18-05-041 | 2016 | 260.75 | $185 | D.17-01-026 | $48,238.75 | 260.75 | $185.00 | $48,238.75 |
| L.Ettenson D.18-05-041 | 2017 | 192.50 | $190 | D.17-01-026; COLA from ALJ Res-345 | $36,575.00 | 194.25 [B] | $190.00 | $36,907.50 |
| L.Ettenson D.18-05-041 | 2018 | 96.50 | $215 | ALJ Res-352 (13+ years of experience); in line with Mohit Chhabra and Merrian Borgeson NOI in A.18-05-015 | $20,747.50 | 96.50 | $215.00 | $20,747.50 |
| *Subtotal: $120,580.00* | | | | | | *Subtotal: $120,912.50* | | |
| INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION \*\* | | | | | | | | |
| Item | Year | Hours | Rate $ | Basis for Rate\* | Total $ | Hours | Rate | Total $ |
| L. Ettenson | 2018 | 10 | $107.50 | 1/2 of 2018 rate | $1075.00 | 10.00 | $107.50 | $1,075.00 |
| *Subtotal: $1,075.00* | | | | | | *Subtotal: $1,075.00* | | |
| **TOTAL REQUEST: $121,655.00** | | | | | | **TOTAL AWARD: $121,987.50** | | |
| \*\*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit their records related to the award and that intervenors must make and retain 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 typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate | | | | | | | | |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Attachment or Comment # | Description/Comment |
| Comment 1 | Lara Ettenson Proposed Rates   * 2016 rate of $185 per D.17-01-026. * 2017 rate of $190 per D.17-01-026 plus 2.14% COLA from ALJ Res-345. * 2018 rate of $215 per ALJ Res-352. Ms. Ettenson has over 13 years of experience. $215 is at the low end of the range and comparable to colleagues Mohit Chhabra and Merrian Borgeson hourly rate proposed in the most recent NOI filed in A.18-05-015. |
| Attachment 1 | Lara Ettenson’s time record |

D. CPUC Disallowances and Adjustments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Reason |
| [A] | Reported 2016 hours for Ettenson was 26.75 hours for D.18-01-004. |
| [B] | Reported 2017 hours for Ettenson was 194.25 hours for D.18-05-041. |

**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))? | Yes |

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Natural Resources Defense Council has made a substantial contribution to

D.18-01-004 and D.18-05-041.

1. The requested hourly rates for Natural Resources Defense 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.
2. The claimed costs and expenses, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
3. The total of reasonable compensation is $121,987.50.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. Natural Resources Defense Council shall be awarded $121,987.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company ratepayers, San Diego Gas & Electric Company ratepayers, Southern California Edison Company ratepayers, and Southern California Gas Company ratepayers shall pay Natural Resources Defense Council their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric and gas revenues for the 2017 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. 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 21, 2018, the 75th day after the filing of Natural Resources Defense Council’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today’s decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, San Francsico, California.

**APPENDIX**

Compensation Decision Summary Information

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Compensation Decision: |  | Modifies Decision? | No |
| Contribution Decision(s): | D1801004, D1805041 | | |
| Proceeding(s): | A1701013, A1701014, A1701015, A1701016, A1701017 | | |
| Author: | ALJ Fitch, ALJ Kao | | |
| Payer(s): | Pacific Gas and Electric Company ratepayers, San Diego Gas & Electric Company ratepayers, Southern California Edison Company ratepayers, and Southern California Gas Company ratepayers. | | |

Intervenor Information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intervenor | Claim Date | Amount Requested | Amount Awarded | Multiplier? | Reason Change / Disallowance |
| Natural Resources Defense Council | 08/06/2018 | $121,655.00 | $121,987.50 | N/A | Difference in reported hours. |

Advocate Information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Name | Last Name | Type | Intervenor | Hourly Fee Requested | Year Hourly Fee Requested | Hourly Fee Adopted |
| Lara | Ettenson | Expert | NRDC | $185.00 | 2016 | $185.00 |
| Lara | Ettenson | Expert | NRDC | $190.00 | 2017 | $190.00 |
| Lara | Ettenson | Expert | NRDC | $215.00 | 2018 | $215.00 |

**(END OF APPENDIX)**

1. The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates), pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)