

Decision 22-01-011 January 13, 2022

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Create a Consistent Regulatory Framework for the Guidance, Planning and Evaluation of Integrated Distributed Energy Resources.

Rulemaking 14-10-003

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 19-05-019**

<b>Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)</b>	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 19-05-019</b>
<b>Claimed: \$ 41,753.08</b>	<b>Awarded: \$41,753.08</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Darcie Houck<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Assigned ALJ: Kelly A. Hymes</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	D.19-05-019 adopted several policies for evaluating the cost-effectiveness of distributed energy resources (DERs). First, it adopted the total resource cost test as the primary test of cost-effectiveness; second, it modified all three existing cost effectiveness tests by replacing the interim greenhouse gas (“GHG”) adder with the values adopted for DERs only in D.18-02-018; and third, it adopted a societal cost test (“SCT”) for use on an interim basis for informational purposes in the Integrated Resource Planning (“IRP”) proceeding. The SCT is based on the TRC but includes a societal discount rate, an avoided social cost of carbon, and an air quality adder.
--	---

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding was reassigned to Commissioner Houck on February 25, 2021.

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:<sup>2</sup>**

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference (PHC):	December 5, 2014	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	December 22, 2014	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	See Comment #1	R.14-05-001
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	See Comment #1	September 5, 2014
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See Comment #1	Noted
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.14-05-001	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	September 5, 2014	Verified
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.19-05-019	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	May 21, 2019	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	July 19, 2019	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

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

<b>#</b>	<b>Intervenor’s Comment(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
1	TURN did not receive an affirmative ruling on its NOI in this proceeding. As	Noted

<sup>2</sup> All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	<p>explained in the Commission’s Intervenor Compensation guide, “normally, an ALJ Ruling needs not be issued unless: (a) the NOI has requested a finding of “significant financial hardship” under § 1802(g). (b) the NOI is deficient; or (c) the ALJ desires to provide guidance on specific issues of the NOI.” (at 12) Since none of these factors apply to the NOI submitted in this proceeding, there was no need for an ALJ ruling in response to TURN’s NOI.</p> <p>TURN has been found eligible for compensation in this proceeding and has been awarded compensation previously in this proceeding in D.17-04-034. All of the hours or expenses requested in this claim are incremental and have not been claimed previously.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION**

**A. Claimant’s description of its claimed contribution to the final decision**

<b>Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s) to D.19-05-019</b>	<b>Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<p>1. Appropriate Cost Effectiveness Test for Evaluating DERs</p> <p>TURN supported the use of the TRC as the primary cost-effectiveness test, and supported modifying the TRC and PAC with a GHG adder. TURN did not support modifying the RIM test.</p> <p>The Commission adopted the TRC as the primary test, but required consideration of the results of the modified PAC and RIM tests.</p>	<p>TURN Reply Comments on Staff Proposal, April 6, 2017, at 1-5. TURN Opening Comments on Amended Staff Proposal, April 20, 2018, at 4-5.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 19-20, 24</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>2. Value of GHG Adder in the modified TRC, PAC and RMI tests</p>		<p>Verified</p>

<p>TURN supported modifying the TRC and PAC by incorporating a GHG adder, but TURN argued that the adder adopted for DERs in D.18-02-018 did not properly estimate avoided abatement costs.</p> <p>The Decision found that this issue has already been resolved, and that TURN did not file an application for rehearing of D.18-02-018.</p>	<p>TURN Reply Comments on Staff Proposal, April 6, 2017, at 1-5. TURN Opening Comments on Amended Staff Proposal, April 20, 2018, at 2-4.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 27.</p>	
<p>3. Use of the SCT for Planning and/or Procurement</p> <p>TURN argued that if the Commission adopts the SCT, it should be used only for planning in the IRP, and not for decision-making to adopt budgets or goals for procurement.</p> <p>The Staff amended its recommendation to support the use of the SCT for planning purposes, and the Commission agreed that it is prudent to adopt the SCT only for informational basis to be used on an interim basis in the IRP.</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal, March 23, 2017, at 2-5. TURN Reply Comments, April 22, 2019, at 3.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 11-12, 32-37.</p>	<p>Verified discussion in D.19-05-019.</p>
<p>4. Elements of the SCT</p> <p>TURN argued that an SCT should be modified only by incorporating a societal discount rate and certain environmental adders, and TURN argued against including various other “non-energy benefits” as proposed by different parties.</p> <p>The Commission agreed and adopted an SCT with only those three elements (societal discount</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal, March 23, 2017, at 9.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 3.</p>	<p>Verified discussion in D.19-05-019.</p>

<p>rate, GHG adder, air quality adder).</p>		
<p>5. Value of GHG Adder in the SCT</p> <p>TURN argued that the marginal abatement cost was the proper value for the GHG adder.</p> <p>After release of the amended staff proposal, TURN recommended against adopting the Staff Proposal for using the “high impact” value of carbon, and explained that the “three percent average” value was a more appropriate value of the avoided social cost of carbon.</p> <p>The Commission ordered staff to test both the high impact and the three percent average values.</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal, March 23, 2017, at 11-12.</p> <p>TURN Opening Comments on Amended Staff Proposal, April 20, 2018, at 6-10.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 40-42.</p>	<p>Verified discussion in D.19-05-019.</p>
<p>6. Societal Discount Rate in SCT</p> <p>TURN supported use of a 3% societal discount rate for evaluating DERs and comparing the impact of different long-lived measures; however, TURN argued against using this rate for setting program budgets. TURN argued that the weighted average cost of utility capital is the appropriate discount rate for setting budgets or evaluating specific investments.</p> <p>The Commission adopted a discount rate of 3%, but required a comparison using the weighted cost of capital.</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal, March 23, 2017, at 9-10, 15.</p> <p>TURN Opening Comments on Amended Staff Proposal, April 20, 2018, at 10.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 46-48 (“The evaluation should compare the two perspectives to determine whether the use of a social discount rate results in distortions that lead to non-optimal outcomes, as predicted by TURN.”)</p>	<p>Verified filings, discussion in D.19-05-019.</p>
<p>7. Modification to Avoided Cost Calculator</p>		<p>Verified filings, discussion in D.19-05-019.</p>

<p>TURN recommended a transparent process for future modification of the ACC, and recommended that the ACC include values for local and flexible generation capacity.</p> <p>The Commission adopted two processes for making minor and major changes to the ACC.</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments on Staff Proposal, March 23, 2017, at 13-14, 15-16.</p> <p>D.19-05-019, at 53-55.</p>	
--	--	--

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
<p><b>a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?</b><sup>3</sup></p>	Yes	Yes
<p><b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b></p>	Yes	Yes
<p><b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b></p> <p>Please see service list for the names of multiple advocacy organizations, environmental organizations, and industry trade groups, who were all parties to the proceeding. Most of the active parties representing environmental stakeholders or industry associations had positions that were generally different from TURN's positions and recommendations. Some of the investor-owned utilities had positions similar to TURN's on some of the issues addressed in D.19-05-019.</p>		Verified
<p><b>d. Claimant's description of how it coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how claimant's participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</b></p> <p>TURN's compensation in this proceeding should not be reduced for duplication of the showings of other parties. In a proceeding involving multiple participants, it is virtually impossible for TURN to completely avoid some duplication of the work of other parties. In this case, TURN took all reasonable steps to keep such duplication to a minimum, and to ensure that when it</p>		Verified

<sup>3</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>did happen, our work served to complement and assist the showings of the other parties.</p> <p>TURN coordinated with several groups during the course of the proceeding, though TURN’s positions on the use of the societal cost test limited coordination with other intervenors, as TURN’s position was more closely aligned with the investor-owned utilities.</p> <p>Any incidental duplication that may have occurred here was more than offset by TURN’s unique contribution to the proceeding. Under these circumstances, no reduction to our compensation due to duplication is warranted given the standard adopted by the Commission in D.03-03-031.</p>	
---	--

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

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion
1	<p><u>Partial Success:</u></p> <p>The Commission should compensate TURN for all work in this proceeding, despite the fact that the Commission did not adopt some of TURN’s policy recommendations. The Commission agreed with TURN’s primary recommendation that the SCT not be used for actual procurement or budgeting purposes at this time. Furthermore, while the Commission adopted different values for the avoided social cost of carbon than recommended by TURN, the Commission directed the utilities to perform sensitivity tests using the values recommended by TURN.</p> <p>Such an outcome is consistent with the statutory definition of “substantial contribution” in Section 1802 of the Pub. Util. Code, which 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 standard for an award of intervenor compensation is whether TURN made a substantial contribution to the Commission’s decision, not whether TURN prevailed on all issues.</p> <p>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. The Commission has established as a general proposition that when a party makes a substantial contribution in a multi-issue proceeding, it is entitled to compensation for time and expenses even if it does not prevail on some of the issues. <i>See, for example,</i> D.98-04-028 (awarding TURN full compensation in CTC</p>	Noted

	<p>proceeding, even though TURN did not prevail on all issues); D.98-08-016, at 6, 12 (awarding TURN full compensation in SoCalGas PBR proceeding); D.00-02-008, at 4-7, 10 (awarding TURN full compensation even though we unsuccessfully opposed settlement).</p>	
--	---	--

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

<p><b>a. Claimant’s explanation of how its participation bore a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through its participation. (include references to record, where appropriate:</b></p> <p>This proceeding addressed significant policy issues concerning the evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of distributed energy resources. Since there were no specific spending proposal addressed in this phase of the proceeding, TURN’s participation could not reasonably lead to a specific reduction in utility revenue requirements.</p> <p>However, TURN’s participation should result in significant ratepayer benefits in the coming years. At this time, the utilities are all long on RPS procurement and have not conducted additional procurement solicitations. At the same time, the utilities continue to fund hundreds of millions of dollars for DERs through energy efficiency and demand response budgets, storage procurement, and SGIP subsidies. Additionally, the growth of NEM projects continues to contribute to a cost shift from NEM customers to all other ratepayers. TURN hopes and expects that a more appropriate evaluation of all resources in the IRP might result in a more equitable and sustainable balance in the procurement of clean energy resources.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>CPUC Discussion</b></p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Verified</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p><b><u>Summary:</u></b></p> <p>TURN devoted 69 hours of attorney time (excluding work on the compensation request) and 56.25 hours of expert time to this proceeding. TURN submits that the Commission should find the hours requested here to be reasonable under the circumstances, and that TURN’s showing supports that conclusion. However, should the Commission believe that more information is needed or that a different approach to discussing the reasonableness of the requested hours is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.</p> <p><b><u>Attorney Time:</u></b></p> <p>TURN devoted 69 attorney hours to this proceeding, with significant participation from three TURN attorneys. Participation by different</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Noted</p>



attorneys was necessary for two reasons. First, due to competing responsibilities two different attorneys took the lead during the 2017–2018-time frames. Second, different attorneys, as well as experts, participated due to subject matter expertise, to address cross-cutting issues related to energy efficiency, cost-effectiveness methodologies, the use of the avoided cost calculator, and application to the Integrated Resource Planning proceeding.

The attorneys generally wrote different sections of pleadings and/or participated during different periods of the proceeding. The attorneys coordinated as necessary to develop TURN policies and to advance TURN’s strategy and positions.

The following describes the role and work of individual attorneys.

Marcel Hawiger

Mr. Hawiger has been a staff attorney with TURN since 1998.

Mr. Hawiger has been the lead attorney on numerous proceedings, including cases addressing demand-side management programs and policies, utility rate cases, and utility procurement.

Mr. Hawiger participated throughout the proceeding and took the lead on issues concerning cost effectiveness and the societal cost test. Mr. Hawiger assisted Ms. Suetake during 2017 and took the lead on the case in 2018.

Hayley Goodson

Ms. Goodson has been a staff attorney with TURN since 2003. She has been TURN’s lead attorney on many cases, including general rate cases, energy efficiency program applications, and other cases directly impacting consumer interests. Due to her expertise in energy efficiency and cost-effectiveness test, Ms. Goodson assisted in developing policies and positions regarding modifications to the TRC, PAC and RIM tests and the use of the GHG adder.

Nina Suetake

Ms. Suetake was a staff attorney with TURN from 2010 until 2018 and represented TURN on a variety of cases involving forecast costs and revenue requirements. Ms. Suetake was the lead attorney in this proceeding during 2017 and developed case strategy and drafted pleadings during that time.

**Expert Witness Time:**

TURN devoted 56.25 hours of expert time to this proceeding. While there was no opportunity for expert testimony, TURN experts assisted extensively in developing positions and drafting pleadings concerning the technical elements of the societal cost test.

**Eric Borden**

Mr. Borden is TURN's in-house energy analyst and joined TURN in February 2015. Prior to TURN, Mr. Borden worked as a consultant in energy and finance for approximately seven years. His academic research addressed electric vehicles and public charging infrastructure.

In this proceeding, Mr. Borden was TURN's lead expert on most of the issues relating to the SCT, including the avoided GHG adder, the social cost of carbon, the societal discount rate, and the potential application of the SCT to different resource procurement and planning proceedings.

**Kevin Woodruff**

TURN retained Mr. Kevin Woodruff as an expert consultant for this phase of the proceeding. Mr. Woodruff has been an expert witness for TURN for over a decade, working on conventional procurement, resource adequacy and wholesale market issues. He is also TURN's expert consultant in the Integrated Resource Planning proceeding.

In this proceeding Mr. Woodruff devoted a very limited amount of time (6.75 hours) to provide expert support on issues related to the valuation of the GHG adder based on abatement costs, and on the potential overlap of the SCT cost effectiveness evaluation with resource selection in the IRP.

**Meetings:**

A small number of hourly entries reflect meetings and phone calls attended by TURN's attorney and consultant, or by more than one TURN attorney or consultant. TURN submits that these hours do not reflect internal duplication. Rather, such participation was essential to TURN's development and implementation of its strategy for this proceeding.

Attendance by multiple staff at internal meetings is necessary to develop a coordinated strategy, especially given that the issues in this proceeding addressed cost effectiveness tests for various distributed resources as well as the IRP proceeding, and thus required input from several staff. Internal meetings were also necessary when other attorneys had to cover pleadings or meetings due to workload issues.

<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue</b></p> <p>TURN uses a combination of activity and issue codes when itemizing the hourly work performed by attorneys and consultants. While TURN has used various issue codes in this proceeding, all of the hours requested in this claim were coded “SCT,” and included work solely related to cost-effectiveness analyses and the proposal to adopt a Societal Cost Test for cost-effectiveness evaluation of distributed energy resources. This was the only issue addressed in D.19-05-019. While this topic included a number of “sub-issues,” the nature of the work and the amount of time involved were such as to make any additional allocation by issue unnecessary. TURN has filed a previous compensation request for other issue-related work and may file a future request for work on issues (for <i>example</i>, concerning pilots, DER tariffs, and DER sourcing) that have not yet been resolved in a Commission decision.</p> <p>Some work is fundamental to active participation in a Commission proceeding and may not be allocable by issue and/or the amount of time required may not vary by the number of issues. <i>Examples</i> of these tasks include reviewing other parties’ testimony and filings, reviewing the proposed and any alternate decision; attending prehearing conferences and ex parte meetings; and preparing compensation filings. TURN uses the activity code “GP” to represent such general participation time that is not allocable by issue. TURN generally used the activity code “#” to denote work that covers multiple issues and cannot be easily allocated to specific issues.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
--	--------------

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
<u>Attorney</u>								
Marcel Hawiger	2017	15.75	\$425.00	D.17-11-032	\$6,693.75	15.75	\$425	\$6,693.75
Marcel Hawiger	2018	8.25	\$435.00	D.18-06-023	\$3,588.75	8.25	\$435	\$3,588.75
Marcel Hawiger	2019	7.25	\$445.00	Res. ALJ-357 (2.35% 2019 COLA)	\$3,226.25	7.25	\$445 <sup>4</sup>	\$3,226.25

<sup>4</sup> See D.20-06-010.

Hayley Goodson	2017	10.25	\$405.00	D.18-01-020	\$4,151.25	10.25	\$405	\$4,151.25
Hayley Goodson	2018	2.50	\$435.00	D.18-04-020	\$1,087.50	2.5	\$435	\$1,087.50
Nina Suetake	2017	25.00	\$375.00	D.18-05-016	\$9,375.00	25	\$375	\$9,375.00
<u>Expert</u>								
Eric Borden	2017	24.75	\$205.00	D.18-07-022	\$5,073.75	24.75	\$205	\$5,073.75
Eric Borden	2018	22.75	\$210.00	D.18-11-043	\$4,777.50	22.75	\$210	\$4,777.50
Eric Borden	2019	2.00	\$215.00	Res. ALJ-357 (2.35% 2019 COLA applied to \$210 2018 rate)	\$430.00	2	\$215 <sup>5</sup>	\$430.00
Kevin Woodruff	2017	6.00	\$260.00	D.17-11-029	\$1,560.00	6	\$260	\$1,560.00
Kevin Woodruff	2018	0.75	\$265.00	D.18-07-022	\$198.75	0.75	\$265	\$198.75
<b>Subtotal: \$ 40,162.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$40,162.50</b>		
<b>OTHER FEES</b>								
<b>Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
<b>Subtotal: \$300.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00 [1]</b>		
<b>INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **</b>								
<b>Item</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate \$</b>	<b>Basis for Rate*</b>	<b>Total \$</b>	<b>Hours</b>	<b>Rate</b>	<b>Total \$</b>
Marcel Hawiger	2019	7.00	\$222.50	Half of 2019 Requested Rate	\$1,557.50	7	\$222.50	\$1,557.50
<b>Subtotal: \$1,557.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$1,557.50</b>		
<b>COSTS</b>								
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Detail</b>			<b>Amount</b>	<b>Amount</b>		
	Copying	Copying of testimony and pleadings for ALJ and Commissioner offices			\$11.40	\$11.40		
	FedEx/Postage	Postage and FedEx for testimonies and pleadings to CPUC			\$11.13	\$11.13		

<sup>5</sup> See D.20-04-025.

	Phone	Phone bills for long-distance calls or conference calls re. R.12-06-013	\$10.55	\$10.55
		<b>Subtotal: \$</b>	\$33.08	<b>Subtotal: \$33.08</b>
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$41,753.08</b>				<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$41,753.08</b>

\* We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.

\*\*Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate

<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>6</sup></b>	<b>Member Number</b>	<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation</b>
Marcel Hawiger	1/23/1998	194244	N
Hayley Goodson	12/03	228535	N
Nina Suetake	12/04	234769	N

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

<b>Attachment or Comment #</b>	<b>Description/Comment</b>
Attach. 1	<b>Certificate of Service</b>
Attach. 2	<b>Hourly Time Keeping</b> A daily listing of the specific tasks performed by all attorneys and experts in connection with this proceeding is set forth in Appendix A. TURN's attorneys maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to work on this case. In preparing this appendix, Mr. Hawiger reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding and included only those that were reasonable for the underlying task.
Comment 1	<b>Hourly Rates</b>

<sup>6</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

	<p>All of the hourly rates used in this compensation request have either 1) been previously authorized by the Commission; or 2) use previously authorized rates as adjusted by the COLA adopted for 2019 in Resolution ALJ-357.</p> <p>All hourly rates for external consultants reflect actual billed rates.</p>
--	---

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

Item	Reason
[1]	TURN’s claim indicated \$300 for this subtotal but did not include any hours associated with it or who performed this work, so this subtotal is not approved. We note that this subtotal was also not included by TURN in their overall claim request of \$41,753.08.

**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 (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	Yes
---	-----

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.19-05-019.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network’s representatives 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 are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$41,753.08.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. The Utility Reform Network shall be awarded \$41,753.08.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company shall pay The Utility Reform Network their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2017 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is 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 October 2, 2019, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of The Utility Reform Network'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 January 13, 2022, at San Francisco, California.

ALICE REYNOLDS

President

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

DARCIE HOUCK

Commissioners

**APPENDIX**

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D2201011	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1905019		
Proceeding(s):	R1410003		
Author:	ALJ Hymes		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, and Southern California Edison Company		

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	07/19/19	\$41,753.08	\$41,753.08	N/A	See CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments above.

## Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	\$425	2017	\$425
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	\$435	2018	\$435
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	\$445	2019	\$445
Nina	Suetake	Attorney	\$375	2017	\$375
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$405	2017	\$405
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$435	2018	\$435
Eric	Borden	Expert	\$205	2017	\$205
Eric	Borden	Expert	\$210	2018	\$210
Eric	Borden	Expert	\$215	2019	\$215
Kevin	Woodruff	Expert	\$260	2017	\$260
Kevin	Woodruff	Expert	\$265	2018	\$265

**(END OF APPENDIX)**