

Decision 22-01-015 January 13, 2022

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Examine Electric Utility De-Energization of Power Lines in Dangerous Conditions.	Rulemaking 18-12-005
--	----------------------

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO CITY OF MALIBU FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 19-05-042**

<b>Intervenor: City of Malibu</b>	<b>For Contribution to Decision (D.)19-05-042</b>
<b>Claimed: \$8,341.50</b>	<b>Awarded: \$8,342.25</b>
<b>Assigned Commissioner: Marybel Batjer</b>	<b>Assigned ALJs: Valerie Kao and Regina DeAngelis</b>

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	The decision presents the overarching de-energization strategy of the Commission and adopts de-energization communication and notification guidelines for electric investor-owned utilities. The Decision provides updates and expands on the requirements established in Resolution (Res) ESRB-8.
--	--

**B. Intervenor Must Satisfy Intervenor Compensation Requirements Set Forth in Public Utility (Pub. Util.) Code §§ 1801-1812<sup>1</sup>:**

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

	<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:	2/19/2019	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	3/21/19	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes, per Administrative Law Judge's (ALJ) Ruling Granting the County of Mendocino's, County of Napa's, County of Sonoma's, County of Nevada's, the City of Santa Rosa's and the City of Malibu's Notices of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation issued on June 16, 2020.
<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:	N/A	Rulemaking (R.)18-12-005
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	N/A	June 16, 2020
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	As set forth in Pub. Util. Code Section 1802(d) "eligible local government entity" is a "city, county, or city and county that is not a publicly owned public utility that intervenes or participates in a commission proceeding for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the residents within the entity's jurisdiction following a catastrophic material loss suffered by its residents either in significant damage to infrastructure or loss of life and property, or both, as a direct result	Noted

	<p>of public utility infrastructure.”                  Under this standard, the City is participating in this proceeding given its experience in the recent Woolsey fire that resulted in catastrophic losses to the City and its residents. Under Pub. Util. Code Section 1803.1, the Commission must determine that the “subject of the hearing or proceeding is the result of a triggering event, as determined by the commission, that significantly impacted the residents of the local government entity.” Here, the Commission instituted this rulemaking due to the recent fire season and an effort to evaluate de-energization in response. This qualifies as a triggering event. Furthermore, the Comparison Test (<i>see, e.g.</i>, D.15-03-040) which is used to evaluate financial hardship for not-for-profit entities could be an appropriate measure of financial hardship for local government entities. Under this test, the City is eligible for compensation as the financial impacts of participating in this proceeding outweigh the direct financial interests of the City’s residents.</p>	
<p>8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?</p>		<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Showing of “Significant Financial Hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):</b></p>		
<p>9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:</p>		<p>R.18-12-005</p>
<p>10. Date of ALJ ruling:</p>		<p>June 16, 2020</p>
<p>11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):</p>	<p>See above explanation.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?</p>		<p>Yes</p>

<b>Timely Request for Compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.19-05-042 – Decision Adopting De-Energization (Public Safety Power Shut-Off) Guidelines (Phase 1 Guidelines)	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	6/4/2019	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	8/5/2019	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

**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>
1. Definition of First Responders/ Emergency Responders	D.19-05-042 at 18: “Parties broadly supported Staff’s proposed definition of first responders/emergency responders, including CASMU, Public Advocates, CCSF, SDG&E, EBMUD, PG&E, the Joint Communications Parties, City of Malibu, CforAT and the Farm Bureau.”	Citation is verified, but this contribution served to support an existing Staff proposal and was made by multiple parties. Because of the limited number of hours claimed, we do not make an adjustment to the awarded hours.
2. Critical Facilities (Issue 2C)	D.19-05-042 at 22: “City of Malibu recommends an expanded list of water infrastructure, discussed more below, as well as the inclusion of city halls or similar city facilities.”	Verified
3. Vulnerable Populations (Issues 2(b) and 2(b)(i))	D.19-05-042 at 27: “CSAC, the Joint Local Governments, and City of Malibu generally agree with the Staff Proposal as presented, although the Joint Local Governments are concerned about the	The correct citation is verified at 28.

	feasibility of identifying and providing effective notice to such a large group.”	
4. When and In What Order Should Contact Occur? (Issue 2(a)(i))	D.19-05-042 at 34: “The parties universally agree that advanced notice is imperative and should be afforded whenever possible. Parties differ on which entities should receive priority notice and how far in advance notice should be given. Comments will focus first on the timing of notification and then on the priority of notification, although some comments overlap. Farm Bureau and the City of Malibu support the Staff Proposal as written.”	The correct citation is verified at 35.
5. Who is Responsible for Notification? (Issue 2(a)(iii))	D.19-05-042 at 43-44: “The parties universally agreed that the utilities should be primarily responsible for notification of affected customers. . . However, many parties recognize that the utilities may have limitations in identifying certain customer groups, such as vulnerable populations, and therefore recommend partnering with various agencies and organizations to more effectively disseminate information. . . For <i>example</i> , Farm Bureau and CforAT recommend coordination with safety agencies, City of Malibu recommends coordination with local governments, and CSAC recommends that notification language be provided to the local Office of Emergency Services to send out via the emergency notification system.”	Verified. Correct citation at 45.
What Notification Systems and Notification Methods Should be Used (Issue 2(a)(iv), Part of Issue 2(a), Part of Issue 2(a)(i), Part of Issue 2(a)(iii))	D.19-05-042 at 47: “City of Malibu agrees with the Staff Proposal but highlights that during a de-energization event, internet and phone services may not be available.”	Verified. Correct citation at 49.
De-Energization of Transmission Lines (Issue 6)	D.19-05-042 at 58: “CSAC argues if a wildfire exists, de-energization should not be permitted, and re-energization	Verified. Correct citation at 60.

	<p>should be required. Similarly, MWDOC requests that the Commission explore what happens if a line is de-energized and a wildfire occurs which could require the need for power. Similarly, MWDOC requests that the Commission explore what happens if a line is de-energized and a wildfire occurs which could require the need for power. City of Malibu notes that water utilities may require generators, and that water utilities must be able to ensure that water needs can be met for firefighting activities.”</p>	
<p>Reporting Issues (Issue 4)</p>	<p>D.19-05-042 at 60: “City of Malibu recommends that the utilities present an analysis of whether the utilities could have reduced the size of the affected area and/or the duration of the de-energization event while still protecting public safety. Many parties suggest that the utilities provide a detailed accounting of how the utilities arrived at the decision to de-energize, including a discussion of alternatives (generally, CSAC, Public Advocates, the Joint Local Governments, CCSF, the Joint Communication Parties, SDG&amp;E and CforAT). City of Malibu requests that the utilities include information on requested delays or modifications from local government and whether the utility agreed to the delay (and if not, an explanation of why). OSA recommends that the number of impacted customers include information on critical facilities and medical baseline customers (how many were impacted and for how long).”</p>	<p>Verified. Correct citation at 63.</p>
<p>Definition of Critical Facilities/ Critical Infrastructure:</p>	<p>Malibu Comments on Proposed Decision at 2: “Interim List of Critical Facilities Should Include Wastewater Facilities. Malibu generally agrees with</p>	<p>Verified</p>

	<p>the interim list of critical facilities identified in the Proposed Decision (PD). In particular, Malibu strongly supports the clarification in the PD that critical water facilities include those “associated with the provision of drinking water including facilities used to pump, divert, transport, store, treat and deliver water.” It is important that all aspects of the water system be included. However, this list should be expanded to include wastewater facilities. While water may play a greater role in firefighting, wastewater facilities are vital during any extended de-energization event. As an <i>example</i>, loss of power at sewer lift stations, and treatment facilities could have dramatic health and safety impacts. In some scenarios, wastewater system failures could render homes uninhabitable. For this reason, Malibu recommends that the PD be modified to expand the list of interim critical facilities to include wastewater facilities. Draft language is attached in Exhibit A.</p>	
<p>Definition of Critical Facilities/ Critical Infrastructure:</p>	<p>Malibu Comments on Proposed Decision, Exhibit A: Water and Wastewater Systems Sector - Facilities associated with the provision of drinking water including facilities used to pump, divert, transport, store, treat and deliver water or wastewater.</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>Definition of Critical Facilities/ Critical Infrastructure:</p>	<p>D.19-05-042 at 75-76: “The Commission adopts the following interim list of critical facilities/infrastructure based upon the Department of Homeland Security’s Critical Infrastructure Sectors: Water and Wastewater Systems Sector - Facilities associated with the provision</p>	<p>Verified</p>

	of drinking water or processing of wastewater including facilities used to pump, divert, transport, store, treat and deliver water or wastewater	
--	--	--

**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?</b> <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes
<b>b. Were there Other Parties to the Proceeding with Positions Similar to Yours?</b>	Yes	Yes
<b>c. If so, Provide Name of Other Parties:</b> California State Association of Counties (CSAC); Joint Local Governments		Noted
<b>d. Intervenor’s Claim of Non-Duplication:</b> The City of Malibu was the only party to the proceeding that represented the perspective of a community that had both experienced a catastrophic wildfire in the previous year and dealt with a De-Energization event in Southern California Edison territory. While it is natural that the City did share some positions with other local governments and agency interest groups, the City provided a unique perspective and substantial independent contributions, as noted above.		Noted

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**

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

	CPUC Discussion
<b>a. Intervenor’s Claim of Cost Reasonableness:</b> Malibu incurred \$8,341.50 in fees participating in this proceeding. Given the number of parties, Malibu sought to focus its participation specifically on issues related to it and similar local governments. In particular, the City focused on issues related to first responders/critical facilities, notification (especially to affected local agencies) and reporting. As an <i>example</i> , the City noted that many cities with contract	The claimed costs are reasonable.

<sup>2</sup>The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Cal Advocates pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

<p>public safety or public safety services provided by a separate local agency still must be included in the definition of first responder given the emergency response role that they play.</p>	
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed:</b>                  Malibu ensured that tasks were accomplished as efficiently as possible. Mr. Nelson took the lead in preparing all comments and pleadings with appropriate oversight and review from Ms. Hogin as City Attorney. Ms. Zambrano provided assistance as necessary. Mr. Bodell has been assisting as Ms. Zambrano recently went on leave.</p>	<p>The claimed hours are reasonable.</p>
<p><b>c. Allocation of Hours by Issue:</b>                  Malibu allocated its time by issue as set forth in the Attorney timesheets. A summary is below:                  GP: 67%                  R: 11%                  CF: 11%                  O: 11%</p>	<p>The allocation of hours is reasonable.</p>

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Christi Hogin	2018	.5	\$500	Comment 1	\$250	0.5	\$500 [1]	\$250.00
Christi Hogin	2019	1.7	\$535	Res. ALJ-357 (5% step and 2.35% 2019 COLA)	\$909.5	1.7	\$535 [2]	\$909.50
Joshua Nelson	2018		\$350	Comment 2	\$980	2.8	\$350 [3]	\$980.00
Joshua Nelson	2019		\$375	Res. ALJ-357 (5% step and 2.35% 2019 COLA)	\$4,575	12.2	\$375 [4]	\$4,575.00
Ashley Zambrano	2019	3.9	\$255	Comment 3	\$994.5	3.9	\$255 [5]	\$994.50

<b>Subtotal: \$7,709</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$7,709.00</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>
Benjamin Bodell	2019	3.2	\$110	1/2 claimed 2019 rate	\$352	3.2	\$110 [6]	\$352.00
Joshua Nelson	2019	3.5	\$187	1/2 claimed 2019 rate	\$280.5	1.5 [7]	\$187.50	\$281.25
<b>Subtotal: \$632.50</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$633.25</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$8,341.50</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$8,342.25</b>		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
<b>ATTORNEY INFORMATION</b>								
<b>Attorney</b>	<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>3</sup></b>		<b>Member Number</b>		<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation</b>			
Christi Hogan	Dec. 1988		138649		No			
Joshua Nelson	Dec. 2008		260803		No			
Benjamin Bodell	May 2017		314661		No			
Ashley Zambrano	Dec. 2014		299090		No			

<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>.

**C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:**

<b>Attachment or Comment #</b>	<b>Description/Comment</b>
1	Certificate of Service
2	Timesheets for Malibu’s Attorneys
Comment 1	<p><b>Christi Hogin</b>            To assess an appropriate rate for CPUC work, Malibu reviewed the posted “Intervenor Hourly Rates”, considered Ms. Hogin’s previous experience; and reviewed Resolutions ALJ-352 and ALJ-357. Specifically, the 2018 range for attorneys with 13 or more years of experience at \$310-\$555 and 2019 range for attorneys with 13 or more years of experience at \$340-\$600. Ms. Hogin does not have an approved intervenor compensation rate.</p> <p>Christi Hogin serves as city attorney for the cities of Lomita, Malibu and Palos Verdes Estates. She also serves as assistant city attorney to West Hollywood and provides a variety of legal services to other city clients.</p> <p>Ms. Hogin has been practicing law since 1988 and her practice focuses on land use, environmental, constitutional, coastal and election law. She also has an active litigationpractice, representing local governments in cases involving the Brown Act, Public Records Act, California Environmental Quality Act, Coastal Act, election challenges and constitutional law. Ms. Hogin has been lead counsel in dozens of appellate cases, practicing in both the California Court of Appeal and the U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.</p> <p>Ms. Hogin is active in the League of California Cities, and leads the Coastal City Attorneys Caucus. She served as an officer of the City Attorneys’ Department and as Department President 2015-2016. She also represented the City Attorneys Department on the League’s Environmental Quality Policy Committee. Ms. Hogin is a past president of the City Attorneys Association of Los Angeles County.</p> <p>The Daily Journal twice named Ms. Hogin among California’s Top 25 Municipal Lawyers and she is regularly recognized as one of Los Angeles' Top Women Lawyers. She was profiled in a special Municipal Law supplement edition of the paper and has been honored as one of the Top Women Lawyers in California. Ms. Hogin has also been named a Southern California Super Lawyer® by her peers 14 times, including for 2019.</p> <p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washington College of Law, American University, J.D., managing editor, American University Law Review</li> <li>• University of California at Los Angeles, B.A., political science and women’s studies, Phi Sigma Alpha</li> </ul>

	<p>Ms. Hogin provider supervisor and oversight to Malibu’s participation. She further provided specific insight and expert opinion into the effect of this proceeding on Malibu and similar cities.</p>
Comment 2	<p><b>Joshua Nelson</b></p> <p>To assess an appropriate rate for CPUC work, Malibu reviewed the posted “Intervenor Hourly Rates”, considered Mr. Nelson’s previous experience; and reviewed Resolutions ALJ-352 and ALJ-357. Specifically, the 2018 range for attorneys with 8-12 years of experience are \$340-\$400 and the 2019 range for attorneys with 8-12 years of experience are \$350-\$410. Mr. Nelson has an approved intervenor rate but it has been more than four years since it was approved or used in any proceeding.</p> <p>Mr. Nelson has been practicing law since 2008 and has been assisting predominately public agency clients with CPUC and other utility issues during that time. Before the CPUC, Mr. Nelson has represented parties in various energy, water and communications proceedings.</p> <p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of California, Davis School of Law, J.D.</li> <li>• Cornell University, B.S., Industrial and Labor Relations</li> </ul>
Comment 3	<p><b>Ashley Zambrano</b></p> <p>To assess an appropriate rate for CPUC work, Malibu reviewed the posted “Intervenor Hourly Rates”, considered Ms. Zambrano’s previous experience; and reviewed Resolution ALJ-357. Specifically, the 2019 range for attorneys with 5-7 years of experience are \$320-350. Ms. Zambrano does not have an approved intervenor compensation rate.</p> <p>Ms. Zambrano has been practicing law since 2014 and primarily focuses on public agency litigation and transactional and advisory work for cities and other local governmental agencies. She has represented public agencies before the CPUC.</p> <p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of San Francisco, School of Law, J.D., magna cum laude</li> <li>• University of Southern California, B.A., international relations, cum laude</li> </ul>
Comment 4	<p><b>Benjamin Bodell</b></p> <p>To assess an appropriate rate for CPUC work, Malibu reviewed the posted “Intervenor Hourly Rates”, considered Mr. Bodell’s previous experience; and reviewed Resolution ALJ-357. Specifically, the 2019 range for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience is \$180-240. Mr. Bodell does not have an approved intervenor compensation rate.</p> <p>Mr. Bodell has been practicing law since 2017 and has been assisting clients on energy and other utility matters during that entire time. He has represented private clients and public agencies before the CPUC.</p> <p><u>Education</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• University of California, Hastings College of the Law, J.D.</li> </ul>

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

Item	Reason
[1] Christi Hogan (Hogan) 2018 Rate	The City of Malibu requests an hourly rate of \$500 for Hogan's work in 2018. According to the claim, Hogan has more than 30 years of experience as a practicing attorney in issues relevant to the Commission. Pursuant to Res ALJ-357, hourly rates for attorneys with more than 13 years of the experience range between \$350 and \$615. We find the requested rate reasonable given her experience and background. We adopt a 2018 rate of \$500.
[2] Hogan 2019 Rate	For Hogan's work in 2019, the City of Malibu requests a 5% step increase, pursuant to D.08-04-010, and a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) of 2.35%, adopted in Res ALJ-357 for 2019. We apply the 2019 COLA per ALJ Res - 357 and the 5% step increase and approve the hourly rate of \$535.00 for Hogan's work in 2019.
[3] Joshua Nelson (Nelson) 2018 Rate	The City of Malibu requests an hourly rate of \$350 for attorney Nelson's work in 2018. The latest previous hourly rate for Nelson was adopted by the Commission for his work in 2014 (D.15-08-039); therefore, we adopt a new hourly rate for this attorney. By December of 2018, Nelson, according to the claim, had had 9 years of the relevant practice. Pursuant to Res ALJ-352, an hourly rate for attorneys with 8-12 years of experience range between \$340 and \$400. We find the requested rate reasonable given Nelson's experience. We adopt a 2018 rate of \$350.
[4] Joshua Nelson (Nelson) 2019 Rate	For Nelson's work in 2019, the City of Malibu requests a 5% step increase, pursuant to D. 08-04-010, and a COLA of 2.35%, adopted for 2019 in Res ALJ-357.  We apply the 2019 COLA and the 5% step increase and approve the hourly rate of \$375 for Nelson's work in 2019.
[5] Ashley Zambrano (Zambrano) 2019 rate	The City of Malibu requests an hourly rate of \$255 for attorney Zambrano's work in 2019. According to the claim, Zambrano has been practicing law since 2014 and had 5 years of experience at the time relevant to the claim.  Pursuant to Res ALJ-357, hourly rates for attorneys with 5 to 7 years of experience range between \$320 and \$350. The requested hourly rate does not exceed this limit. We adopt the requested hourly rate of \$255 for Zambrano's work in 2019.
[6] Benjamin Bodell (Bodell) 2019 rate	The City of Malibu requests an hourly rate of \$110 for an attorney Bodell's work on the intervenor compensation matters. Since the intervenor compensation work is rated at one half of the regular

	<p>professional rate, Bodell’s full professional rate requested in the claim is \$220. According to the claim, Bodell started practicing law in May of 2017; by 2019, he had 2 years of the relevant experience.</p> <p>Pursuant to Res ALJ-357, hourly rates for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience range between \$180 and \$240. The requested hourly rate does not exceed this limit. We adopt the hourly rate of \$220 for Bodell’s work in 2019.</p>
[7] Miscalculation of hours	<p>According to the time records, Nelson spent 1.50 hours on preparing the subject claim. We adjust the hours to align with the time records submitted.</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))**

<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. City of Malibu has made a substantial contribution to D.19-05-042.
2. The requested hourly rates for City of Malibu’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 \$8,342.25.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

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

**ORDER**

1. City of Malibu shall be awarded \$8,342.25.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., and PacifiCorp dba Pacific Power, shall pay City of Malibu their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2019 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 19, 2019, the 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of City of Malibu's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Date January 13, 2022 at San Francisco, California.

ALICE REYNOLDS

President

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

DARCIE HOUCK

Commissioners

**APPENDIX**

## Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D2201015	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1905042		
Proceeding(s):	R1812005		
Author:	ALJs Kao and DeAngelis		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, San Diego Gas & Electric Company, Liberty Utilities (CalPeco Electric), Bear Valley Electric Service, Inc., and PacifiCorp dba Pacific Power		

## Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
City of Malibu	8/5/19	\$8,341.50	\$8,342.25	N/A	See CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustment Section above.

## Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Christi	Hogin	Attorney	\$500	2018	\$500
Christi	Hogin	Attorney	\$535	2019	\$535
Joshua	Nelson	Attorney	\$350	2018	\$350
Joshua	Nelson	Attorney	\$375	2019	\$375
Ashley	Zambrano	Attorney	\$255	2019	\$255
Benjamin	Bodell	Attorney	\$220	2019	\$220

**(END OF APPENDIX)**