

Decision 22-04-020 April 7, 2022

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion to Consider the Ratemaking and Other Implications of a Proposed Plan for Resolution of Voluntary Case filed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, pursuant to Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, in the United States Bankruptcy Court, Northern District of California, San Francisco Division, In re Pacific Gas and Electric Corporation and Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Case No.19-30088.

Investigation 19-09-016

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO
WILLIAM B. ABRAMS FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION
TO DECISION (D.) 20-05-053 AND D.20-10-018**

Intervenor: William B. Abrams	For contribution to Decision (D.) 20-05-053, D.20-10-018
Claimed: \$99,605	Awarded: \$53,537.50
Assigned Commissioner: Alice Reynolds ¹	Assigned ALJ: Brian Stevens ²

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	This decision (D.20-05-053) approves, with conditions and modifications, the reorganization plan of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) and its holding company PG&E Corporation (PG&E Corp.) pursuant to the requirements of Assembly Bill 1054 (Ch. 79, Stats. 2019). Changes to PG&E's governance structure and enhancements to the Commission's oversight are
--	---

¹ This proceeding was reassigned from President Batjer to President Alice Reynolds on January 5, 2022.

² This proceeding was reassigned from ALJ Buch to ALJ Stevens on February 7, 2022.

	put in place to facilitate PG&E's ability to provide safe, reliable and affordable utility service. The decision (D.20-10-018) closes this proceeding.
--	--

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812³:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	10/23/2019	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	11/14/2019	Verified
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:	R.18-12-005	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:		
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Supplement to NOI filed on 6/17/19	Verified
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:	R.18-12-005	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Filed Under Seal on 7/29/19	Verified
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.20-10-018	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	10/26/2020	Verified

³ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
15. File date of compensation request:	12/22/2020	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
1	I was very active and engaged in this proceeding including substantial contributions to the Evidentiary Hearings which required significant preparation time. Individually, I spent over 12 hours cross-examining witnesses that provided substantial contribution to proceeding and the decision.	Noted
2	As a wildfire survivor and the only "victim" actively engaged in this proceeding, I provided value and perspective from the "victim" standpoint that was not represent by any other party in the proceeding. Given that victims are also ratepayers as well as shareholders through this bankruptcy, this "victim" perspective was critical to understanding the broad impacts.	Noted
3	I have over 20 years of related experience in various executive and managerial roles and have significant experience managing restructuring within organizations large and small. I also have substantial consulting experience related to these decisions. Please, see my resume with my notice for R.18-12-005 submitted on 7/29/19.	Noted
4	I was actively engaged in the US Bankruptcy proceeding (Case#19-30088) spending countless hours to advocate for victims and the public. However, unlike all other parties, I did NOT bill any time in that proceeding and did NOT charge any of my time in that proceeding through this Intervenor Claim. However, my active engagement in that proceeding (including filing well over 10 motions and briefs) gave me unique and significant perspective that I brought to this decision before the commission.	Noted

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
I am presenting my substantial contributions to this proceeding and to these decisions in reverse chronological order (most recent first) in which the positions were presented:		
1. I argued at the prehearing conference that we did not need to wait for Tubbs estimation to review non-financial issues. I stress the importance of safety and governance issues. This recommendation was adopted by ALJ, Allen. (Abrams Transcript PHC, pg. 108-110)	“Because of that uncertainty, some parties have suggested that the Commission start its review of the plans of reorganization with the non-financial issues, such as safety, climate change, and governance issues. (See, TURN, Transcript v. PHC at 97, Abrams, Transcript PHC at 108-110.) This approach makes sense, and is adopted, as these issues can be examined before there is an outcome of the estimation and Tubbs proceedings.” (See, Assigned Commissioners’ Scoping Memo and Ruling, 11/14/2019, pg. 10 and ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING MODIFYING SCHEDULE, 12/27/2019, pg. 3)	Verified
2. I argued extensively for this equity across my opening brief including the statement “Indeed, the commission is required by the Public Utilities Code to weigh any and all proposed plans based on the criteria set in § 854 in the best interests of the State of California and those stakeholders that reside and operate within it.” (WBA BRIEF ON PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 854 ISSUES RELATED TO PROPOSED PLANS FOR PACIFIC GAS AND	“Abrams supports applying the requirements of Section 854 to the two plans currently before the Commission and any other plans that may come before the Commission.” (See, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING ON PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 854, 11/27/2019, pg. 5)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
ELECTRIC COMPANY PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE, pg. 4)		
3. I argued in my brief the applicability of § 853(b) including the statement that “The commission is obligated to look at any and all proposed plans that are offered up and seriously under consideration in US Bankruptcy Court to support that court’s determination of “feasibility”. (WBA BRIEF ON PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 854 ISSUES RELATED TO PROPOSED PLANS FOR PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE, pg. 5-6)	“Even the parties that oppose the use of Section 853(b) – PG&E, TCC, CUE, Abrams - do not contest the Commission’s authority to use it.” (See, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING ON PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 854, 11/27/2019, pg. 8)	Verified
4. I advocated for fairness and equity in terms of how the competing plans would be considered stating “we should welcome any and all plans to compete on a playing field... to ensure only a “prudent manager” arises from bankruptcy to provide “safe and reliable” service.” (WBA BRIEF ON PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 854 ISSUES RELATED TO PROPOSED PLANS FOR PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE, pg. 6)	“Abrams does not directly address Section 853(b), but in the section of his brief addressing whether the Commission should apply the exemption from Section 854 pursuant to Section 853(b), Abrams primarily expresses a desire for a “level playing field” for any and all plans of reorganization brought before the Commission.” (See, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE’S RULING ON PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 854, 11/27/2019, pg. 9)	Verified
5. I filed this motion to get bankruptcy related issues onto the record which directly pertained to the commission decision including “PG&E RSA, pending decision of Governor Newsom and related Form	“On December 11, 2019, William B. Abrams (Abrams) filed a Motion to Amend the Schedule of this proceeding. Abrams’ Motion is DENIED.” (See, E-MAIL RULING DENYING MOTION TO AMEND SCHEDULE	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
8-K submitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)" (See, WBA MOTION TO AMEND THE SCHEDULE GIVEN THE RECENTLY SUBMITTED PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY RESTRUCTURING SUPPORT AGREEMENT (RSA), 12/11/2019)	OF WILLIAM B. ABRAMS, 12/11/2019, pg. 2)	
6. I argued extensively at the status conference for more representation from the public given the trajectory of the proceeding. (See, Reporter's Transcript, December 20, 2019 pg. 9-24, 35-36, 51)	"At the Status Conference on December 20, 2019, William B. Abrams (Abrams) made a motion that the Commission hold Public Participation Hearings in this proceeding. Abrams subsequently filed a written Motion for Evidentiary Hearings and Public Participation Hearings on December 30, 2019, with supporting attachments. After reviewing the supporting attachments, considering the arguments made in the motions and the applicable statutes, Abrams' Motions are DENIED." (See, E-MAIL RULING DENYING MOTIONS FOR HEARINGS OF WILLIAM B. ABRAMS, 1/2/2020, pg. 6)	Verified
7. I provided arguments across many of my briefs to promote a safe path for the PG&E reorganization and argued that the commission should consider all remedies provided by Public Utilities Code including the modification or elimination of PG&E holding company structure and making a turn towards performance-based regulation. (See, COMMENTS OF WILLIAM B. ABRAMS ON THE PROPOSED OPTIONS TO CONTINUE THE ORDER INSTITUTING INVESTIGATION ON THE	"William B. Abrams (Abrams) argues that the proceeding should consider modification or elimination of PG&E Corporation's holding company structure and linking PG&E's return on equity to safety performance metrics." (See, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING UPDATING CASE STATUS, 9/4/2020, pg. 5)	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION TO IMPROVE THE SAFETY CULTURE OF PG&E CORPORATION, 8/4/2020, pg. 4-5)		
8. I provided 20 pages of opening testimony to provide professional perspective and provide the unique personal perspective of a wildfire survivor and PG&E victim. (See, WILLIAM B. ABRAMS OPENING TESTIMONY ON NON-FINANCIAL ISSUES RELATED TO PROPOSED PLAN FOR RESOLUTION OF VOLUNTARY CASE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE BY PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, 12/13/2019)	D.20-05-053 (pg. 5) "On December 13, 2019, opening testimony on non-financial issues was served by PG&E, AHC, The Utility Reform Network (TURN), William B. Abrams (Abrams), the California Large Energy Consumers Association (CLECA), and Small Business Utility Advocates (SBUA), consistent with the schedule established in the Scoping Memo."	Verified
9. I provided 20 pages of reply testimony to respond to the opening comments and position of other parties in the proceeding. (See, WILLIAM B. ABRAMS REPLY TESTIMONY RELATED TO THE PROPOSED PLAN FOR RESOLUTION OF VOLUNTARY CASE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 11 OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE BY PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, 2/21/2020)	D.20-05-053 (pg. 8) "On February 21, 2020, reply testimony was served by Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE), City and County of San Francisco (CCSF), TURN, Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (A4NR), Abrams, CLECA, and SBUA."	Verified
10. I filed this brief to bring unique perspective to the proceeding regarding implications within the communities and brought relevant information from other proceedings to help inform decisions. (See, "WILLIAM B. ABRAMS OPENING BRIEF REGARDING	D.20-05-053 (pg. 9) "Briefs were filed by A4NR, CUE, Marin Clean Energy (MCE), Joint CCAs, EPUC/IS, South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID), Next E	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PLAN OF REORGANIZATION PURSUANT TO AB1054 AND RELATED BANKRUPTCY EXIT CRITERIA", 3/13/2020)		
11. I provided background regarding the criminal probation of PG&E and argued among other points that safety/financial risks would shift to ratepayers and public. (See, "WILLIAM B. ABRAMS REPLY BRIEF GIVEN "PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY'S (U 39 E) POST-HEARING BRIEF AND COMMENTS ON ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S PROPOSALS", 3/20/2020)	D.20-05-053 (pg. 10) "On March 26, 2020, reply briefs and reply comments were filed by A4NR, CLECA, Joint CCAs, CUE, EPUC/IS, Cal Advocates, CCSF, CEERT, TCC, PG&E, TURN, Abrams, and SBUA."	Verified
12. I pointed out to ALJ Allen that the AB1054 deadline in the bill was something set for PG&E stating "PG&E is late getting to this point and that June deadline is their deadline?" (See, Reporter's Transcript, vol. 6, 3/3/2020, pg. 1088)	D.20-05-053 (pg. 10-11) "One party, Abrams, argued that the Commission should not feel bound by the deadline set in AB 1054, and should take as much time as it deems necessary, on the grounds that the deadline is a deadline for PG&E, not the Commission. (Transcript v. 6 at 1088.)"	Verified
13. I argued that PG&E did not demonstrate measurable wildfire risk mitigation to meet this standard and alignment with California's climate goals. (See, "WILLIAM B. ABRAMS OPENING BRIEF REGARDING PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PLAN OF REORGANIZATION PURSUANT TO AB1054 AND RELATED BANKRUPTCY EXIT CRITERIA", 3/13/20, pg. 8)	D.20-05-053 (pg. 94) "Abrams argues that PG&E's plan is an inadequate response to climate change, and that: "The plan must provide measurable climate change adaptation metrics in-line with California's climate goals and tied to PG&E bottom-line financial metrics." (Ex. Abrams-1.)"	Verified
14. I argued that PG&E wildfire related CO2 emissions should be considered and demonstrates that	D.20-05-053 (pg. 94) Abrams' brief reiterates the idea that the plan of reorganization must effectively	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
they are not supporting California's climate goals. (See, "WILLIAM B. ABRAMS OPENING BRIEF REGARDING PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY PLAN OF REORGANIZATION PURSUANT TO AB1054 AND RELATED BANKRUPTCY EXIT CRITERIA", 3/13/20, pg. 8)	address wildfire mitigation in order to be consistent with the state's climate goals. (Abrams Brief at 8.)"	
15. See Reporter's Transcript, volume 1, Evidentiary Hearing 2/25/20, pg. 88-165	Through the Evidentiary Hearing cross examination of B. Johnson, CEO (Day 1), I brought to light the distinctions between past wildfire mitigation activities, current disposition and the propensity of PG&E toward safety and financial issues critical to the proceeding. I also focused on the financial mechanisms PG&E might use to address their safety risks "Q: So have you considered financial mechanisms to target risk? A: No." (See, pg. 119	Verified
16. See Reporter's Transcript, volume 2, Evidentiary Hearing 2/26/20, pg. 298-323	Through the Evidentiary Hearings and cross Examination of Mr. Plaster on (Day 2), I probed regarding the financial implications to the plan for ratepayers, PG&E and the public particularly with increasing wildfire risk.	Verified
17. See Reporter's Transcript volume 3, Evidentiary Hearing 2/27/20, pg. 422-478	Through the Evidentiary Hearings (Day 3) and cross examination of Mr. Vesey, CEO PG&E Utility, I uncovered the PG&E safety disposition related communications and the degree to which the company was positioned to address their risks and have a culture of safety among other issues.	Verified
18. See Reporter's Transcript volume 4, Evidentiary Hearing 2/28/20, pg. 587-618, pg. 738-774	Through the Evidentiary Hearings (Day 4) and cross examination of Mr. Wells, CFO, I probed regarding the financial strength of PG&E and how the company would respond financial to more wildfire risks and the reliance on the	Verified

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	Wildfire Fund. I also cross-examined Ms. Brownell, Board Chair regarding PG&E governance and their orientation to ensure a safety culture and the right skills to turnaround the company.	
19. See Reporter's Transcript volume 5, Evidentiary Hearing 3/2/20, pg. 838-888, pg. 971-1,000	Through the Evidentiary Hearings (Day 5) and cross examination of Ms. Kane, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer I revealed the company code of ethics had not been updated since August 2013 among other questions of safety and ethics in the corporation, I also extensively cross-examined Ms. Powell, VP Electrical Safety, Mr. Pender and Ms. Maratukulam regarding how PG&E was repositioning to address wildfire risks.	Verified
20. See Reporter's Transcript volume 6, Evidentiary Hearing 3/3/20, pg. 1115-1137, 1156-1161, 1169	Through the Evidentiary Hearings (Day 6) and cross examination of Mr. Kenney, VP of Regulatory and External Affairs I brought to light how PG&E would navigate the regulatory hurdles due to past and present wildfires and how he viewed the CPUC role in this proceeding, I also cross-examined Mr. Wyspianski and Mr. Lowe.	Verified
21. See Reporter's Transcript volume 7, Evidentiary Hearing 3/4/20, pg. 1395, pg. 1426	Through the Evidentiary Hearings (Day 5) and cross examination of Mr. Gorman and Mr. Long, I brought broader understanding of the different perspectives of other parties to the proceeding relative to safety, quality of service and utility financials. I also argued for inclusion of safety related documents to be entered as evidence in the proceeding.	Verified

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?⁴	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No. Some parties supported and had complementary positions but in certain areas I stood alone to advocate for safety metrics tied to financials and a broader interpretation of AB1054.	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties:		
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: I was the only "PG&E victim" that was a party to the proceeding. Additionally, I was the only individual in the proceeding that argued both within the US Bankruptcy courtroom before Judge Montali and ALJ Allen regarding safety and financial issues. Given this unique role, I was able to identify issues across these proceedings that would support the Commission's work and goals within this proceeding. Additionally, my professional background managing private and public organizations with a heavy focus on risk mitigation, organizational development and analytics provided additional important context along with experience in adjacent industries including tech, telecom, emergency management solutions and diverse nonprofits.		Noted

C. Additional Comments on Part II:

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	I have attended meetings with PG&E representatives, representatives of the TCC, Bondholders, Shareholder Groups, Fire Claimant Professionals and other parties that were also parties to the US Bankruptcy Court proceeding. I have been careful NOT to count any of those meetings towards this claim	Noted

⁴ The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion
	even though I am not billing for my work in the US Bankruptcy Court.	
	I inadvertently filed a public document during the quiet period of this proceeding. That filing, the related notices nor any work associated with that filing is included within this claim.	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>My request for intervenor compensation is very reasonable given my unique professional and personal experience and expertise I bring to this proceeding. As a "victim", ratepayer and now shareholder, I was able to provide perspective that no other party to the proceeding could provide. I understand first-hand the safety risks from utilities like PG&E that have not been oriented towards safe and reliable service as my family and I ran through the flames in October, 2017. I am also very familiar with the pain and financial circumstances of ratepayers who were adversely affected by PG&E. Through this proceeding, I worked to bring these perspectives to light while supporting PG&E to seek the turnaround we all wish occurs.</p> <p>Moreover, my executive and managerial-level experience across sectors (business, nonprofit and government) for over 25 years allowed me to work within the guidelines of the proceeding, to provide advice and guidance directly relevant to the focus of this proceeding. I have spent a considerable amount of time in Sacramento working to provide this perspective to Legislators and others so that they can better understand the needs of ratepayers, victims and the public. I have looked for win-win solutions that will support utility interests, utility investor interests, ratepayers, victims and the public.</p> <p>I believe my work associated with this proceeding has provided specific and practical recommendations regarding how to move forward given the AB-1054 requirements and the goals of the commission within this proceeding. The aggressive timeline associated with this proceeding has meant that I have had to put other professional and personal endeavors on hold. I have had to turn down other clients and forgo other compensation to participate in this proceeding. That said, I am very</p>	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
<p>appreciative that the commission accepted me as a party to this important proceeding. I feel it is my duty given what my family went through the night of October 8, 2017 to participate and contribute as much as I can to these important issues.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>I am seeking compensation for my 332 hours of work on this proceeding which does not include travel time or meetings with stakeholders that also were engaged in the US Bankruptcy Courtroom. My work on this proceeding was extensive and included over 25 different filings on matters central to this proceeding including but not limited to the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Comments/Briefs/Reply Briefs 2) Testimony and Reply Testimony 3) Evidentiary Hearing – Extensive Preparation and Participation 4) Meetings with Parties on all sides of this proceeding to understand and share perspective and to find common ground to advance the matters before the commission in this proceeding 5) Motions were put forward to support the Commission with their critical work by modifications to scope and schedule including the request of public participation hearings and to get central documents onto the record of the proceeding. <p>I am not claiming compensation on much of my volunteer work that has informed my recommendations for these proceedings. During this same period of time, I have been working with various parties locally (Fire Chiefs, wildfire survivors, PG&E victims, local elected officials, etc.) along with former colleagues and those working for change on broader climate change adaptation, recovery/resiliency and economic equality issues. I have met with other subject matter experts to inform my work to provide recommendations and guidance in this proceeding. My prior work in government, nonprofit and corporate environments provided me contacts and context to provide broad-based recommendations related to many facets of this proceedings.</p> <p>Summary: I believe my work both through my filed documents and through the evidentiary hearings speaks to the reasonableness of my request. Also, please consider the scope and complexity of the issues (financial and non-financial) where I provide significant contribution.</p>	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue: I have provided detailed analysis and recommendations on many issues associated with this proceeding. The following provides a general breakdown of the hours devoted to each category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance Structure and Safety Culture Considerations – Ensure that PG&E has an ingrained and verifiable safety culture in-line with AB1054 as a precondition to bankruptcy exit (25%) • Ratepayer Financial Impacts – Impact on rates (rate neutral per AB1054) and the general impacts on resident cost of living and business health across California (25%) • Consistency with State Climate Goals – Ensure that PG&E is adequately positioned to focus on renewables and to meet or exceed California’s climate change goals (25%) • Quality of Service and Other Compliance Issues – Evaluate whether the PG&E plan will improve the quality of service for ratepayers and the overall quality of PG&E management relative to compliance with AB-1054 and other Public Utilities Code (15%) • Financial and Operational Feasibility Issues – Determine if the plan sufficiently orients PG&E finances and operations given AB1054 to provide safe/reliable service without the need to re-enter bankruptcy (10%) 	Noted

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
William B. Abrams (expert)	2019	117	\$290.00	D.20-05-053	\$33,930	117.00	\$155.00 [1]	\$18,135.00
William B. Abrams (expert)	2020	214	\$290.00	D.20-05-053	\$62,060	214.00	\$160.00 [2]	\$34,240.00
Subtotal: \$95,990.00						Subtotal: \$52,375.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
William B. Abrams	2019	15	\$145.00	D.20-10-018	\$2,175	15.00	\$77.50 [3]	\$1,162.50
Subtotal: \$2,175.00						Subtotal: \$1,162.50		

CLAIMED				CPUC AWARD
COSTS				
#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount
1.	Travel Expenses	12 Trips from Santa Rosa to San Francisco at \$120/trip	\$1,440	\$0.00 [4]
<i>Subtotal: \$1,440.00</i>				<i>Subtotal: \$0.00</i>
<i>TOTAL REQUEST: \$99,605.00</i>				<i>TOTAL AWARD: \$53,537.50</i>
<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>				

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Timesheet
Comment #1	Quoted hourly rate of William B. Abrams is less than ½ his usual hourly rate.
Comment #2	Hours worked with Wildfire Survivor Groups, Nonprofits and Local/State Governmental Organizations and other SME Stakeholders to inform my recommendations in this proceeding were not included in this claim.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1]	Per D.20-08-009, Abrams adopted rate for 2019 is \$155.00
[2]	Adopting \$160 rate for 2020. New rate based on Abram's 2019 rate adjusted to reflect Resolution ALJ-387 (2.55% COLA).
[3]	Per D.20-08-009, Abrams adopted rate for 2019 is \$155. IComp preparation is compensated at ½ the preparer's normal hourly rate which in this case will be \$77.50

Item	Reason
[4]	The Commission does not reimburse intervenors for trips between locations that are less than 120 miles apart. Santa Rosa is roughly 95 miles from Sacramento and Santa Rosa is roughly 55 miles from San Francisco.

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 (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion
	No comments were filed.	

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. William B. Abrams has made a substantial contribution to D.20-05-053 and D.20-10-018.
2. The requested hourly rates for William B. Abrams' 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 \$53,537.50.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. William B. Abrams shall be awarded \$53,537.50.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay William B. Abrams the total award. 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 March 3, 2021, the 75th day after the filing of William B. Abrams' 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 April 7, 2022, at San Francisco, California.

ALICE REYNOLDS
President
CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN
GENEVIEVE SHIROMA
DARCIE L. HOUCK
JOHN R.D. REYNOLDS
Commissioners

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D2204020	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2005053, D2010018		
Proceeding(s):	I1909016		
Author:	ALJ Stevens		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/ Disallowance
William B. Abrams	12/22/20	\$99,605	\$53,537.50	N/A	See CPUC 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
William	Abrams	Expert	\$290.00	2019	\$155.00
William	Abrams	Expert	\$290.00	2020	\$160.00

(END OF APPENDIX)