

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue the Development of Rates and Infrastructure for Vehicle Electrification and Closing Rulemaking 13-11-007.

Rulemaking 18-12-006

DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO GREEN POWER INSTITUTE FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISIONS (D). 20-09-025, D.20-12-027, D.20-12-029, AND D.21-07-028

Intervenor: Green Power Institute	For contribution to Decisions (D.) 20-09-025, D.20-12-027, D.20-12-029, and D.21-07-028
Claimed: \$141,996	Awarded: \$120,734.40
Assigned Commissioner: Alice Reynolds ¹	Assigned ALJs: Marcelo Poirier and Colin Rizzo ²

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision (D.) 20-09-025 Clarifying Status of Electric Vehicle Charging Service Providers as Public Utilities. D.20-12-027 Concerning Low Carbon Fuel Standard Holdback Revenue Utilization. D.20-12-029 Concerning Implementation of Senate Bill 676 And Vehicle-Grid Integration Strategies. D.21-07-028 Setting Near-Term Priorities for Transportation Electrification Investments By The Electrical Corporations.
--	--

¹ This proceeding was re-assigned to Commissioner Alice Reynolds on January 31, 2023.

² Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Colin Rizzo was co-assigned to this proceeding on February 15, 2023.

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities (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:	March 1, 2019	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	March 29, 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:	Rulemaking (R.) 20-05-002	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 20, 2020	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.20-05-002	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 20, 2020	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes

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

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.21-07-028	D.20-09-025, D.20-12-027, D.20-12-029, D.21-07-028
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	July 21, 2021	September 28, 2020 December 21, 2020 December 21, 2020 July 21, 2021
15. File date of compensation request:	September 17, 2021	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):

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	(Please note that Attachment 2 includes a list of issue areas, and of GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.)	
<p>1. D.20-09-025</p> <p>EV Charging Service Providers are not Public Utilities.</p> <p>Decision D.20-09-025 is a narrow Decision that settles a Motion for clarification regarding whether EV charging service providers that are not covered by D.10-07-044 are still exempt from regulation as public utilities. GPI made a Substantial Contribution to the Decision by supporting the</p>	<p>Pleadings</p> <p>Therefore, this decision finds that EV charging service providers are not public utilities, in accordance with the Legislature's overall intentions with respect to providing charging services and developing business models to support widespread transportation electrification. [D.20-09-025, at 17.]</p> <p>The GPI's comments on the PD support the PD's finding that EV charging service providers are not public utilities, and provide additional legal argument in favor of the PD's conclusions.</p>	<p>Verified, in part. Formal filings submitted by GPI do not provide a distinct analysis. <i>See</i> CPUC discussion in Part III. D. [5].</p>

<p>Decision’s conclusions, and by supplying additional legal analysis and policy support for the Decision.</p>		
<p>2. D.20-12-027</p> <p>Utilization of Low Carbon Fuel Standard Holdback Revenue</p> <p>The GPI made substantial contributions to D.20-12-027 by advocating for more flexibility in the use of Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) funds, allocating more of the funds to marketing, education and outreach (ME&O) programs, including encouraging more collaboration between the IOUs and other entities engaging in ME&O, the allowance of LCFS funds to be used for rebates for secondhand EVs and other market sectors, and an increase in the minimum amount of LCFS holdback expenditures on equity projects to 75 percent starting in 2021. In most cases the Commission adopted our positions, and in cases where the Commission did not adopt our positions we made a substantial contribution by enriching the record underlying the Decision.</p>	<p>Pleadings</p> <p>Green Power Institute and Community Environmental Council (GPI/CEC) supported a used EV rebate program, but wished to include other electrified forms of transportation such as scooters (D.20-12-027, at 21).</p> <p>For these reasons, this decision holds that it is reasonable to impose requirements on the large electrical corporations regarding their use of LCFS holdback revenues (D.20-12-027, at 22).</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>3. D.20-12-029</p> <p>Implementation of SB 676 and Vehicle-Grid Integration Strategies.</p>	<p>Pleadings</p>	<p>Verified, in part. GPI does not reference to any particular instance showing that</p>

<p>The GPI made substantial contributions to D.20-12-029 through its active participation in the VGI working group, whose reports form the basis for the Decision. GPI played a key role in the working group, bringing proposals before the group, and contributing to the deliberations and reporting. In most cases the working group and the Commission adopted our positions, and in cases where the Commission did not adopt our positions we made a substantial contribution by enriching the record underlying the Decision.</p>	<p>GPI feels that this approach is insufficiently urgent given the severity of the various crises California faces, first and foremost the wildfire/PSPS crises driven by increasing heat storms and regional climate change. The Working Group completed significant work on the cost effectiveness issue and, while failing to complete that work for various reasons, was able to complete enough for the Commission to take action at this time. [GPI Comments, 12/3/20, at 3.]</p> <p>GPI recommended during the Working Group, with the support of various parties, that the final report adopt a color-coded qualitative approach to assessing cost-effectiveness in lieu of a detailed quantitative analysis at this time. [GPI Comments, 12/3/20, at 3.]</p> <p>It is this relative cost/benefit analysis that the Working Group did conduct that GPI suggests is sufficient to meet the statutory mandate and allow the Commission to move forward on the more obviously cost-effective recommendations contained in the report. Accordingly, we urge the Commission to reconsider its interpretation of the statutory language and the hard work that the Working Group did compete in assessing relative cost benefits. [GPI Comments, 12/3/20, at 5, emphasis in original.]</p>	<p>these comments meaningfully informed the decision. <i>See</i> CPUC discussion in Part III. D.[5].</p>
<p>4. D.21-07-028</p> <p>Near-Term Priorities for Transportation Electrification Investments.</p> <p>The GPI made substantial contributions to D.21-07-028 by supporting social equity in the use of transportation</p>	<p>Pleadings</p> <p>GPI/CEC suggested that “IOUs could survey their customers and install EVSE at publicly accessible workplace locations such as schools or government offices, and then do targeted outreach (such as mailers with information about the new chargers being accessible, and</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>electrification (TE) investments, advocating for increased and better targeted use of funds for ME&O, and proposing means to target investments to promote charging by disadvantaged customers. In many cases the Commission adopted our positions on the proposals in the Staff Proposal, and in cases where the Commission did not adopt our position, we made a substantial contribution by enriching the record underlying the Decision.</p>	<p>marketing collateral on utility rebate programs and the benefits of EVs) to MDU complexes within a few blocks of the location (D.21-07-028, at 30).”</p> <p>CEC/GPI also stated that ME&O for low-income and disadvantaged communities is important for increasing mid- and long-term EV adoption, as “low-income Californians could save thousands of dollars on gas each year if they knew about the affordability of 100+ mpge EVs. Lower income ‘supercommuters’ who live in outlying regions with more affordable housing, with 50+ mile commutes, have the most to save, and should be among the targets of deep ME&O efforts.” [D.21-07-028, at 30.]</p> <p>GPI/CEC recommended including a separate near-term priority area for ME&O, and included descriptions for several potential “deep ME&O” projects to be considered for near-term priority consideration (D.21-07-028, at 43).</p> <p>GPI/CEC recommended piloting dual workplace/MUD charging options to increase utilization of Level 2 EVSE at workplaces, with MUD tenants encouraged to use workplace charging infrastructure during non-business hours. TURN supported this proposal. [D.21-07-028, at 52).]</p> <p>This proposal not only ensures the equitable distribution of charging infrastructure, but removes the financial barrier to Level 2 EVSE installation that many homeowners and renters of single family homes face in underserved communities. Moreover, this proposal can assist “supercommuters” that have daily commutes that exceed the capability of Level 1 charging. [D.21-07-028, at 63, footnoted to GPI).]</p>	
---	--	--

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Noted
c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN, Tesla, Alliance for Transportation Electrification, ChargePoint, UCAN, Electrify America, UCS, Sierra Club, EDF, and the three large electric IOUs.		Noted
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: This proceeding covers a wide variety of topics related to California's transportation electrification program. The Green Power Institute has been an active participant in the Commission's clean energy proceedings, and is continuing these efforts in the present proceeding (R.18-12-006). The Green Power Institute coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties in order to avoid duplication of effort, filed joint comments with other parties, and added significantly to the outcome of the Commission's deliberations through our own unique perspective. Some amount of duplication has occurred in this proceeding on all sides of contentious issues, but Green Power avoided duplication to the extent possible, and tried to minimize it where it was unavoidable.		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**A. General Claim of Reasonableness (§ 1801 and § 1806):**

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>The GPI is providing, in Attachment 2, a listing of all of the pleadings we provided in this Proceeding, R.18-12-006, that are relevant to matters covered by this Claim, and in Attachment 3 a detailed breakdown of GPI staff time spent for work performed that was directly related to our substantial contributions to Decisions D.20-09-025, D.20-12-027, D.20-12-029 and D.21-07-028.</p>	Noted

The hours claimed herein in support of D.20-09-025, D.20-12-027, D.20-12-029 and D.21-07-028 are reasonable given the scope of the Proceeding, and the strong participation by the GPI. GPI staff maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to the matters settled by these Decisions in this case. In preparing Attachment 3, Dr. Morris reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding, and included only those that were reasonable and contributory to the underlying tasks. As a result, the GPI submits that all of the hours included in the attachment are reasonable, and should be compensated in full.

Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than 35 years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental fields. He is a nationally recognized expert on biomass and renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse-gas emissions analysis, integrated resources planning, and analysis of the environmental impacts of electric power generation. Dr. Morris holds a BA in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MSc in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a PhD in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Morris has been actively involved in electric utility restructuring in California throughout the past two decades. He served as editor and facilitator for the Renewables Working Group to the California Public Utilities Commission in 1996 during the original restructuring effort, consultant to the CEC Renewables Program Committee, consultant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on renewable energy policy during the energy crisis years, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation.

Mr. Hunt is a renewable energy law and policy expert with substantial experience in California, in local energy planning and in state energy-policy development. He has worked with local governments throughout Southern California, in his current role with Community Renewable Solutions LLC and in his previous role as Energy Program Director for the Community Environmental Council, a well-known non-profit organization based in Santa Barbara. Mr. Hunt was the lead author of the Community Environmental Council's A New Energy Direction, a blueprint for Santa Barbara County to wean itself from fossil fuels by 2030.

Mr. Hunt also contributes substantially to state policy, in Sacramento at the Legislature, and in San Francisco at the California Public Utilities Commission, in various proceedings related to renewable energy, energy efficiency, community-scale energy projects, and climate change policy. Mr. Hunt is also a Lecturer in Climate Change Law and Policy at UC Santa Barbara's Bren School of Environmental Science & Management (a graduate-level program) from

<p>2007-2014. He received his law degree from the UCLA School of Law in 2001, where he was chief managing director of the Journal for International Law and Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hunt is a regular columnist at GreenTechMedia.com.</p> <p>Rebecca Davis is a partner at the law firm Lozeau Drury LLP. She has been practicing environmental and energy law for over nine years, and has been an active member of the California Bar since was admitted in December 2010. As a partner of Lozeau Drury LLP, Ms. Davis represents community groups, environmental organizations, and labor unions in litigation and administrative law proceedings throughout California often enforcing the California Environmental Quality Act, the Clean Water Act, Proposition 65, and the Administrative Procedures Act, among others. She has litigated dozens of lawsuits through trial, settlement, or other negotiated resolution.</p>													
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>The GPI made Significant Contributions to D.20-09-025, D.20-12-027, D.20-12-029 and D.21-07-028 by actively participating in workshops and working groups, and providing a series of Commission filings on the various topics that were under consideration in the Proceeding and are covered by this Claim. Attachment 3 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant the GPI's claim in its entirety.</p>	<p>Hours claimed are not proportional to the level of contribution made due to lack of substantive commentary.</p>												
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>1. D.20-09-025</td> <td>EV charging service providers are not public utilities</td> <td>4%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. D.20-12-027</td> <td>Use of LCFS holdback funds</td> <td>5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. D.20-12-029</td> <td>Vehicle Grid Integration Strategies</td> <td>40%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. D.21-07-028</td> <td>Near-term priorities for transportation electrification investments</td> <td>51%</td> </tr> </table>	1. D.20-09-025	EV charging service providers are not public utilities	4%	2. D.20-12-027	Use of LCFS holdback funds	5%	3. D.20-12-029	Vehicle Grid Integration Strategies	40%	4. D.21-07-028	Near-term priorities for transportation electrification investments	51%	<p>Totals 100%</p>
1. D.20-09-025	EV charging service providers are not public utilities	4%											
2. D.20-12-027	Use of LCFS holdback funds	5%											
3. D.20-12-029	Vehicle Grid Integration Strategies	40%											
4. D.21-07-028	Near-term priorities for transportation electrification investments	51%											

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
G. Morris	2019	6.00	325	D.19-12-019	1,950	6.00	\$325	\$1,950.00

G. Morris	2020	11.00	335	D.21-03-040	3,685	11.00	\$335	\$3,685.00
G. Morris	2021	1.00	450	D.22-06-041	450	1.00	\$450	\$450.00
T. Hunt	2019	47.25	450	D.20-02-063	21,263 [1]	47.25	\$450	\$21,262.50
T. Hunt	2020	164.25	460	D.21-03-042	75,555	164.25	\$460	\$75,555.00
T. Hunt	2021	49.25	585	D.22-06-041	28,811 [2]	49.25	\$585	\$28,811.25
R. Davis	2019	6.00	350	D.20-12-039	2,100	6.00	\$350	\$2,100.00
R. Davis	2020	11.70	360	D.21-03-042	4,212	11.70	\$360	\$4,212.00
Subtotal: \$138,026						Subtotal: \$138,025.75 After 15% deduction applied Subtotal: \$117,321.90 [5]		

OTHER FEES

Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):

Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Paralegal	2020	3.00	130	See comment 3	390	0 [3]	N/A [3]	\$0.00
Paralegal	2021	1.20	140	See comment 3	168	0 [3]	N/A [3]	\$0.00
Davis trave	2019	1.50	175	½ 2019 rate	263 [4]	1.50	\$175	\$262.50
Subtotal: \$821						Subtotal: \$262.50		

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **

Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
G. Morris	2021	14.00	225	½ 2021 rate	3,150	14.00	\$225	\$3,150.00
Subtotal: \$3,150						Subtotal: \$3,150		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$141,996						TOTAL AWARD: \$120,734.40		

*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 are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR⁴	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Tamlyn Hunt	November 2001	218673	No
Rebecca Davis	December 2010	271662	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Allocation of effort by issue, list of pleadings, travel receipts
Attachment 3	Breakdown of hourly efforts by issue category
Comment 1	Public Policy / Regulatory Affairs Expert Gregg Morris qualifies as Level V in the Commission’s 2021 hourly rate chart, with more than 35 years of experience. Public Policy Analyst Level V has an hourly rate range of \$492-869, with a median rate of \$651. Regulatory Affairs Specialist Level V has an hourly rate range of \$267-387, with a median rate of \$319. We are asking for an hourly rate for Dr. Morris for 2021 of \$450, which is well within the bounds of the Commission’s adopted rate study for practitioners with Dr. Morris’ expertise and experience.
Comment 2	Attorney Tamlyn Hunt qualifies as Level V in the Commission’s 2021 hourly rate chart, with more than 15 years of experience in regulatory law. Attorney Level V has an hourly rate range of \$486-699, with a median rate of \$606. We are asking for an hourly rate for Mr. Hunt for 2021 of \$585, which is well within the bounds of the Commission’s adopted rate study.
Comment 3	Lozeau Drury LLC supplies paralegal services to GPI. The firm has a several paralegals, with a range of experience levels. For purposes of this Claim, we are seeking to categorize the firm’s paralegals as high-end Level I in the Commission’s 2021 hourly rate chart. Paralegal Level I has an hourly rate range of \$89-141. We are asking for an hourly rate for 2021 of \$140, which is within the bounds of the Commission’s adopted rate study. The hourly rate request for 2020 is \$130, which is consistent with previous GPI Intervenor Comp Claims.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1]	Correct total for Hunt’s 2019 fees is \$21,262.50

⁴ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch> .

[2]	Correct total for Hunt’s 2021 fees is \$28,811.25
[3]	<p>Timesheets should be allocated to specific individual and should include the following: the issue in the proceeding, the listed task addressed, and a description of the specific task. <i>See</i> Intervenor Compensation guide at 25. All of GPI’s timesheet entries for work completed by their paralegal team only indicate “Administrative Management” which is vague and does not include a complete description of the specific task. We disallow 3.00 hours in 2020 and 1.20 hours in 2021 claimed by the paralegal team.</p> <p>Because we disallow all the hours for “Administrative Management” (presumed to be clerical in nature), we do not establish an hourly rate at this time.</p>
[4]	Correct total for Davis’s travel fees is \$262.50
[5] Substantial Contribution- % Disallowance	<p>As determined in our analysis of GPI’s claims of substantial contributions (Part II(A)), GPI partially meets the substantial contribution standards of Section 1802(j) and Section 1802.5. However, the number of hours claimed is incommensurate to the contribution provided by GPI. For D.20-09-025, GPI does not provide distinct analysis, nor do they demonstrate how the comments they provided informed Commission decision-making. Therefore, for D.20-09-025 this decision finds that GPI did not make a substantial contribution to the decision. For D.20-12-029, GPI provides reference to their own comments and again fails to show how these comments were utilized by the Commission for their decision-making in D.20-12-029. However, we do award GPI for the portion of the time they spent contributing to the working group for that decision (75% of the request related to D.20-12-029). Therefore, overall we disallow 15% percent of the hours claimed. This overall disallowance is equivalent to a total disallowance of GPI’s time related to D.20-09-025 and a deduction of 25% of GPI’s request for work on decision pleadings related to D.20-12-029.</p>

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

Within 30 days after service of this Claim, Commission Staff or any other party may file a response to the Claim (*see* § 1804(c))

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Green Power Institute has made a substantial contribution to D.20-12-027, D.20-12-028, and D.21-07-028.

2. The requested hourly rates for Green Power Institute'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, as adjusted herein, are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$120,734.40.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Green Power Institute is awarded \$120,734.40.
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 Green Power Institute their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional electric revenues for the 2020 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data are unavailable, the most recent electric revenue data shall be used. Payment of the award shall include compound interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning December 1, 2021, the 75th day after the filing of Green Power Institute'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 _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2009025, D2012027, D2012029, and D2107028		
Proceeding(s):	R1812006		
Author:	ALJ Colin Rizzo & ALJ Marcelo Poirier		
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
Green Power Institute	Sep. 17, 2021	\$141,996	\$120,734.40	N/A	See Part III.D CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Gregg	Morris	Expert	\$325	2019	\$325
Gregg	Morris	Expert	\$335	2020	\$335
Gregg	Morris	Expert	\$450	2021	\$450
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	\$450	2019	\$450
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	\$460	2020	\$460
Tamlyn	Hunt	Attorney	\$585	2021	\$585
Rebecca	Davis	Attorney	\$350	2019	\$350
Rebecca	Davis	Attorney	\$360	2020	\$360
		Paralegal	\$130	2020	\$0
		Paralegal	\$140	2021	\$0

(END OF APPENDIX)