

Decision 24-04-029 April 18, 2024.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Its Proposals and Cost Recovery for Improvements to the Click-Through Authorization Process Pursuant to Ordering Paragraph 29 of Resolution E-4868. (U39E.)	Application 18-11-015
And Related Matters	Application 18-11-016 Application 18-11-017

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO
SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY ADVOCATES FOR
SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 23-09-006**

Intervenor: Small Business Utility Advocates	For contribution to Decision (D.) 23-09-006
Claimed: \$47,285.50	Awarded: \$40,782.25
Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds	Assigned ALJ: Jonathan Lakey

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.23-09-006 largely approves the proposed enhancements to the Click-Through Process filed in applications of Pacific Gas and Electric Co. (“PG&E”), Southern California Edison Co. (“SCE”), and San Diego Gas & Electric Co. (“SDG&E”).
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	April 26, 2019	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	May 28, 2019	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes. <i>See</i> CPUC Discussion in Part I. C.
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.20-08-020	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 23, 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.20-08-020	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	December 23, 2020	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.23-09-006	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	Sept. 28, 2023	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	Nov. 27, 2023	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

C. Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
B.3	Rule 17.1(a) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure requires the NOI to be filed within 30 days of the prehearing conference. Pursuant to Rule 1.15, if the last day falls on a Saturday, Sunday, holiday or other day when the Commission offices are closed, the time limit is extended to include the next business day thereafter. Thirty days from the prehearing conference was Sunday, May 26, 2019, and Monday is a holiday (Memorial Day). Therefore, SBUA’s submission on Tuesday, May 28, 2019, is timely.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Since the filing date for the NOIs fell on a weekend (Sunday, May 26, 2019) and the next available weekday was also a holiday (Memorial Day on Monday, May 27, 2019) for this proceeding, SBUA’s NOI was timely filed on Tuesday, May 28, 2019.</p> <p>See Rule 1.15 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.</p>

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
<p>1. Focus the Proceeding on DR Providers Only</p> <p>On August 28, 2020, the <i>Administrative Law Judge issued an E-mail Ruling Ordering Supplemental Briefing on Scoping Memorandum Issue Item 12</i> to consider whether the proceeding should “be expanded to include other distributed energy resource and energy management providers[.]” SBUA argued that rules for non-demand response (“DR”) providers would more appropriately be addressed in a separate rulemaking in order to involve additional intervenors whose interests would be implicated and efficiently rule on</p>	<p>D.23-09-006 (the “Decision”) determines that</p> <p>As noted in the Amended Scoping Memo, expanding the click-through solution to other distributed energy resource and energy management providers is out of scope to the present proceeding.</p> <p>(Decision at 11; <i>see also, id.</i> at 15 (same).) This is in accord with SBUA’s arguments to limit issues in the case that are specific to DR providers and the IOU applications.</p>	<p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>the present applications, which will be evaluated under current rules. (<i>SBUA Response to the Joint Applicants’ Response to Administrative Law Judge Ruling Ordering Supplemental Briefing on Scoping Issue Item 12</i> (Sept. 11, 2020); <i>SBUA Reply to the Joint Objection of California Efficiency + Demand Management Council, California Energy Storage Alliance, Home Energy Analytics, Mission:Data Coalition And Ohmconnect, Inc.</i> (Sept. 18, 2020).)</p> <p>SBUA also participated in the October 8, 2020 status conference that addresses scheduling and Issue 12. <i>See</i> Reporter’s Transcript, Track 1 Proceeding, Oct. 8, 2020, at 83, ln. 3-12.</p>		
<p>2. Reject Imposition of Service Level Agreements</p> <p>DR-provider parties urged the Commission to require the IOUs to enter into Service Level Agreements (“SLAs”). SBUA argued that SLA service levels “exceed[] the specifications for which the system was designed and budgeted to be maintained” and would impose excessive cost on customers. (<i>SBUA Opening Brief</i> at 3-4 (May 28, 2021); <i>SBUA Reply Brief</i> at 2 (June 18, 2021); <i>SBUA Opening Comments on PD</i> at 3-4 (Sept. 7, 2023).)</p>	<p>The Decision declined to impose SLAs as urged by SBUA. (Decision at 38.) SBUA directly supported the Decision’s conclusion and SBUA’s contribution is reflected in the record.</p>	<p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>3. Streamline Resolution of Enrollment Conflicts</p> <p>SBUA supported requiring IOUs to take realistic steps to simplify the current burdensome process faced by customers seeking to enroll in a new DR program. (<i>SBUA Opening Brief</i> at 5-6; <i>SBUA Reply Brief</i> at 5-6; <i>SBUA Opening Comments on PD</i> at 3, 5, 7.)</p> <p>Some IOUs categorically opposed this action (<i>see</i> Decision at 41), and SBUA argued against those positions as well as contentions that the streamlined process should be limited to residential customers. (<i>SBUA Reply Comments on PD</i> at 2-6.) SBUA did not agree with industry parties that full automation is realistic with existing utility IT systems. (<i>SBUA Reply Brief</i> at 6; <i>SBUA Reply Comments on PD</i> at 2-6.) SBUA’s intermediary position closely aligns with the balance ultimately struck by the Decision to require IOUs to file Tier 2 letters describing their method of aiding customers to more easily resolve enrollment conflicts. (Decision at 41.)</p>	<p>The Decision quotes SBUA in support for reducing enrollment conflicts stating that SBUA “urges the Commission to ‘simplify the process of customers obtaining their choice of demand response program[.]’” (Decision at 41.)</p>	<p>Verified</p>
<p>4. Respect Customer Privacy</p> <p>Industry parties urged the Commission to require IOUs to provide detailed customer behavior information to DR providers without express customer consent. SBUA opposed these actions as violating reasonable customer privacy</p>	<p>The Decision states as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">In order to protect the privacy of customers, the Commission declines to require the IOUs to provide notifications on why customers fail to complete data sharing authorizations on a case-by-</p>	<p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
expectations. (<i>SBUA Opening Brief</i> at 4-5; <i>SBUA Opening Comments on PD</i> at 5.)	case basis. This issue was raised by several parties, including Cal Advocates and SBUA. (Decision at 42.)	

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.	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: OhmConnect, Inc., Mission:data		Verified
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: Other than Cal Advocates, SBUA was the only party representing customer interests. SBUA uniquely represented the needs of small business customers to have a streamlined and transparent process for enrolling in third-party demand response (“DR”) programs. SBUA’s position on reducing barriers to third-party DR providers and resolving enrollment conflicts aligned with OhmConnect and Mission:data but diverged with respect to the appropriate scope of the proceeding, respecting customer privacy and the unreasonableness of service level agreements. SBUA took distinct positions on core issues to protect small commercial customers from unreasonable costs and address particular barriers faced by this class to participation in DR programs. SBUA’s experts and attorneys endeavored to offer distinctive analyses and insight, as reflected in our detailed yet focused comments and briefs. SBUA submits that the Commission should find that SBUA’s perspectives, goals, and analysis were necessarily different from other parties and supplemented—not duplicated—any efforts on common issues.		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>SBUA seeks compensation for actively participating in this proceeding by filing motion for party status, attending a prehearing conference and status conferences, submitting comments on the ALJ’s ruling regarding the scope of the proceeding, filing opening and reply legal briefs, and filing opening and reply comments on the proposed decision.</p> <p>SBUA intervened in this proceeding as the only party specifically representing the interests of small commercial customers and the only customer-serving intervenor other Cal Advocates. SBUA’s focused narrowly on four issues: (1) maintaining a manageable proceeding scope by addressing DR enrollment processes before expanding to other programs, (2) respecting customer privacy, (3) streamlining enrollment by simplifying resolution on enrollment/disenrollment conflicts and (4) avoiding wasteful costs, principally by opposing unnecessary service level agreements. SBUA carefully avoided duplication of effort and its contributions are reflected in Decision and the record.</p> <p>SBUA’s participation benefited small business ratepayers, an otherwise underrepresented class of ratepayers. SBUA’s compensation request seeks an award of <u>\$47,285.50</u> for <u>approximately 101 hours</u>, which is a reasonable in light of the effectiveness of SBUA’s expert and legal contributions, and the Commission should find that SBUA’s efforts have been valuable and justify this request for fees.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>SBUA focused its efforts and offered unique perspectives on the interests of small businesses. SBUA assembled a team of attorneys and an expert, highly experienced in details of regulatory and utility proceedings, for its advocacy in this case. As described in the above section, SBUA’s hours are reasonable to address issues of importance to small business customers successfully participating in DR programs.</p> <p>This proceeding opened in November 2018 and concluded in September 2023. Over this extended duration of almost five years, SBUA experienced staffing changes. SBUA’s regulatory counsel, Ivan Jimenez, served as principal counsel in the initial procedural phase of this proceeding in 2020 and 2021.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	CPUC Discussion
<p>Ariel Strauss, participated intermittently in 2019 and 2020 but stepped in as primary counsel in after Mr. Jimenez assumed a position at the Sonoma County Counsel’s Office. Mr. Strauss was responsible for drafting opening and reply briefs in 2021 and comments on the proposed decision in 2023.</p> <p>SBUA’s General Counsel James Birkelund participated by providing strategic guidance, managing work efforts, overseeing and coordinating the legal team and the final review of litigation positions.</p> <p>Given its careful focus on areas meriting SBUA’s participation, SBUA decided that further testimony was not necessary. (<i>See Joint Statement Re Material Facts</i> (April 23, 2021) (“there are no material facts in dispute”).) SBUA did, however, consult with Paul Chernick, President of Resource Insight, Inc. with 40 years of experience, who provided expert input into DR program processes related to the scope of the proceeding.</p> <p>Michael Brown also assisted SBUA as an expert by reviewing the initial click thru applications and testimony. Mr. Brown has over 17 years of professional experience in the energy field in both private (PG&E) and public utilities (City of Redding and related municipal entities) with roles as program manager, supervisor of electric resources, and project analyst.</p> <p>SBUA took care to coordinate between professionals, and SBUA’s hours represent an appropriate level of engagement and effort to participate in the proceeding with legal briefs, and other activities leading up to the decision. Therefore, SBUA seeks compensation for all of the hours recorded by our attorneys and expert included in this request.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>SBUA has assigned the following issue codes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus the Proceeding on DR Providers Only (27.2 hrs; 27%) 2. Reject Imposition of Service-Level Agreements (11.85 hrs; 12%) 3. Streamline Resolution of Enrollment Conflicts (15.2 hrs; 15%) 4. Respect Customer Privacy (15.6 hrs; 15%) 5. Prehearing Conference and Statutes Conferences (9.15 hrs; 9%) 6. General Participation (including evidentiary hearing issues, reviewing misc. filings, coordination with parties) (22.25 hrs; 22%) 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>We find the hours allocated for General Participation to be excessive. <i>See</i> CPUC comment [7] in Part III D.</p>

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Michael Brown	2018	7.5	\$215	D.21-12-012	\$1,612.50	7.5	\$215	\$1,612.50
Michael Brown	2019	0.5	\$220	D.21-12-012	\$110	0.5	\$220	\$110.00
Ivan Jimenez	2019	6.2	\$245	D.20-06-013	\$1,519	4.8 [5][7]	\$245	\$1,176.00
Ivan Jimenez	2020	17	\$265	D.22-06-045	\$4,505	16.55 [7]	\$265	\$4,385.75
Ivan Jimenez	2021	2.4	\$350	Res. ALJ-393; <i>see</i> Comment 1	\$840	2.35 [7]	\$350 [1]	\$822.50
Paul Chernick	2020	2.5	\$505	D.23-11-031	\$1,262.50	2.5	\$430 [2]	\$1,075.00
Ariel Strauss	2021	11.5	\$450	D.23-02-016	\$5,175	11.15 [7]	\$450	\$5,017.50
Ariel Strauss	2023	7.7	\$510	As above, escalated by a 4.46% for 2023 plus a 5% step increase per Res. ALJ-393; <i>see</i> Comment 2, below.	\$3,927	7.05 [6][7]	\$485 [3]	\$3,419.25
James Birkelund	2019	13	\$495	D.20-02-061	\$6,435	10.4 [7]	\$495	\$5,148.00
James Birkelund	2020	14.6	\$510	D.22-06-045	\$7,446	12.55 [7]	\$510	\$6,400.50
James Birkelund	2021	12.5	\$650	D.23-02-016	\$8,125	10.1 [5][7]	\$650	\$6,565.00
James Birkelund	2022	1.5	\$705	D.23-02-016	\$1,057.5	0.75 [7]	\$705	\$528.75
James Birkelund	2023	4.5	\$770	As above, escalated by a 4.46% for 2023 plus a 5% step increase per Res. ALJ-393; <i>see</i> Comment 3 below	\$3,465	3.8 [7]	\$735 [4]	\$2,793.00
Subtotal: \$45,479.50						Subtotal: \$39,053.75		

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Ariel Strauss	2019	1.2	\$187.5	50% of 2019 Rate (D.21-07-021)	\$225	1.2	\$187.50	\$225.00
Ariel Strauss	2023	6.2	\$255	50% of 2023 Rate	\$1,581	6.2	\$242.50 [3]	\$1,503.50
<i>Subtotal: \$1,806</i>						<i>Subtotal: \$1,728.50</i>		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$47,285.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$40,782.25		

*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 BAR ²	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
Ariel Strauss	March 2012	282230	No
Ivan Jimenez	December 2016	313644	No
James Birkelund	March 2000	206328	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service (see attachment under separate cover)
Attachment 2	Time Sheet Records with Allocation of Hours by Issue
Comment 1	<u>2021 Hourly Rate for Attorney Ivan Jimenez</u> SBUA seeks a 2021 hourly rate for the work of attorney Ivan Jimenez of \$350 based on Resolution ALJ-393. SBUA sought this same rate in our amended compensation request filed on July 1, 2022, in A.18-10-007. Pending a decision on the earlier claim, the same proposed rate is suggested

² This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at: <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	to apply here. SBUA requests that the Commission refer to and rely on this earlier showing of support for Mr. Jimenez’s 2021 rate.
Comment 2	<p data-bbox="441 426 1013 457"><u>2023 Hourly Rate for Attorney Ariel Strauss</u></p> <p data-bbox="441 499 1390 747">SBUA seeks an hourly rate for the work of attorney Ariel Strauss of \$510 for his work in 2023 based on Resolution ALJ-393. SBUA made the same request in its compensation claim filed on September 1, 2023, in A.22-05-002, <i>et al.</i> Pending a decision on that compensation claim, the same 2023 hourly rate will apply here. SBUA requests that the Commission refer to and rely on the showing in this other docket to support Mr. Strauss’ 2023 rate.</p>
Comment 3	<p data-bbox="441 772 1203 804"><u>2023 Hourly Rate for General Counsel James M. Birkelund</u></p> <p data-bbox="441 846 1411 1094">SBUA seeks an hourly rate for the work of General Counsel James Birkelund of \$770 for his work in 2023 based on Resolution ALJ-393. SBUA made the same request in its compensation claim filed on September 1, 2023, in A.22-05-002, <i>et al.</i> Pending a decision on that compensation claim, the same 2023 hourly rate will apply here. SBUA requests that the Commission refer to and rely on the showing in this other docket to support Mr. Birkelund’s 2023 rate.</p>

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments:

Item	Reason
[1] Ivan Jimenez (Jimenez) 2021 Hourly Rate	D.23-11-035 authorized a 2021 hourly rate of \$350 for Jimenez.
[2] Paul Chernick (Chernick) 2020 Hourly Rate	SBUA’s basis for Chernick’s 2020 rate cites D.23-11-031. That decision approved a 2020 rate of \$430 for Chernick. Therefore, we apply the correct 2020 rate of \$430 for Chernick.
[3] Ariel Strauss (Strauss) 2023 Hourly Rate	D.23-11-118 authorized a 2023 hourly rate of \$485 for Strauss.

Item	Reason
[4] James Birkelund (Birkelund) 2023 Hourly Rate	D.23-11-118 authorized a 2023 hourly rate of \$735 for Birkelund.
[5] Typographical Errors	<p>Jimenez’s 2019 hours in Part II. B of the claim do not match the hours from their timesheet entries dated 1/19/2019 to 5/7/2019. In Part II.B, SBUA lists 6.2 hours while the timesheets list 6.4 hours. We adjust the number of hours to align with the submitted timesheets.</p> <p>Birkelund’s 2021 hours in Part II. B of the claim do not match the hours from their timesheet entries dated 1/15/2021 to 11/18/2021. In Part II.B, SBUA lists 12.5 hours while the timesheets list 12.15 hours. We adjust the number of hours to align with the submitted timesheets.</p> <p>We remind SBUA to input the correct totals within their timesheets and in Part III. B to avoid any potential disallowances.</p>
[6] Disallowance of Hours Claimed on Timesheet – Hours Claimed After Issuance of a Decision	<p>Public Utilities Code §1802(j) defines substantial contribution as “substantially assisted the commission in the making of its order or decision because the order or decision has adopted in whole or in part one or more factual contentions, legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations presented by the customer.” Any hours after the issuance of the decision cannot have contributed to the Commission’s decision-making process.</p> <p>We disallow the hours listed below as they were claimed after the issuance of the underlying decisions for which the intervenor requests compensation. <i>See</i> D.10-04-024 and §1802(j).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9/28/2023 (Strauss): Rev final Decision. — 0.25 hours
[7] Disallowance of Hours Claimed on Timesheet – Excessive General Participation	<p>Per Intervenor Compensation Program Guide at 26, “Time records must not excessively label work as of a “General” issue type (general work on the proceeding). Most of the professional work on the proceeding can and must be associated with the proceeding’s substantive issues. <i>See</i> D.10-04-023 at 13-14.”</p> <p>SBUA allocated 21.78% of their total hours in this proceeding to General Participation (GP)*. Given the size and scope of this proceeding, we find the number of hours dedicated to GP excessive.</p> <p>We disallow 50% of all hours coded GP as excessive per year.</p>

Item	Reason			
	Person	Year	GP Hours Requested*	GP Hours Disallowed
	Jimenez	2019	3.2	1.6
		2020	0.9	0.45
		2021	0.1	0.05
	Strauss	2021	0.7	0.35
		2023	0.8	0.4
	Birkelund	2019	5.2	2.6
		2020	4.1	2.05
		2021	4.1	2.05
		2022	1.5	0.75
		2023	1.4	0.7
<p>*GP hours are based on the GP hours totaled after disallowances and any other adjustments from the previous comments have been applied.</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 (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Small Business Utility Advocates has made a substantial contribution to D.23-09-006.
2. The requested hourly rates Small Business Utility Advocates’ 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 \$40,782.25.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Small Business Utility Advocates is awarded \$40,782.25.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company shall pay Small Business Utility Advocates 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 February 10, 2024, the 75th day after the filing of Small Business Utility Advocates' request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated April 18, 2024, at Sacramento, California.

ALICE REYNOLDS

President

DARCIE L. HOUCK

JOHN REYNOLDS

KAREN DOUGLAS

Commissioners

Commissioner Matthew Baker recused himself from this agenda item and was not part of the quorum in its consideration.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:	D2404029	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2309006		
Proceeding(s):	A1811015, <i>et al.</i>		
Author:	ALJ Lakey		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Small Business Utility Advocates	Nov. 27, 2023	\$47,285.50	\$40,782.25	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
Michael	Brown	Expert	\$215	2018	\$215
Michael	Brown	Expert	\$220	2019	\$220 ¹
Ivan	Jimenez	Attorney	\$245	2019	\$245
Ivan	Jimenez	Attorney	\$265	2020	\$265
Ivan	Jimenez	Attorney	\$350	2021	\$350
Paul	Chernick	Expert	\$505	2020	\$430
Ariel	Strauss	Attorney	\$375	2019	\$375
Ariel	Strauss	Attorney	\$405	2020	N/A ²
Ariel	Strauss	Attorney	\$450	2021	\$450

¹ Brown's 2019 hourly rate entry was missing; therefore we created the entry to include their 2019 rate.

² Strauss did not claim any 2020 hours for this proceeding; therefore their 2020 rate will not be established here.

Ariel	Strauss	Attorney	\$510	2023	\$485
James	Birkelund	General Counsel	\$495	2019	\$495
James	Birkelund	General Counsel	\$510	2020	\$510
James	Birkelund	General Counsel	\$650	2021	\$650
James	Birkelund	General Counsel	\$705	2022	\$705
James	Birkelund	General Counsel	\$770	2023	\$735

(END OF APPENDIX)