

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Compliance Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Approval of Year 2001 Low Income Programs, in Compliance with Ordering Paragraph 4 of Decision 00-09-036. (U 39 M)	Application 00-11-009 (Filed November 6, 2000)
Application of Southern California Gas Company (U 904-G) for Authority to Continue Low Income Assistance programs and Funding Through 2001.	Application 00-11-011 (Filed November 6, 2000)
Application of San Diego Gas & Electric company (U 902-E) for Authority to Continue Low Income Assistance Programs and Funding Through 2001.	Application 00-11-012 (Filed November 6, 2000)
Southern California Edison Company Compliance Applicants for Approval of year 2001 Low Income Program Plans.	Application 00-11-020 (Filed November 6, 2000)

O P I N I O N

This decision awards Greenlining Institute and Latino Issues Forum (Greenlining/LIF) \$74,563.72 in compensation for its contribution to Decision (D.) 01-05-033 and D.01-06-010.

1. Background

These decisions address two low-income assistance programs, California Alternate Rates for Energy (CARE) and Low-Income Energy Efficiency (LIEE), in

light of the 2001 energy crisis. The CARE and LIEE programs are administered by California investor-owned utilities, and are funded through ratepayers by a public purpose surcharge. Additional funding for these programs is provided by Senate BillX1 5 (SBX1 5) and Assembly BillX1 29 (AB1X 29). SBX1 5 and ABX1 29 also provide funding to the Department of Community Services and Development (DCSD), for use in its Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). LIHEAP provides services such as installation of high efficiency lighting and weatherization through community based organizations or LIHEAP providers.

Early in the proceeding, Greenlining/LIF filed a motion recommending several proposals to protect low-income ratepayers. These proposals included increasing the CARE discount and changing CARE eligibility criteria, exemption of CARE customers from any Tier 3 rate increases, media outreach programs, and fee authorization for enrolling CARE customers. Although the motion was denied as certain of these issues were already being addressed in other proceedings, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) requested comments on three related issues:

1. The applicability of the modified income eligibility requirements for CARE discounts adopted in D.01-03-082 to the gas customers of PG&E and customers of all other gas and electric jurisdictional utilities.
2. Whether income eligibility requirements for LIFE should be made consistent with the revised requirements for CARE.
3. Whether the CARE discount should be increased for both electric and gas customers of jurisdictional utilities, and if so, by how much.

Following comments by Greenlining/LIF, the utilities, and other interested parties, these issues were addressed in D.01-06-010.

D.01-06-010 adopted CARE eligibility requirements for gas customers consistent with requirements for electric customers to avoid providing an incentive for low-income customers to switch from gas heating to electric heating, and as a means to lower utility administrative costs. The Commission also adopted eligibility requirements for LIEE consistent with requirements for CARE to improve administration efficiency, and increased the CARE discount. The Commission stated that an increase in the CARE discount is needed to provide additional relief to low-income customers, noting that the increase would be partially offset by Senate Bill X 15 funds.

In D.01-05-033, the Commission identified the best methods to rapidly deploy LIEE and CARE services to qualifying ratepayers. The Commission stated that the needs of low-income customers were inadequately addressed because (1) the CARE assistance program reached only 60% of eligible customers, and (2) comprehensive weatherization services reached an even smaller percentage of qualifying customers. To address problems in delivery of these services to qualifying ratepayers, workshops were held on developing effective and efficient measures to accomplish this goal. Participants included the utilities, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, Community Based Organizations Greenlining/LIF, private energy service providers and DCSD. Issues included identifying a rapid deployment strategy for LIEE, developing new energy efficiency measures, expanding the comprehensive nature of energy efficiency programs, and the number of contractors, and specifically reaching out to CARE customers.

In order to improve coordination between LIEE and LIHEAP, and to rapidly deploy available low-income services, the Commission directed utility program administrators to use LIEE funding to leverage DCSD energy programs.

The Commission specified several approaches for combining LIEE and LIHEAP funds to provide comprehensive services, including memoranda of understanding between the utilities and LIHEAP providers and use of non-LIHEAP providers for weatherization services. To accomplish the Commission's goals, it provided considerable flexibility to utilities for developing rapid deployment strategies for LIEE programs.

In addition, the Commission authorized new efforts under the LIEE program, such as installation of LIEE equipment in rental units and measures to increase the number of customers included in the CARE program. In order to increase the number CARE customers, utilities were encouraged to contract with community based organizations and agencies, and provide compensation to these organizations and agencies for signing up eligible CARE customers ("capitation" fees). Other Commission actions included segregating CARE and LIEE funding, allowing dual-fuel utilities to shift funds between electric and gas programs, and adopting certain utility reporting requirements.

Greenlining/LIF filed its compensation claim on July 5, 2001, for \$137,493.22. After a request for further information by the ALJ, Greenlining/LIF provided errata to its request on September 25, 2001, including additional computations and timesheets, and stating that the request would waive the time of Robert Gnaizda. Additional letters from Greenlining/LIF amended the compensation request to \$95,203.91¹ and explained why some of the hours

¹ Letter of Susan Brown to assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), October 16, 2001.

requested in A.00-11-009 are for work in R.98-07-037, although the latter proceeding is not mentioned in the original filing or errata.²

2. Requirements for Awards of Compensation

Intervenors who seek compensation for their contributions in Commission proceedings must file requests for compensation pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Sections 1801-1812. (Unless otherwise noted, all statutory citations are to the Pub. Util. Code.) Section 1804(a) requires an intervenor to file a notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days after the prehearing conference or by a date established by the Commission. The NOI must present information regarding the nature and extent of the customer's³ planned participation and an itemized estimate of the compensation the customer expects to request. The NOI may request a finding of eligibility.

The customer, either at the NOI stage or later, must also show that the costs of effective participation, if not compensated, would constitute a "significant financial hardship" (as defined by Section 1802(g)) for the customer. Regarding Greenlining/LIF, we had made a recent finding of significant hardship by ruling on April 4, 2000 in another proceeding (I.98-02-025). This recent finding, pursuant to Section 1804(b)(1), creates a rebuttable presumption of Greenlining/LIF's eligibility for compensation in other Commission proceedings, such as the consolidated proceedings here, that start within a year

² Letter of Susan Brown to assigned ALJ, August 13, 2002. Greenlining/LIF explains that low-income issues in R.98-07-037 were merged into A.00-11-009.

³ To be eligible for compensation, an intervenor must be a customer as defined by Section 1802(b). In D.98-04-059 (footnote 14) we affirmed our previously articulated interpretation that compensation be proffered only to customers whose participation

Footnote continued on next page

of the finding. No one has challenged this presumption, so we find Greenlining/LIF continues to be eligible under the statute and prior ruling.

Other code sections address requests for compensation filed after a Commission decision is issued. Section 1804(c) requires an eligible customer to file a request for an award within 60 days of issuance of a final order or decision by the Commission in the proceeding. Greenlining/LIF timely filed its request for an award of compensation on July 5, 2001, and provided errata on September 27, 2001. Under Section 1804(c), an intervenor requesting compensation must provide “a detailed description of services and expenditures and a description of the customer’s substantial contribution to the hearing or proceeding.” Section 1802(h) states that “substantial contribution” means that,

“in the judgment of the commission, the customer’s presentation has 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. Where the customer’s participation has resulted in a substantial contribution, even if the decision adopts that customer’s contention or recommendations only in part, the commission may award the customer compensation for all reasonable advocate’s fees, reasonable expert fees, and other reasonable costs incurred by the customer in preparing or presenting that contention or recommendation.”

Section 1804(e) requires the Commission to issue a decision that determines whether the customer has made a substantial contribution and what amount of compensation to award. The level of compensation must take into

arises directly from their interests as customers. (*See* D.88-12-034, D.92-04-051, and D.96-09-040.)

account the market rate paid to people with comparable training and experience who offer similar services, consistent with Section 1806.

3. Substantial Contribution to Resolution of Issues

A party may make a substantial contribution to a decision in one of several ways.⁴ It may offer a factual or legal contention upon which the Commission relied in making a decision,⁵ or it may advance a specific policy or procedural recommendation that the ALJ or Commission adopted.⁶ A substantial contribution includes evidence or argument that supports part of the decision even if the Commission does not adopt a party's position in total.⁷

Greenlining/LIF, representing low-income ratepayers, substantially contributed through its recommendations on energy efficiency and CARE issues. Greenlining/LIF recommended that the Commission leverage energy efficiency dollars through LIHEAP providers including utility company purchases of energy efficient equipment, utility contracts with a LIHEAP agency for LIEE programs, and a coordinated program between a utility and LIHEAP agency for a neighborhood within a utility service territory. We adopted these recommendations subject to the caveat that the customers are those subject to Commission jurisdiction and not public agency utilities.

⁴ Section 1802(h).

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ The Commission has provided compensation even when the position advanced by the intervenor is rejected. D.89-03-063 (awarding San Luis Obispo Mothers For Peace and Rochelle Becker compensation in Diablo Canyon Rate Case because their arguments, while ultimately unsuccessful, forced the utility to thoroughly document the safety issues involved).

In its comments on D.01-05-033, Greenlining/LIF recommended a capitation fee for community organizations, and the initiation of meetings through the Energy Division between energy utilities. We adopted both of these recommendations and recognize the substantial contribution by Greenlining/LIF on these issues. While we did not adopt all of Greenlining/LIF's proposals, we profited by its participation and comments on issues affecting low-income customers and recognize its substantial contribution to D.01-05-033.

In D.01-06-010 we discussed the proposals of Greenlining/LIF and our adopted responses. Although Greenlining/LIF requested an increase in the CARE discount from 15% to 25%, after weighing all of the factors we provided for an increase in the CARE discount of 20% for both electric and gas usage. In adopting this increase, we considered the arguments of Greenlining/LIF for a greater increase, and Greenlining/LIF substantially contributed to our adopted position. Similarly, Greenlining/LIF recommended relaxing the CARE eligibility criteria from 150% to 175% of Federal Poverty Guidelines, which we adopted in our decision. Overall we adopted many of Greenlining/LIF's proposals for low-income customers, and we believe it made a substantial contribution to D.01-06-010.

4. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

Per its revised claim, Greenlining/LIF requests \$95,203.91 as follows:

Attorney's Fees

Susan Brown	145.41 hours @ \$275/hour x 1.25 =	\$49,984.69
Chris Witteman	39 hours @ \$265/ hour x 1.25 =	12,918.75

Consultant's Fees

Viola Gonzales	13.25 hours @ \$250 /hour	=	3,312.50
John Gamboa	41.9 hours @ \$250/ hour	=	10,475.00

Interns

Jenny Flores	118.55 hours @ \$90/ hour	=	10,669.50
--------------	---------------------------	---	-----------

Erin Hartigan	36.25 hours @ \$90/ hour	=	<u>3,262.50</u>
	Subtotal	=	\$ 90,622.94
Other costs			
Postage and photocopying		=	2,632.83
Task Force meetings		=	<u>1,948.14</u>
	Subtotal	=	\$ 4,580.97
	Total	=	\$95,203.91

4.1 Overall Benefits of Participation

In D.98-04-059, the Commission adopted a requirement that a customer must demonstrate that its participation was “productive,” as that term is used in Section 1801.3, where the Legislature gave the Commission guidance on program administration. (*See* D.98-04-059, *mimeo.*, at 31-33, and Finding of Fact 42.) In that decision, we discuss the requirement that participation must be productive in the sense that the costs of participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through such participation. Customers are directed to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to ratepayers. This exercise assists us in determining the reasonableness of the request and in avoiding unproductive participation.

We have considered the contributions of Greenlining/LIF through its written proposals, comments, and workshop participation in these proceedings to achieve benefits for low-income electric and gas customers. In D.01-05-033 we adopted many of Greenlining/LIF’s proposals regarding leveraging of LIEE dollars, use of weatherization fees and payment of capitation fees to community-based organizations. No party provided estimates of the value to low-income customers of the leveraging effects of LIEE dollars with LIHEAP dollars. However, SBX1 5 and ABX1 29 provided an additional \$140 million to DCSD to supplement LIHEAP activities. Given the substantial dollars involved, even a small improvement in effectiveness achieved by leveraging LIEE dollars

with LIHEAP dollars is significant relative to the costs of Greenlining/LIF's participation in these proceedings.

Similarly, in D.01-06-010 we adopted some of Greenlining/LIFs proposals that have significant dollar effects on low-income customers. We adopted an increase in the CARE discount from 15% to 20% resulting in a benefit to low-income customers exceeding \$40 million. In addition, we liberalized the CARE eligibility criteria for gas and electric customers from 150% to 175% of the federal poverty level as recommended by Greenlining/LIF. This increase provides a benefit to low-income gas customers estimated at about \$900,000 for SDG&E customers and \$11million for SoCalGas customers.⁸ Additional substantial benefits will accrue to low-income customers of PG&E and Edison. In short, Greenlining/LIF's participation in these two decisions was productive.

4.2 Hours Claimed

Greenlining/LIF documented its claimed hours through daily records of the time spent by attorneys, consultants, and other staff, as provided in its July 5 compensation request and amended by its September 25 errata. The records indicate both the professional and support hours and the activities associated with the hours. The hourly breakdowns and allocation of hours reasonably support the claimed hours. Greenlining/LIF also properly calculated the time for preparation of its compensation request at one-half of actual hours.

4.3 Hourly Rates

In D.02-05-011 we thoroughly reviewed hourly rates for Greenlining/LIF's attorneys and certain staff, and ordered revisions to several decisions awarding compensation to Greenlining/LIF. Consistent with the rates subsequently adopted in

D.02-07-030, we will use \$275 per hour for Brown for 2001 and \$255 per hour for Witteman for 2000. For work in 2001, we will award compensation for Witteman at the rate requested of \$265 per hour.

Gonzales holds an MBA from Harvard University (1972), held management positions at Pacific Bell between 1974 and 1982, and served in various high level/executive positions in government and non-profit organizations since 1986. Gonzales has served on the Boards of several for-profit and non-profit organizations. Gonzales provides consulting services at a rate of \$180/hour but her declaration does not describe what types of services are provided at that hourly rate, or what year she charged that rate to clients. D.01-09-045 adopted a rate of \$135 per hour for Gonzales for 1999 and 2000. After review of Gonzales' declaration, which includes information we did not previously have, we will increase that rate by \$25 per hour for 2001 to recognize her training and experience, as well as inflation, to \$160 per hour for 2001.

In D.02-05-011 we adopted a rate of \$135 per hour for Gamboa for work in 1998. This rate reflected his work as Executive Director of Greenlining Institute, providing policy direction and analysis. In these proceedings the recorded hours by activity for Gamboa indicate his involvement addresses primarily similar policy and analysis work, as well as organization and recording of the task force meetings. This work parallels his work as an Executive Director in 1998. Gamboa has been Executive Director of Greenlining Institute since 1994 and prior to this position served as Executive Director of Latino Issues Forum and Project Participant. Gamboa served as a line and staff manager at Pacific Bell between 1971 and 1981. Gamboa's declaration indicates he served on

⁸ D.01-06-010, p. 11.

various corporate boards; the boards are not identified. Gamboa has been a frequent participant at Commission proceedings as a witness. The declaration does not describe Gamboa's educational background. Gamboa and Gonzales provided similar services in this case and have similar work experiences. Therefore we will compensate Gamboa in 2001 at \$160 /hour, the same rate we have awarded to Gonzales.

There is no record that Greenlining/LIF's interns Flores and Hartigan have been previously compensated by this Commission. In the September 25 errata,⁹ Greenlining/LIF states that Flores and Hartigan are 2000 college graduates with degrees in political science. The time and activity records submitted by Greenlining/LIF show that both interns assisted with the task force meetings, workshops and preparation of various materials for Greenlining/LIF's attorneys and consultants. Our review of this work shows that the work of these interns is not as complex as the work performed by Greenlining/LIF's senior analyst, Jose Hernandez, that was compensated at a rate of \$75 per hour in D.02-05-011 for 2000. Therefore, we will adopt a rate of \$70 per hour for both Flores and Hartigan for 2001.

A more significant difference between the award and Greenlining/LIF's request is due to our rejection of an hourly multiplier. Greenlining/LIF requests hourly rates for its attorneys multiplied by a factor of 1.25. An hourly rate multiplier is not requested for its consultants or interns. In its September 25 errata Greenlining/LIF argues that this additional compensation is justified due to work on the motion regarding low-income

⁹ Exhibit A, Declaration of John Gamboa.

issues and the substantial benefit incurred for low-income customers. We agree with Greenlining/LIF that these were important issues, and some of these issues were resolved consistent with positions advocated by Greenlining/LIF in D.01-05-033 and D.01-06-010. However, our standards for applying hourly multipliers to attorney fees are necessarily high. If we did not set and maintain high standards, many attorney fees in compensation requests would include such multipliers, and we would no longer be adopting attorney fees based on market rates for comparable training and experience as required by Section 1804.

As we stated in D.98-04-059, we have included hourly rate multipliers when a customer's participation involved skills or duties beyond those normally required, such as when an attorney develops and sponsors technical testimony, in addition to his/her work as an attorney. As we stated in D.88-02-056 and reiterated in D.00-10-007, an upward adjustment in base level of compensation depends on many factors. Factors that can be considered in making this determination are:

A. Fee Level

1. The experience, reputation and ability of the attorney
2. The skill required to perform the legal service properly
3. Customary fee

B. Compensable Hours

1. The time and labor required (reasonable number of hours to present the case)
2. Efficiency of presentation
3. Novelty and difficulty of the issues
4. Duplication of effort

C. Degree of Success

1. Dollar amount involved
2. Degree of importance of the issue
3. The result obtained (partial or complete success on the issue)

As we further stated, “of course, these factors are not to be applied in a rigid manner. Some factors will apply to particular elements at times and at other times the factors will be considered in adjusting the overall award. These final adjustments can logically take the form of flat dollar amounts, percentage increases/decreases to either the base award or number of hours, and finally the hourly fee can be enhanced or reduced.” (D.00-10-007, p. 13.)

Weighing these factors, we find that the issues in this proceeding were not of such novelty or complexity as to justify application of a multiplier. Greenlining/LIF’s participation was successful, but we recognize that success by awarding compensation for all of the almost 400 hours claimed, without any reduction for issues on which Greenlining/LIF did not prevail.

4.4 Other Costs

Greenlining/LIF requests \$4,580.97 in other costs (postage, photocopying and task force meetings). Our review of the submitted expenses in relationship to the size of the service list (150), the amount of work performed by Greenlining/LIF attorneys and staff, and its choice not to seek any reimbursement for other related costs, leads us to conclude that these other requested costs are reasonable.

5. Award

We award Greenlining/LIF \$73,670.22, calculated accordingly:

Brown	145.41 hours @ \$275/ hour	= \$39,987.75
-------	----------------------------	---------------

Witteman	39 hours @ \$265/ hour	= 10,335.00
----------	------------------------	-------------

Consultant’s Fees

Gonzales	13.25 hours @ \$160/ hour	= 2,120.00
----------	---------------------------	------------

Gamboa	41.9 hours @ \$160 / hour	=	6,704.00
Interns			
Flores	118.55 hours @ \$70 / hour	=	8,298.50
Hartigan	36.25 hours @ \$70 / hour	=	<u>2,537.50</u>
Subtotal			= \$69,982.75
Other Costs			
Postage and photocopying		=	2,632.83
Task Force Meetings		=	<u>1,948.14</u>
Subtotal			= <u>4,580.97</u>
Total			= \$ 74,563.72

We will assess responsibility for payment among PG&E, Edison, SDG&E and SoCalGas according to their respective share of the California jurisdictional revenues filed with the Commission for each utility for 2001. These revenues include combining the gas and electric revenues for PG&E and SDG&E. We adopt this methodology to reflect the nature of the combined gas and electric issues in these proceedings. This methodology results in the following allocation of award payment responsibility:

PG&E	47.6%
SDG&E	8.7
Edison	29.4
<u>SoCalGas</u>	<u>14.3</u>
100.0%	

Consistent with previous Commission decisions, we will order that interest be paid on the award amount (calculated at the three-month commercial paper rate) commencing September 18, 2001 (the 75th day after Greenlining/LIF filed its compensation request) and continuing until the utility makes its full payment of award.

As in all intervenor compensation decisions, we put Greenlining/LIF on notice that the Commission Staff may audit Greenlining/LIF's records related to this award. Thus, Greenlining/LIF must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Greenlining/LIF's records should identify specific issues for which it requests compensation, the actual time spent by each employee, the applicable hourly rate, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation may be claimed.

Findings of Fact

1. Greenlining/LIF has made a timely request for compensation for its contributions to D.01-05-033 and D.01-06-010.
2. Greenlining/LIF has made a showing of significant financial hardship by demonstrating the economic interests of its individual members would be extremely small compared to the costs of participating in this proceeding.
3. Greenlining/LIF contributed substantially to D.01-05-033 and D.01-06-010.
4. Except as noted in the Opinion, Greenlining/LIF has requested hourly rates for attorneys and experts that are no greater than the market rates for individuals with comparable training and experience.
5. The adopted hourly rate for attorney Brown is based on a rate previously approved by the Commission.
6. The adopted rate of \$265 per hour for Witteman is reasonable based on our comparison of market rates and the hourly rates for intervenors with similar experience.
7. The adopted rate of \$160 per hour is a reasonable rate for Gonzales and Gamboa's professional services considering their experience and work in these proceedings.

8. The adopted rate of \$70 per hour is reasonable for Flores and Hartigan considering their experience and work in these proceedings.

9. The miscellaneous costs incurred by Greenlining/LIF are reasonable.

Conclusions of Law

1. Greenlining/LIF has substantially fulfilled the requirements of Sections 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation.

2. Greenlining/LIF should be awarded \$74,563.72 for its contributions to D.01-05-033 and D.01-06-010.

3. Per Rule 77.7(f)(6) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the comment period for this compensation decision may be waived.

4. This order should be effective today so that Greenlining/LIF may be compensated without unnecessary delay.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Greenlining Institute and Latino Issues Forum is awarded \$74,563.72 in compensation for substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 01-05-033 and D.01-06-010.

2. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (Edison), San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E), and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) shall pay Greenlining/LIF the following compensation amounts: PG&E, \$35,492.34; Edison, \$21,921.73; SDG&E, \$6,487.04; and SoCalGas, \$10,662.61. Payment shall be made within 30 days of the effective date of this order. PG&E, Edison, SDG&E and SoCalGas shall also pay interest on the award at the rate earned on prime, three-month

commercial paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning September 18, 2001, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

4. This proceeding is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision(s):	
Contribution Decision(s):	D0105033/D0106010
Proceeding(s):	A0011009/A0011011/A0011012/A0011020
Author:	ALJ DeBerry
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas & Electric Company/Southern California Edison/San Diego Gas & Electric Company/Southern California Gas Company

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Reason Disallowance
Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	7/15/01	\$95,203.91	\$74,563.72	Failure to justify hourly rates; failure to justify multiplier.

Witness Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Susan	Brown	Attorney	Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	\$275	2001	\$275
Chris	Witteman	Attorney	Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	\$265	2001	\$265
Viola	Gonzales	Policy Expert	Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	\$250	2001	\$160
John	Gamboa	Policy Expert	Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	\$250	2001	\$160
Jenny	Flores	Intern	Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	\$90	2001	\$70
Erin	Hartigan	Intern	Greenlining Institute/Latino Issues Forum	\$90	2001	\$70

Compensation Decision Summary Information