

Decision 12-03-052 March 22, 2012

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking on the Commission's Own Motion to Determine Whether Sharing of Customer Information Between Regulated Water Utilities and Regulated Energy Utilities/Municipal Energy Providers Should be Required; and if so, to Develop the Rules and Procedures Governing Such Sharing.

Rulemaking 09-12-017
(Filed December 17, 2009)

**DECISION AWARDING COMPENSATION TO DISABILITY RIGHTS
ADVOCATES FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 11-05-020**

Claimant: Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA)	For contributions to Decision (D.) 11-05-020
Claimed: \$16,586.38	Awarded: \$14,929.48 (reduced 10%)
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: ALJ Division

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES¹

A. Brief Description of Decision: D.11-05-020 creates an information sharing program between Commission-regulated water and energy utilities to increase the participation rates in water low income assistance programs. In addition, this decision creates a set of rules and data sharing guidelines for automatic enrollment into the low income rate assistance programs between the two types of utilities where there is overlapping serving territory.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	N/A	Correct

¹ Pursuant to the Rules of Practice and Procedure 17.1, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) has the discretion to set the filing dates for NOIs. In this proceeding, the Order Instituting Rulemaking specified that NOIs should be filed "no later than 30 days after the scoping memo is issued." The Scoping Memo was issued on April 1, 2010.

2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	May 3, 2010	Correct
3. Date NOI Filed:	April 30, 2010	Correct
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		Yes
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:		A.08-12-021
6. Date of ALJ ruling:		March 30, 2009
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See comment below, Part I Section C	
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:		A.08-12-021
10. Date of ALJ ruling:		March 30, 2009
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	See comment below, Part I Section C	
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes. A rebuttable presumption pursuant to § 1804(b)(1) is applied to DisabRA's participation here, as a substantive finding on significant financial hardship was issued within a year of the commencement of this proceeding.
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.11-05-020	Correct
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	May 10, 2011	Correct
15. File date of compensation request:	July 11, 2011	Correct
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

C. DisabRA’s Additional Comments on Part I:

#	Comments
5-12	<p>No separate ruling was ever made on Disability Rights Advocates’ NOI in this proceeding. However, in every proceeding in which Disability Rights Advocates has participated, Disability Rights Advocates was found eligible for compensation through demonstrating customer-related status and showing of significant financial hardship. Most recently, on June 3, 2011, Disability Rights Advocates was found eligible for compensation in Application (A.) 10-11-015, as set forth in the Administrative Law Judge’s (ALJ) Ruling Finding Various Parties Eligible for Intervenor Compensation.</p> <p>Furthermore, Disability Rights Advocates’ customer status has never been questioned. However, due to recent discussions of customer status in the context of other parties’ compensation requests, Disability Rights Advocates has recently amended its bylaws to explicitly conform to the statute that serves as the basis for customer eligibility. (<i>See Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b)(1)(C).</i>) Article I states, in part, that Disability Rights Advocates’ mission includes “representation of the interests of disabled residential customers, and small commercial customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation and other disabled customers of utilities.” These amended bylaws were submitted as Attachment 2 to D.10-04-024, Decision Awarding Intervenor Compensation to Disability Rights Advocates in A.08-12-021.</p>

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Claimant’s claimed contribution to the final decision:

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>The Commission initiated this rulemaking to explore methods for sharing of information between water and energy utilities to increase participation in low-income water assistance programs. Throughout the duration of this proceeding, Disability Rights Advocates worked closely with the National Consumer Law Center (NCLC) and The Utility Reform Network (TURN), submitting comments together as “Joint Consumers.”</p> <p>In addressing the issues raised in the scoping memo, the Joint Consumers</p>	<p><i>See generally</i> Comments of Joint Consumers on Issues Presented in</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>supported the stated goals of the proceeding and sought to ensure that they were put into effect in a manner that was understandable to consumers and respected their rights.</p> <p>Joint Consumers collectively made multiple substantial contributions to the final decision, as set forth in detail below. Disability Rights Advocates worked with other consumer groups to avoid duplication of effort as discussed below in Part II, Section B(d).</p>	<p>Assigned Commissioner’s and ALJ’s Ruling Requesting Comments and Scoping Memo (Opening Comments), April 23, 2010.</p>	
<p>Overall, the Joint Consumers strongly supported “moving forward on data sharing and coordinated outreach and enrollment efforts on utility affordability programs” in order to “help struggling low-income Californians maintain access to essential utility services.” Opening Comments at 1. At the same time, Joint Consumers noted that “consumers must be able to control the way that utilities use their customer information.” <i>Id.</i> at 2. The final decision, D.11-05-020, worked to balance these issues and design a program that will support low-income consumers while respecting the customer’s right to control their personal information.</p>	<p>Decision Adopting Guidelines for Sharing of Low-Income Customer Information (D.11-05-020), Ordering Paragraph 4, issued May 10, 2011.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The Joint Consumers urged the Commission to support creation of an automatic enrollment process. Comments of the Joint Consumers on the ALJ’s Ruling Requesting Comments (Comments on the ALJ Ruling), February 1, 2011 at 2.</p> <p>The Joint Consumers also advocated an opt-out mechanism for data sharing that allows customers the option to explicitly indicate whether they would or would not like their information shared with other utilities</p>	<p>The Commission agreed with the Joint Consumers regarding the importance of automatic enrollment. The final decision adopts “automatic enrollment as a necessary adjunct to a cost-effective data sharing program and require[s] water utilities to provide a 30-day opt-out notification, should the customer decline to participate in the water utility’s low-income assistance program.” D.11-05-020 at 16.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>for the purpose of enrolling in other low-income assistance programs; an opt-out (rather than an opt-in) facilitates enrollment of more consumers while respecting the rights of those who prefer not to participate. (See Opening Comments at 5.)</p>		
<p>While supporting information sharing and automatic enrollment (with an opt-out), the Joint Consumers also worked to guard the confidentiality of customer information. Comments on the ALJ Ruling at 7.</p>	<p>While the final decision did not adopt the Joint Consumers’ recommendation that customers names and addresses should be treated as confidential information in the context of a list of participants in a low income program, it does seek to protect confidential information in general. The final decision holds that “disclosure of name and address information plus additional data, including but not limited to enrollment in a low-income program, would constitute a disclosure of information.” D.11-05-020 at 23-24.</p>	<p>The Joint Consumers recommended that customers also be notified of any unauthorized disclosure of names and addresses alone. The Decision at 23 states “[w]e decline to adopt a customer notification safeguard for the disclosure of names and addresses. It is unlikely that the disclosure of names and addresses alone would constitute a disclosure of confidential information, because names and addresses generally are publicly available and existing best practices do not consider breach of name and address alone to trigger notification requirements”. We disallow 4%</p>

		<p>of DisabRA’s time spent preparing its Joint Consumer Comments filed on April 23, 2010 and 8% of its time spent on preparing its Joint Consumer Comments filed on February 1, 2011. We disallow this time as it did not make a substantial contribution to the final decision.</p>
<p>In our Opening Comments, the Joint Consumers suggested that flexibility in timing be considered to allow customers time to consent to data sharing, since the proposed guidelines appeared to require a data match. (See Opening Comments at 6.)</p>	<p>The Commission agreed with the Joint Consumer’s recommendation and adopted a timing modification. D.11-05-020 at 24.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The Joint Consumers noted that people with disabilities and people who do not speak English as their primary language are more likely to be low income than the rest of the population. Thus, the Joint Consumers highlighted the need for information intended for customers to be provided in accessible formats and in different languages so that customers will have access to information about these programs. Comments on the ALJ Ruling at 10-11.</p>	<p>The final decision requires water utilities to submit a proposed data sharing plan that includes information regarding “[i]dentification of languages and accessible formats to be used in low-income sharing documents by district.” (D.11-05-020 at 31-32.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>The Joint Consumers supported efforts to encourage coordination of outreach and enrollment efforts with municipal utilities. (See Opening Comments at 7; Comments on the ALJ Ruling at 12.)</p>	<p>The final decision acknowledges the importance of coordination between all water and energy utilities and encourages collaboration even among utilities that are not directly subject to the decision. (See D.11-05-020 at 27.)</p>	<p>Yes</p>

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: National Consumer Law Center; Southwest Gas Corporation; Sierra Pacific Power Co.; The Utility Reform Network, Southern California Edison; Golden State Water Company; San Diego Gas & Electric Company; Pacific Gas & Electric Company; Pacificorp; Director of Revenue Requirements Park Water Company; San Gabriel Valley Water Company; California American Water Company; California Public Utilities Commission; Nossaman, LLP; Manatt Phelps & Phillips LLP.		Correct
d. Claimant’s description of how it coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how claimant’s participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: As noted above, DisabRA worked in coalition with The Utility Reform Network and the National Consumer Law Center. Each of these consumer groups worked on all aspects of this proceeding and deferred each to areas where they had greater expertise in a particular area. In areas where the consumer group’s interests overlapped, tasks were divided for maximum efficiency.		We make no reductions to DisabRA’s claim for unnecessary duplication of effort with other parties.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

Claimant’s explanation as to how the cost of claimant’s participation bore a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through claimant’s participation
<p>While it is not possible to directly quantify the benefits to the low income consumers with disabilities represented by Disability Rights Advocates in this proceeding, a number of these consumers will directly obtain a financial benefit by being enrolled in water Low-Income Ratepayer Assistance (LIRA) program. For these consumers, the small dollar benefit will make their utility service more affordable. In addition to the direct beneficiaries, the attention paid in general to outreach regarding the water LIRA, including support for increased information-sharing among utilities in general and ongoing attention to the need to provide information to consumers in accessible formats and appropriate languages, provide additional benefits. Collectively, these benefits to low-income consumers, including those with disabilities, will substantially outweigh the cost of Disability Rights Advocates’ participation in this proceeding.</p> <p>Additionally, Disability Rights Advocates’ states that its request is reasonable because they were</p>

efficient in staffing this proceeding and pursuing our results. Because Disability Rights Advocates worked in close coordination with other consumer groups, we primarily staffed the proceeding with only one attorney, Melissa Kasnitz, who has led all of Disability Rights Advocates' work before the Commission. At times, Kasnitz was assisted in discrete tasks by a junior attorney, Rebecca von Behren, and supported by a paralegal.

Finally, in its NOI, Disability Rights Advocates estimated spending a total of 60 hours, and \$31,100, on this proceeding. In fact, Disability Rights Advocates is requesting \$16,586.38 for 48.1 hours of merits work, considerably less than anticipated in the NOI filed on April 30, 2010, making this request for compensation reasonable in relation to the actual work done in this proceeding.

CPUC verification:

DisabRA's participation through its joint filings with TURN and NCLC assisted the Commission in adopting an information sharing program between the water and energy low income programs which will increase low-income household participation in the water discount program. The automatic enrollment stemming from D.11-05-020 will benefit low-income consumers by streamlining the time and effort to enroll into similar assistance programs. The creation of this program will not only benefit the water utilities' low-income customers, but all ratepayers by making outreach efforts more efficient and cost effective. We find that DisabRA's participation will result in benefits to low-income consumers which outweigh the cost of DisabRA's participation.

We make some minor disallowances to DisabRA's claim and find the remaining hours and costs to be productive and warranting compensation.

B. Specific Claim*:

CLAIMED*						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Rate Rationale	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
M. Kasnitz	2010	9.5	420	D.10-07-013	3,990.00	2010	8.97	420	3,767.40
M. Kasnitz	2011	20.2	420	D.11-06-035	8,484.00	2011	20.02	420	8,408.40
R. von Behren	2010	16.4	160	Adopted here	2,624.00	2010	12.49	160	1,998.40
Subtotal: \$15,098						Subtotal: \$14,174.20			
OTHER FEES (Paralegal):									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Rate Rationale	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Paralegal	2010	1.8	110	D.10-07-013	198.00	2010	0.00	110	0.00
Paralegal	2011	0.2	110	Adopted here	22.00	2011	0.20	110	22.00
Subtotal: \$220.00						Subtotal: \$22.00			

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Rate Rationale	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
M. Kasnitz	2011	1.3	210	½ D.11-06-035 rate	273.00	2011	1.30	210	273.00
M. Kasnitz	2010	0.3	210	½ D.10-07-013 rate	63.00	2010	0.30	210	63.00
R. Williford	2011	4.2	80	½ D.11-07-024	336.00	2011	1.10	75	82.50
Paralegal	2011	5.3	55	½ D.10-07-013 rate	291.50	2011	5.30	55	291.50
Paralegal	2010	3.2	55	½ D.10-07-013 rate	176.00	2010	0.00	55	0.00
Subtotal: \$1,139.50						Subtotal: \$710.00			
COSTS									
Item	Detail			Amount	Amount				
Photocopies & Printing	See Comment # 3 below			124.00	18.40				
Postage	See Comment # 3 below			4.88	4.88				
Subtotal: \$128.88						Subtotal: \$23.28			
TOTAL REQUEST: \$16,586.38						TOTAL AWARD: \$14,929.48			
<p>* 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>**Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.</p>									

C. Comments Documenting Specific Claim:

Comments	Description/Comment
Comment 1	<p><u>Summary of Disability Rights Advocates' Allocation of Time by Activity</u></p> <p>Disability Rights Advocates has allocated its merits time into the following activity categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Case Management</u>: Time spent in mandatory activities regarding participation in the proceeding, such as reviewing party comments, reviewing commission documents, etc. Overall, 25% of the merits time recorded was spent on case management. • <u>General Access</u>: Time spent addressing the special needs of vulnerable consumers, including consumers with disabilities. This includes time spent reviewing the initial application to identify access issues as well as time spent on efforts that were primarily focused on disability access issues. Overall, 18% of the merits time recorded was spent addressing general access.

	<p><u>Coordination</u>: Time spent working in conjunction with the other consumer organizations to address substantive issues of shared concern, and to coordinate efforts to address such issues (including overall strategy efforts, allocation of substantive issues to those most focused on them, and cooperative efforts in preparing materials). Within time spent as “Coordination,” Disability Rights Advocates took the lead on our primary issues of communication and vulnerable customers, while providing input on all issues of concern to consumers. Disability Rights Advocates estimates that 20% was spent on outreach and other communications matters, 35% was spent on automatic enrollment and associated issues concerning customer information, and 45% on process issues surrounding the development and review of the data-sharing process. Overall, 57% of the merits time recorded were spent addressing Coordination.</p>
<p>Comment 2</p>	<p><u>Justification for 2010 Rate for Rebecca von Behren</u> The 2010 rate sought for attorney Rebecca von Behren is \$160. This rate has not yet been evaluated by the Commission. Von Behren is a 2008 graduate of Columbia University School of Law and was admitted to the California State Bar on December 27, 2008. She has not previously had a rate set by the Commission. At the time she worked on this Commission proceeding, she was in her second year of litigation experience with Disability Rights Advocates. The requested rate of \$160 is slightly above the minimum for an attorney in the 0-2 year range of experience.</p> <p><u>Justification of 2011 Rates for Attorneys and Paralegals</u></p> <p><u>Melissa Kasnitz</u> As stated in Disability Rights Advocates’ request for intervenor compensation filed on July 11, 2011 in Investigation (I.) 07-01-022, A.06-09-006, A.06-10-026, A.06-11-009, A.06-11-010, and A.07-03-019, Disability Rights Advocates is not seeking a rate increase for Melissa Kasnitz in 2011. Kasnitz’s requested 2011 rate remains at \$420.</p> <p><u>Rebecca Williford</u> As stated in Disability Rights Advocates’ request for intervenor compensation filed on July 11, 2011 in Investigation 07-01-022, Application 06-09-006, Application 06-10-026, Application 06-11-009, Application 06-11-010, and Application 07-03-019, Disability Rights Advocates seeks a rate of \$160 for Rebecca Williford in 2011.</p> <p><u>Paralegals</u> As stated in Disability Rights Advocates’ compensation request filed on July 11, 2011 in I.07-01-022, A.06-09-006, A.06-10-026, A.06-11-009, A.06-11-010, and A07-03-019, Disability Rights Advocates is not seeking a rate increase for paralegals in 2011. Disability Rights Advocates’ paralegals who worked on this proceeding were Kaitlin Anderson in 2010 and Raziya Brumfield in 2011.</p>

Comment 3	<p><u>Summary of Costs</u></p> <p>In its compensation request, Disability Rights Advocates seeks recovery of \$128.88 in costs. Disability Rights Advocates seeks \$124.00 for in-house printing and copying costs; this amount reflects efforts on the part of Disability Rights Advocates to avoid printing documents that are not relevant to issues of concern to our constituency.</p>
-----------	--

D. CPUC Adoptions, Adjustments and Disallowances:

Item	Adoptions
2010 rate for Rebecca von Behren	DisabRA requests an hourly rate of \$160 for Rebecca von Behren. Von Behren has not previously had a rate adopted by the Commission. Von Behren is a 2008 graduate of Columbia University of Law and was admitted to the California State Bar on 12/27/08. Her work in this proceeding was performed during her second year as an attorney. We find the requested rate for von Behren to be reasonable and slightly above the minimum of the range of \$150-\$205 established for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience as approved in D.08-04-010. We adopt the hourly rate as requested.
2011 rate for Rebecca Williford	DisabRA requests an increase of \$10 to the 2011 hourly rate of Williford. Williford’s approved hourly rate for her 2010 work before the Commission is \$150. Resolution ALJ-267 disallows cost-of-living increases for 2011 intervenor work. Other than citing to the proceedings where DisabRA “requested” an hourly rate of \$160 for Williford, it has failed to provide substantiation for this increase in its request for an award. ²
We note at the onset of our review that DisabRA’s timesheets indicate numerous entries between staff for “receiving documents”. This a clerical task subsumed in the fees paid to attorneys. We forgo disallowances here for this task, but caution DisabRA that future claims including this type of activity will face appropriate clerical reductions.	
Item	Adjustments and Disallowances
2010 hours spent on clerical matters	We disallow 2.37 hours of DisabRA’s 2010 hours spent on clerical matters. The tasks subject to disallowances include “new proceeding and dates, calendaring proceeding dates, scheduling and the filing and serving of documents”. ³ Disallowance: 2010 von Behren .57 hrs and 2010 Paralegal 1.8 hrs
2010 hours of 2/8/10	We disallow .40 hrs of von Behren and Kasnitz’s total time on this date for a “meeting to discuss issues raised in the proceeding and plan for opening comments”. We have previously compensated both of these individuals on 1/6/10 for the same efforts.

² DisabRA must provide more information to justify an hourly rate increase for Williford’s 2011 work. See D.08-04-010, Section 4.3.3 at 8 for the various circumstances which would normally qualify for a rate increase and also Resolution ALJ-267.

³ See D.11-07-024 and D.11-05-044.

2010 travel hours of von Behren	We disallow .80 hrs of von Behren’s time for travel to and from a data sharing workshop on 3/3/10. This time is considered to be “routine” travel and non-compensable. ⁴
2010 von Behren time on 3/3/10	We reduce by 2 hrs von Behren’s time preparing and attending a data sharing workshop. This time is equal to a similar amount billed by other joint intervenors in attendance at the same workshop.
2010 hours recommending that customers be notified of any unauthorized disclosure of names and addresses alone	<p>As outlined above, these hours did not result in making a substantial contribution to the final decision. The decision declined to adopt a customer notification safeguard for the disclosure of names and addresses.⁵</p> <p>4% disallowance of April 23, 2010 comments: 0.14 hrs 2010-von Behren 0.13 hrs 2010-Kasnitz</p> <p>8% disallowance of February 1, 2011 comments: 0.65 hrs 2011 Kasnitz</p>
Kasnitz hours on 1/25/11	We reduce by 1.25 hrs the time Kasnitz bills for a “strategy call with TURN and NCLC-joint intervenors, regarding the coordination of comments on an ALJ Ruling.” The reduced time equals the same time billed by other joint intervenors similarly involved in this same phone call.
Kasnitz hours on 4/4/11 and 4/8/11 for receiving and reviewing the proposed decision, notes regarding the same and preparing summary of issues	We reduce Kasnitz time by 1.2 hrs to be similarly equal to the same amount of time approved by other joint intervenors for the same tasks.
Excessive photocopying expenses	We reduce DisabRA’s photocopying and printing expenses by \$105.60, to be equal to the same amount billed by another Joint Consumer. While DisabRA may wish to copy documents that are electronically retrievable, we see no reason why ratepayers should be expected to pay for this practice. DisabRA was one of three parties that filed all documents jointly as “Joint Consumers.” Compensation claims have been submitted by all three intervenors. Of these claims, one intervenor waived these expenses (minimally incurred), and the other intervenor requested \$18.40 for

⁴ See D.02-08-011 and D.10-11-032.

⁵ See D.11-05-020 at 23.

	photocopying reimbursement. We find this amount to be reasonable and approve this same amount for DisabRA.
Excessive hours for preparing DisabRA's request for compensation	DisabRA requests a total of 14.3 hours for all participants in preparing its request for compensation. This equals 30% of its total time spent in this proceeding. We approve the more reasonable amount of time of 8 hrs for this task. This is equal to the same amount of time requested by another Joint Consumer who filed all documents jointly with DisabRA. To achieve the 6.3 hr disallowance, we disallow 3.2 of the 2010 paralegal time and 3.1 of the 2011 hours for Williford. The adjusted total more closely reflects our standards on the reasonableness of hours.

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim?

No

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived?

Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant has made a substantial contribution to D.11-05-020.
2. The claimed fees and costs, as adjusted herein, are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The total of reasonable contribution is \$14,929.48.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Claimant is awarded \$14,929.48.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, San Diego Gas and Electric Company (SDG&E), Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), California Water Service Company (CalWater), Great Oaks Water Company, Suburban Water Systems, Valencia Water Company, Park Water Company, California-American Water Company, Golden State Water Company, San Jose Water Company, San Gabriel Valley Water Company and Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company shall pay the award. We direct SDG&E, SoCalGas, SCE, PG&E, CalWater, Great Oaks Water Company, Suburban Water Systems, Valencia Water

Company, Park Water Company, California-American Water Company, Golden State Water Company, San Jose Water Company, San Gabriel Valley Water Company and Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company to allocate payment responsibility among themselves, based on their California-jurisdictional gas and electric or water revenues for the 2011 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning September 24, 2011, the 75th day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision was waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated March 22, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
TIMOTHY ALAN SIMON
MICHEL PETER FLORIO
CATHERINE J.K. SANDOVAL
MARK J. FERRON
Commissioners

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D1203052	Modifies Decision? No
Contribution Decision:	D1105020	
Proceeding:	R0912017	
Author:	ALJ Division	
Payees:	San Diego Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Gas Company, Southern California Edison Company, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, California Water Service Company, Great Oaks Water Company, Suburban Water Systems, Valencia Water Company, Park Water Company, California-American Water Company, Golden State Water Company, San Jose Water Company, San Gabriel Valley Water Company and Apple Valley Ranchos Water Company	

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Disability Rights Advocates	07-11-11	\$16,586.38	\$14,929.48	No	Lack of substantial contribution, disallowance of clerical tasks, excessive hours, hours previously compensated, disallowance of routine travel, excessive hours for compensation preparation

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$420	2010 and 2011	\$420
Rebecca	Williford	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$160	2011	\$150
Rebecca	Von Behren	Attorney	Disability Rights Advocates	\$160	2010	\$160
Paralegals			Disability Rights Advocates	\$110	2010 and 2011	\$110

(END OF APPENDIX)