



BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

05/03/19
02:20 PM

Order Instituting Investigation and Order to Show Cause on the Commission's Own Motion into the Operations and Practices of Pacific Gas and Electric Company with Respect to Locate and Mark Practices and Related Matters.	Investigation 18-12-007 (Filed December 13, 2018)
---	--

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
AND, IF REQUESTED (and ☒ ¹ checked), ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S
RULING ON **THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK'S** SHOWING OF
SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP**

NOTE: AFTER ELECTRONICALLY FILING A PDF COPY OF THIS NOTICE OF INTENT, PLEASE EMAIL THE DOCUMENT IN AN MS WORD FORMAT TO THE INTERVENOR COMPENSATION PROGRAM COORDINATOR AT Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Customer or Eligible Local Government Entity (party intending to claim intervenor compensation): The Utility Reform Network (TURN)		
Assigned Commissioner: Clifford Rechtschaffen		Administrative Law Judge: Peter V. Allen
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, III and IV of this Notice of Intent is true to my best knowledge, information and belief.		
Signature:		/s/
Date: 5/3/19	Printed Name:	Thomas J. Long

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES
(To be completed by the party intending to claim intervenor compensation)

A. Status as "customer" (see Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b))² The party claims "customer" status because the party is (check one):	Applies (check)
1. A Category 1 customer is an actual customer whose self-interest in the proceeding arises primarily from his/her role as a customer of the utility and,	

¹ DO NOT CHECK THIS BOX if a finding of significant financial hardship is not needed (in cases where there is a valid rebuttable presumption of eligibility (Part III(A)(3)) or significant financial hardship showing has been deferred to the intervenor compensation claim).

² All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

<p>at the same time, the customer must represent the broader interests of at least some other customers. See, for example, D.08-07-019 at 5-10).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>2. A Category 2 customer is a representative who has been authorized by actual customers to represent them. Category 2 involves a more formal arrangement where a customer or a group of customers selects a more skilled person to represent the customer's views in a proceeding. A customer or group of customers may also form or authorize a group to represent them, and the group, in turn, may authorize a representative such as an attorney to represent the group.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>3. A Category 3 customer is a formally organized group authorized, by its articles of incorporation or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers or small commercial customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation (§1802(b)(1)(C)). Certain environmental groups that represent residential customers with concerns for the environment may also qualify as Category 3 customers, even if the above requirement is not specifically met in the articles or bylaws. See D.98-04-059, footnote at 30.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>4. The party's detailed explanation of the selected customer category.</p> <p><u>The party's explanation of its status as a Category 1 customer.</u> A party seeking status as a Category 1 customer must describe the party's own interest in the proceeding and show how the customer's participation goes beyond just his/her own self-interest and will benefit other customers. Supporting documents must include a copy of the utility's bill.</p> <p><u>The party's explanation of its status as a Category 2 customer.</u> A party seeking status as a Category 2 customer must identify the residential customer(s) being represented and provide authorization from at least one customer.</p> <p><u>The party's explanation of its status as a Category 3 customer.</u> If the party represents residential and small commercial customers receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation, it must include in the Notice of Intent either the percentage of group members that are residential ratepayers or the percentage of the members who are receiving bundled electric service from an electrical corporation. Supporting documentation for this customer category must include current copies of the articles of incorporation or bylaws. If current copies of the articles and bylaws have already been filed with the Commission, only a specific reference (the proceeding's docket number and the date of filing) to such filings needs to be made.</p>	

<p>Do you have any direct economic interest in outcomes of the proceeding?³</p> <p>If “Yes”, explain:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>B. Conflict of Interest (§ 1802.3)</p>	<p>Check</p>
<p>1. Is the customer a representative of a group representing the interests of small commercial customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>2. If the answer to the above question is “Yes”, does the customer have a conflict arising from prior representation before the Commission?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>C. Status as an Eligible Local Government Entity (§§1802(d), 1802.4, 1803.1)</p>	
<p>The party claims “eligible local government entity” status because the party is a city, county, or city and county that is not a publicly owned public utility that intervenes or participates in a Commission proceeding for the purpose of protecting the health and safety of the residents within the entity’s jurisdiction following a catastrophic material loss suffered by its residents either in significant damage to infrastructure or loss of life and property, or both, as a direct result of public utility infrastructure.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>The party’s explanation of its status as an eligible local government entity must include a description of</p> <p>(1) The relevant triggering catastrophic event;</p> <p>(2) The impacts of the triggering catastrophic event on the residents within the entity’s jurisdiction as a result of public utility infrastructure; and</p> <p>(3) The entity’s reason(s) to participate in this proceeding.</p>	
<p>D. Timely Filing of Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)(1)):</p>	
<p>1. Is the party’s NOI filed within 30 days after a Prehearing Conference? Date of Prehearing Conference: 4/4/2019</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<p>2. Is the party’s NOI filed at another time (for example, because no Prehearing Conference was held, the proceeding will take less than 30 days, the schedule did not reasonably allow parties to identify issues within the timeframe normally permitted, or new issues have emerged)?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>2a. The party’s description of the reasons for filing its NOI at this other time:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>	
<p>2b. The party’s information on the proceeding number, date, and decision number for any Commission decision, Commissioner ruling, Administrative Law Judge’s ruling, or other document authorizing the filing of NOI at that other time:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N/A</p>	

³ See Rule 17.1(e).

PART II: SCOPE OF ANTICIPATED PARTICIPATION
(To be completed by the party intending to claim intervenor compensation)

A. Planned Participation (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)):

The party's statement of the issues on which it plans to participate:

At this time, in the absence of a Scoping Memo Ruling, TURN anticipates addressing the following broad issues, including ones that have been identified by the Order Instituting Rulemaking:

- 1) The nature and severity of violations, including the role of management in such violations.
- 2) The appropriate penalties and remedies for violations.
- 3) Whether PG&E shareholders should bear the costs of its own employees and consultants related to the CPUC's investigation of the conduct at issue in this case, as well as the costs of the SED.

The party's explanation of how it plans to avoid duplication of effort with other parties:

TURN has already begun coordinating with SED and intends to coordinate with other parties with similar viewpoints, including the Public Advocates Office and the Office of Safety Advocate in order to avoid duplication or, where such duplication is unavoidable, seek to ensure that TURN presents material that complements and supplements the showing of other parties.

The party's description of the nature and extent of the party's planned participation in this proceeding (to the extent that it is possible to describe on the date this NOI is filed).

TURN has already participated actively in this proceeding, including filing comments on the Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR) and participating in the prehearing conference and a settlement conference. TURN also plans to actively participate in any evidentiary hearings that may be provided for in the Scoping Memo, including submission of testimony, cross examination of witnesses, and preparation of opening and reply briefs.

B. The party's itemized estimate of the compensation that the party expects to request, based on the anticipated duration of the proceeding (§ 1804(a)(2)(A)):

Item	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	#
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES				
Thomas J. Long	125	\$615	\$76,875	
Katy Morsony	150	\$330	\$49,500	
Subtotal: \$126,375				

OTHER FEES				
[Person 1]				
[Person 2]				
Subtotal: \$				
COSTS				
Postage, photocopying, phone, computerized research fees			\$1,000	
Subtotal: \$1,000				
TOTAL ESTIMATE: \$127,375				
Estimated Budget by Issues: At this early juncture in the proceeding, TURN can only provide the following very rough estimate of the allocation of our estimated costs by issue area.				
Issue	Time	Budget		
Issue #1 (see Part II.A above)	40.0%	\$50,950		
Issue #2 (see Part II.A above)	40.0%	\$50,950		
Issue #3 (see Part II.A above)	20.0%	\$25,475		
Total (Excluding Direct Costs)	100.0%	\$127,375		
TURN's estimates of attorney time and hourly rates are preliminary. TURN will address in our Request for Compensation the reasonableness of the time we ultimately devote to this proceeding and the hourly rates ultimately requested.				
<i>When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows to table as necessary. Estimate may (but does not need to) include estimated Claim preparation time. Claim preparation time is typically compensated at ½ professional hourly rate.</i>				

PART III: SHOWING OF SIGNIFICANT FINANCIAL HARDSHIP
(To be completed by party intending to claim intervenor compensation;
see Instructions for options for providing this information)

A. The party claims that participation or intervention in this proceeding without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship, on the following basis:	Applies (check)
1. The customer cannot afford, without undue hardship, to pay the costs of effective participation, including advocate's fees, expert witness fees, and other reasonable costs of participation. (§ 1802(h))	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. In the case of a group or organization, the economic interest of the Individual members of the group or organization is small in comparison to the costs of effective participation in the proceeding. (§ 1802(h))	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3. The eligible local government entities' participation or intervention without an award of fees or costs imposes a significant financial hardship. (§ 1803.1(b).)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>4. A § 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b) finding of significant financial hardship in another proceeding, made within one year prior to the commencement of this proceeding, created a rebuttable presumption in this proceeding (§ 1804(b)(1)).</p> <p>Commission's finding of significant financial hardship made in proceeding number:</p> <p>Date of Administrative Law Judge's Ruling (or CPUC Decision) in which the finding of significant financial hardship was made:</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>

B. The party's explanation of the factual basis for its claim of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)) (necessary documentation, if warranted, is attached to the NOI:

Please see TURN's annual showing of significant financial hardship, included within the NOI that TURN filed in A.18-12-008 on Feb. 12, 2019. TURN has requested an ALJ Ruling in that proceeding on TURN's showing of significant financial hardship.

TURN also requests an ALJ Ruling in this proceeding. Because this proceeding commenced on [insert date], *before* the future date on which the Commission will presumably issue an ALJ Ruling in A.18-12-008 finding that TURN has demonstrated significant financial hardship, that ALJ Ruling in A.18-12-008 will not create a rebuttable presumption in this proceeding. Nor can TURN apply the previous ALJ Ruling finding significant hardship, issued in I.15-08-019 on November 8, 2017, to create a rebuttable presumption in this proceeding, as this proceeding commenced *more than a year after* that finding. As such, TURN requires an ALJ Ruling in this proceeding that we can reference in a request for intervenor compensation (should we eventually seek compensation), without needing to present our showing on significant financial hardship in full at that time.

If the Commission would prefer that TURN repeat the showing we recently presented in A.18-12-008 here in order to receive an ALJ Ruling on our significant financial hardship showing, TURN requests an opportunity to supplement this NOI to include that showing here.

TURN intends to apply the rebuttable presumption created by the earliest ALJ Ruling we receive on our showing of significant financial hardship to proceedings commencing *within one year after* the date of such ruling, as the Commission's rules permit. (See instructions in Section III.A.4 above.)

To avoid any additional confusion, TURN notes that we previously submitted a request for an ALJ Ruling on our significant financial hardship showing presented in the NOI we filed in R.18-07-005 on September 14, 2018. This earlier request was submitted consistent with

TURN's longstanding practice of including our demonstration of significant financial hardship for an upcoming 12-month period in an NOI filed before the expiration of the then-current 12-month period. However, TURN was informed by the ALJ Division's Intervenor Compensation team that this practice was no longer acceptable, and instructed to instead seek an ALJ Ruling in an NOI filed after the expiration of the rebuttable presumption created by the ALJ Ruling in I.15-08-019. TURN is attempting to comply with that directive, but it creates an awkward transition period, as there is now a gap in coverage for proceedings commencing after November 8, 2018 (when our last rebuttable presumption expired) and before the next ALJ Ruling we receive in response to our requests in A.18-12-008 and here. TURN expects to file NOIs in numerous proceedings commencing in this window and intends to request ALJ Rulings in all of them for the same reason we are requesting that ruling in this proceeding, unless directed otherwise by the Commission.

**PART IV: ATTACHMENTS DOCUMENTING SPECIFIC
ASSERTIONS MADE IN THIS NOTICE**

**(The party intending to claim intervenor compensation identifies and attaches documents;
add rows as necessary)**

Attachment No.	Description
1	Certificate of Service

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE RULING⁴
(Administrative Law Judge completes)

	Check all that apply
1. The Notice of Intent (NOI) is rejected for the following reasons:	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. The NOI has not demonstrated the party's status as a "customer" or an "eligible local government entity" for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The NOI has not demonstrated that the NOI was timely filed (Part I(B)) for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The NOI has not adequately described the scope of anticipated participation (Part II, above) for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁴ A Ruling needs not be issued unless: (a) the NOI is deficient; (b) the Administrative Law Judge desires to address specific issues raised by the NOI (to point out similar positions, areas of potential duplication in showings, unrealistic expectations for compensation, or other matters that may affect the customer or eligible local government entity's Intervenor Compensation Claim); or (c) the NOI has included a claim of "significant financial hardship" that requires a finding under § 1802(h).

2. The NOI has demonstrated significant financial hardship for the reasons set forth in Part III of the NOI (above).	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The NOI has not demonstrated significant financial hardship for the following reason(s):	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The Administrative Law Judge provides the following additional guidance (see § 1804(b)(2)):	<input type="checkbox"/>

IT IS RULED that:

1. The Notice of Intent is rejected.	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The customer or eligible local government entity has satisfied the eligibility requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 1804(a).	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The customer or eligible local government entity has shown significant financial hardship.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The customer or eligible local government entity is preliminarily determined to be eligible for intervenor compensation in this proceeding. However, a finding of significant financial hardship in no way ensures compensation.	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Additional guidance is provided to the customer or eligible local government entity as set forth above.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

Administrative Law Judge