

Decision 19-02-018 February 21, 2109

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Investigation and Ordering Pacific Gas and Electric Company to Appear and Show Cause Why It Should Not Be Sanctioned for Violations of Article 8 and Rule 1.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure and Public Utilities Code Sections 1701.2 and 1701.3.

Investigation 15-11-015

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 18-04-014**

Intervenor: The Utility Reform Network (TURN)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 18-04-014
Claimed: \$80,408.31	Awarded: \$80,408.31
Assigned Commissioner: Michael Picker	Assigned ALJ: Robert Mason

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES:

A. Brief description of Decision:	In D.18-04-014, Revised Decision Granting Joint Motion of the City of San Bruno, the City of San Carlos, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, the Safety and Enforcement Division, The Utility Reform Network, and Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Adoption of Settlement Agreement, the Commission adopted the Settlement Agreement entered into by the parties named in the decision. The Settlement Agreement resolved the first phase of the Commission's investigation into PG&E's pattern and practice from 2010-2014 of violating the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure governing <i>ex parte</i> communications and associated sections of the California Public Utilities Code. The Settlement Agreement adopted in D.18-04-014 provides financial and non-financial remedies for PG&E's conduct related to the 48 communications originally identified by the Commission as within the scope of this investigation, plus 116 additional communications that parties agreed to add to the
-----------------------------------	--

	scope of this proceeding (for a total of 164 communications between 2010 and 2014). ¹ The Commission in D.18-04-014 also determined that a second phase of this proceeding should be opened to consider whether any of the additional communications disclosed by PG&E on September 21, 2017, after the submission of the Settlement Agreement, violated the Commission's <i>ex parte</i> rules.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	April 20, 2016	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	May 20, 2016	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.15-03-005	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	Aug. 6, 2015	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:	A.15-03-005	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	Aug. 6, 2015	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		

¹ While PG&E agreed to add these communications to the scope of the proceeding, PG&E has not admitted that each is a violation of the Commission's *ex parte* rules.

13. Identify Final Decision:	D.18-04-014	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	May 3, 2018	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	July 2, 2018	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION:

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (*see* § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059).

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p><u>Scope of Investigation</u></p> <p>TURN, in conjunction with the other Non-PG&E Settling Parties (which include the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), the Commission's Safety and Enforcement Division (SED), the City of San Bruno (San Bruno), and the City of San Carlos (San Carlos), demonstrated that limited discovery regarding the "Category 3 e-mails" was appropriate to determine whether the encounters they described were in fact <i>ex parte</i> violations, despite the appearance otherwise. PG&E had opposed including these Category 3 communications in the scope of this proceeding and thus opposed any discovery. The Commission determined that limited discovery on the Category 3 emails was appropriate "under the extraordinary circumstances of this investigation, where PG&E's past conduct has aroused an unprecedented level of public concern." Following that determination, TURN and the other Non-PG&E Settling Parties</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Joint Ruling Revising Preliminary Scoping Memorandum</i>, Jul. 12, 2016, p. 7 • Joint Opening Brief of SED, ORA, TURN, San Carlos, and San Bruno on Whether "Category 3" Communications Should Be Included in this Proceeding, filed May 20, 2016 • D.18-04-014, Attachment A, pp. 8-9 (addressing Category 3 emails) • TURN Comments on the Preliminary Determination of Need for Evidentiary Hearings, Issues, and Schedule in This Proceeding, 12/3/15, pp. 4-9 	Verified

<p>conducted limited discovery on the original 21 Category 3 emails and concluded that 7 should remain in the proceeding. The remedies provided by the Settlement Agreement adopted in D.18-04-014 addressed these 7 Category 3 emails, in addition to the Category 1 and Category 2 emails at issue here.</p> <p>TURN also demonstrated that PG&E should be held accountable in this investigation for violating Rule 12.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procure, in addition to its <i>ex parte</i> violations. TURN raised this issue in its response to the OIL, pointing to PG&E's oral communication with then-Commission President Peevey on August 29, 2010, concerning PG&E's 2011 General Rate Case, A.09-12-020. PG&E had disclosed that particular communication on May 21, 2015, in a supplement to its October 6, 2014 disclosure of other oral <i>ex parte</i> communications. The Commission only listed the October 6, 2014 disclosure in the preliminary scope of the OIL. TURN explained that the Aug. 29, 2010 communication should be in the scope of this proceeding because it violated both the <i>ex parte</i> rules and Rule 12.6, which governs the confidentiality and inadmissibility of settlement negotiations.</p> <p>Section 2.1.A of the Settlement Agreement includes PG&E's admission that it violated Rule 12.6 "on at least one occasion" during the time period from 2010</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-04-014, Attachment A, Settlement Agreement, Section 2.1.A (Violation of Commission Rules) 	<p>Verified</p>
--	--	-----------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gas Transmission and Storage Rate Case Ratemaking Remedy: PG&E shall forego collection of \$63.5 million in revenue requirements for the years 2018 and 2019 • General Rate Case Remedy: PG&E will implement a one-time adjustment of \$10,000,000 amortized in equivalent annual amounts for its next General Rate Case cycle • Compensation Payable to the City of San Bruno and City of San Carlos: PG&E shall pay \$6,000,000 to the City of San Bruno General Fund and \$6,000,000 to the City of San Carlos General Fund • Payment to the State of California General Fund: PG&E shall pay \$12,000,000 <p>These terms represent the largest financial remedy ever imposed by the Commission in a decision addressing violations of its ex parte rules.</p> <p><i>Non-Financial Remedies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a period of two years, PG&E shall provide notice of tours provided to Commission Decisionmakers of PG&E's facilities that may be at issue in pending proceedings and must 		
---	--	--

<p>additionally invite TURN, ORA, and SED to attend the tour.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For a period of three years, PG&E shall provide notice of transmittals of credit rating agency or investor reports to Commission Decisionmakers to TURN, ORA, SED, and parties in PG&E’s most recent cost of capital, General Rate Case, and Gas Transmission and Storage proceedings.• For a period of two years, PG&E shall provide notice of “meet and greet” meetings between certain PG&E Officers and Commission Decisionmakers to ORA and TURN• For a period of three years, PG&E will provide the parties to I.15-11-015 a copy of the training materials PG&E uses to annually train its employees on the Commission’s <i>ex parte</i> rules, as well as an annual certificate of completion for the training of all officers, Regulatory Affairs employees and Law Department attorneys. <p>TURN participated actively in all aspects of the process that lead to the Commission’s adoption of the Settlement Agreement in D.18-04-014. Indeed, TURN played a</p>		
---	--	--

<p>leading role in many aspects of the Non-PG&E Parties' efforts, including discovery, strategy development, preparation of offers and counteroffers presented to PG&E, negotiation, and contribution to the factual stipulations for the 164 communications that formed the "Joint Record" relied upon by the Commission in assessing the reasonableness of the proposed Settlement Agreement.</p> <p>Settlement negotiations commenced and concluded under unusual circumstances, as parties were able to reach agreement before presenting their litigation positions on the legal and policy issues presented in this investigation. Parties first began meeting in compliance with the January 8, 2016 <i>Assigned Commissioner and Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Directing Parties to Engage in Meet and Confer Process and Setting Prehearing Conference</i>. Given the fruitful – albeit prolonged – nature of negotiations that flowed from the Meet and Confer process, Parties sought and received extensions in the briefing schedule to provide more time to pursue settlement. (See E-Mail Rulings on 1/13/17 and 3/22/17 continuing the briefing schedule). Ultimately, that process was successful and avoided the need for additional litigation. As a result of this unusual procedural context, TURN cannot point to pleadings that indicate TURN's litigation position on the extent of PG&E's violations of the</p>		
--	--	--

<p>Commission's <i>ex parte</i> rules and related California statutes, and TURN's position on appropriate remedies for PG&E's egregious conduct, which could be compared to the Settlement Agreement. Even so, given TURN's role in this proceeding and the significance of the resulting Settlement Agreement adopted by the Commission, TURN submits that the Commission should find that D.18-04-014 and the Settlement Agreement it adopted reflect TURN's substantial contribution.</p>		
<p><u>Treatment of New Communications Disclosed by PG&E in September 2017</u></p> <p>TURN, in conjunction with the other Non-PG&E Settling Parties, demonstrated that the Commission should open a second phase of this OII to investigate the new emails released by PG&E on September 21, 2017. PG&E had argued that the remedies included in the Settlement Agreement should suffice as punishment for these new emails because they "are similar in nature to those previously addressed in this proceeding." The Commission disagreed in D.18-04-014 and ordered a second phase in this proceeding to determine if the e-mails disclosed by PG&E on Sept. 21, 2017 violated the Commission's <i>ex parte</i> rules.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D.18-04-014, p. 22 and Ordering Paragraph 3. • Joint Response of SED, ORA, San Bruno, and San Carlos to PG&E's September 21, 2017 Motion Accepting the Proposed Decision's Modification of the Settlement Agreement, filed Nov. 1, 2017 • PG&E's Reply to the Joint Response of SED, ORA, TURN, San Bruno, and San Carlos to PG&E's Sept. 21, 2017 Motion Accepting the Proposed Decision's Modification of the Settlement Agreement, filed Nov. 8, 2017, p. 5 	<p>Verified</p>

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding? ²	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: The Commission's Safety and Enforcement Division (SED), the City of San Bruno (San Bruno), and the City of San Carlos (San Carlos) were also active parties from the inception of this proceeding and joined the Settlement Agreement.		Verified
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: From the outset of this proceeding, TURN has been coordinating our coverage of issues with all of the other Non-PG&E Parties (ORA, SED, San Bruno, and San Carlos) to avoid duplication to the extent possible. This active coordination continued throughout the time period covered by this request for compensation. In consultation with the other Non-PG&E parties, TURN took the lead in many aspects of case, including the meet and confer process, discovery, and settlement negotiations, including: drafting data requests; drafting documents used during negotiations; reviewing and editing stipulations proposed by PG&E (and negotiating the same); and playing a coordination role among the Non-PG&E Parties throughout settlement negotiations. TURN also took the lead in drafting the Non-PG&E Parties' response to PG&E's September 21, 2017 Motion, wherein PG&E first disclosed the additional emails that are now the subject of Phase 2 of this OIL. TURN's timesheets reflect this allocation of work, which created efficiencies for other parties. For all of these reasons, TURN submits that there was no undue duplication between TURN's participation and that of ORA and the other Non-PG&E Parties.		Noted

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) was renamed the Public Advocate's Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates), pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION:

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

<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>TURN's request for intervenor compensation seeks an award of approximately \$80,000 as the reasonable cost of our participation in the first phase of this proceeding. TURN submits that these costs are reasonable in light of the importance of the issues TURN addressed and the benefits to customers.</p> <p>As explained in Section II.A above, the Settlement Agreement adopted in D.18-04-014 provides PG&E's ratepayers with \$73.5 million in direct financial benefits. This means that ratepayers received more than \$900 in benefits for each \$1 spent by TURN on participating in this proceeding, a very reasonable return on investment.</p> <p>Ratepayers will also benefit from the non-financial remedies adopted by D.18-04-014, which foster greater transparency, accountability, and ethical conduct by PG&E. As the Commission recognized in Section 2.5 of D.18-04-014, the Commission's <i>ex parte</i> restrictions and reporting requirements promote the dual public policies of openness and due process. "Proper adherence to the rules regarding the avoidance of improper <i>ex parte</i> communications, as well as the duty to report such communications, assures the parties and the public that the decisionmakers have comported themselves in an impartial manner." (D.18-04-014, p. 13). Ratepayers clearly have a strong interest in policies that promote compliance with the Commission's rules governing <i>ex parte</i> communications. Non-compliance with these rules, such as the conduct of PG&E at issue in this OII, undermines the integrity of the Commission's decision making process and the Commission's ability to carry out its duty to protect the public interest. In contrast, ratepayers benefit when the Commission renders its decisions in an impartial manner, and where all parties (including utilities, ratepayer advocates, and other stakeholders) are given equal access to decisionmakers, as the <i>ex parte</i> rules require.</p> <p>For these reasons, the Commission should find that TURN's efforts have been productive.</p>	<p>CPUC Discussion</p> <hr/> <p>Noted</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>This Request for Compensation includes slightly more than 200 hours of TURN's attorney time, spanning two and a half years of work. TURN's efforts reflected herein resulted the development of the factual stipulations that formed the record in this proceeding (given</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>the absence of any testimony or briefs), the Settlement Agreement adopted in D.18-04-014, as well as the Commission’s initiation in that decision of a second phase of this OIL.</p> <p>TURN assigned this proceeding to staff attorney Hayley Goodson, who did the vast majority of the work. Ms. Goodson benefitted from occasional input from TURN Legal Director Thomas Long and TURN General Counsel Robert Finkelstein on strategic matters and also on tax-related issues related to the remedies under negotiation. Because Mr. Long represented TURN in many of the proceedings implicated by PG&E’s ex parte violations, including the Gas Transmission and Storage proceeding and the San Bruno OILs, he was also able to efficiently offer Ms. Goodson valuable background information and insights. This request for compensation includes approximately 8 hours of Mr. Long’s time and 3 hours of Mr. Finkelstein’s time. Ms. Goodson also consulted with TURN staff attorney Marcel Hawiger on PG&E’s communications related to matters with which he had particular familiarity, as well as on ratemaking issues associated with the Gas Transmission and Storage revenue requirement component of the financial remedies. Approximately 2 hours of Mr. Hawiger’s time are included in this request.</p> <p>TURN submits that the Commission should find the hours requested here to be reasonable under the circumstances, and that TURN’s showing supports that conclusion. However, should the Commission believe that more information is needed or that a different approach to discussing the reasonableness of the requested hours is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.</p>				
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>TURN has allocated its daily time entries by activity codes to better reflect the nature of the work reflected in each entry. TURN has used the following activity codes:</p> <table><tr><td>Code</td><td>Description</td><td>Allocation of Time</td></tr></table>	Code	Description	Allocation of Time	Noted
Code	Description	Allocation of Time		

I.15-11-015 ALJ/RIM/eg3

GP	The work in this category included activities associated with general participation in this proceeding, such as the initial review of the OIL, preparing preliminary pleadings, attending the PHC, reading ALJ rulings, and reading parties' pleadings as necessary to determine whether TURN should address the issues raised.	6.79%		
M&C	This work was related to participating in the Meet and Confer process ordered by the ALJ and Assigned Commissioner	22.55%		
Cat1	This work was specific to the "Category 1" communications, including preparation of factual stipulations, which were addressed through the Meet and Confer process	5.82%		
Cat2	This work was specific to the "Category 2" communications, including discovery and preparation of factual stipulations, which were addressed through the Meet and Confer process	4.97%		
Cat3	This work was specific to the "Category 3" communications, including discovery and preparation of factual stipulations, which were addressed through the Meet and Confer process	10.42%		
Cat2/3	This work was specific to both the "Category 2" and "Category 3" communications, which were addressed through the Meet and Confer process	3.27%		
#	The work in in this category pertained to substantive issues but was not specific to any one issue area addressed by TURN.	0.48%		
Sett	This work was related to settlement negotiations	33.94%		

NewCom	This work was related to the new communications revealed by PG&E when it responded to the original Proposed Decision, specifically how the Commission should address them procedurally	6.91%		
PD	This work was related to the original Proposed Decision and revised Proposed Decision which preceded D.18-04-014	1.33%		
Comp	Intervenor Compensation: work preparing TURN's NOI and Request for Compensation	3.52%		
TOTAL		100.00%		
<p>If the Commission believes that a different approach to issue-specific allocation is warranted here, TURN requests the opportunity to supplement this section of the request.</p>				

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein, TURN General Counsel	2016	1.50	\$510	D.16-11-004	\$765.00	1.50	\$510.00	\$765.00
Robert Finkelstein, TURN General Counsel	2017	1.25	\$520	D.17-11-032	\$650.00	1.25	\$520.00	\$650.00
Hayley Goodson , TURN Staff Attorney	2015	10.50	\$355	D.16-10-036	\$3,727.50	10.50	\$355.00	\$3,727.50
Hayley Goodson , TURN Staff	2016	121.75	\$380	D.17-03-022	\$46,265.00	121.75	\$380.00	\$46,265.00

Attorney								
Hayley Goodson , TURN Staff Attorney	2017	53.25	\$405	D.18-01-020	\$21,566.25	53.25	\$405.00	\$21,566.25
Hayley Goodson , TURN Staff Attorney	2018	0.75	\$435	D.18-04-020	\$326.25	0.75	\$435.00	\$326.25
Marcel Hawiger, TURN Staff Attorney	2016	1.00	\$415	D.16-06-024	\$415.00	1.00	\$415.00	\$415.00
Marcel Hawiger, TURN Staff Attorney	2017	0.75	\$425	D.17-11-032	\$318.75	0.75	\$425.00	\$318.75
Thomas Long, TURN Legal Director	2015	0.75	\$570	D.16-11-004	\$427.50	0.75	\$570.00	\$427.50
Thomas Long, TURN Legal Director	2016	2.50	\$575	D.16-11-004	\$1,437.50	2.50	\$575.00	\$1,437.50
Thomas Long, TURN Legal Director	2017	5.00	\$585	D.17-11-029	\$2,925.00	5.00	\$585.00	\$2,925.00
Subtotal: \$78,823.75						Subtotal: \$78,823.75		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Hayley Goodson , TURN Staff Attorney	2016	1	\$190.00	1/2 of 2016 hourly rate; D.16-03-027	\$190.00	1.00	\$190.00	\$190.00

Hayley Goodson , TURN Staff Attorney	2018	6.25	\$217.50	1/2 of 2018 hourly rate; D.18-04-020	\$1,359.38	6.25	\$217.50	\$1,359.38
Subtotal: \$1,549.38						Subtotal: \$1,549.38		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	Copies	Copies of documents related to D.18-04-014			\$15.80	\$15.80		
	Phone	Phone calls related to D.18-04-014			\$5.55	\$5.55		
	Postage	Mailing costs for filings related to D.18-04-014			\$13.83	\$13.83		
Subtotal: \$35.18						Subtotal: \$35.18		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$80,408.31						TOTAL AWARD: \$80,408.31		
<p>*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. Intervenor’s 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.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney			Date Admitted to CA BAR ³		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation	
Robert Finkelstein			June 1990		146391		No	
Hayley Goodson			December 2003		228535		No	
Marcel Hawiger			January 1998		194244		No	
Thomas Long			December 1986		124776		No	

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
-------------------------------	---------------------

³ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Timesheets for TURN's Attorneys
Attachment 3	TURN Direct Expenses Associated with D.18-04-014
Attachment 4	TURN Hours Allocated by Issue

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS:

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Utility Reform Network has made a substantial contribution to D.18-04-014.
2. The requested hourly rates for The Utility Reform Network's 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 \$80,408.31.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. The Utility Reform Network shall be awarded \$80,408.31.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company ratepayers shall pay The Utility Reform Network the total award. 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 September 16, 2018, the 75th day after the filing of The Utility Reform Network's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

I.15-11-015 ALJ/RIM/eg3

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

This decision is effective today.

Dated February 21, 2019, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL PICKER

President

LIANE M. RANDOLPH

MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

Commissioners

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D1902018	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D1804014		
Proceeding(s):	I1511015		
Author:	ALJ Mason		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company ratepayers		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
The Utility Reform Network	07/02/2018	\$80,408.31	\$80,408.31	N/A	N/A

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	\$510.00	2016	\$510.00
Robert	Finkelstein	Attorney	\$520.00	2017	\$520.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$355.00	2015	\$355.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$380.00	2016	\$380.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$405.00	2017	\$405.00
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	\$435.00	2018	\$435.00
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	\$415.00	2016	\$415.00
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	\$425.00	2017	\$425.00
Thomas	Long	Attorney	\$570.00	2015	\$570.00
Thomas	Long	Attorney	\$575.00	2016	\$575.00
Thomas	Long	Attorney	\$585.00	2017	\$585.00

(END OF APPENDIX)