

Decision 22-07-020 July 14, 2022

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority, Among Other Things, to Increase Rates and Charges for Electric and Gas Service Effective on January 1, 2020. (U39M)

Application 18-12-009

**DECISION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION
TO ALLIANCE FOR NUCLEAR RESPONSIBILITY
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS
TO DECISION 20-12-005**

Intervenor: Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility (“A4NR”)	For contribution to Decision (D.) 20-12-005
Claimed: \$288,401.76	Awarded: \$253,410.61
Assigned Commissioner: Clifford Rechtschaffen ¹	Assigned ALJs: Rafael Lirag and Elaine Lau

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	The Decision adopts, with some modifications, a Settlement Agreement (to which A4NR was not a party) to resolve PG&E’s TY 2020 general rate case with accompanying adjustments to revenue requirements in the 2021 and 2022 attrition years.
--	--

¹ The proceeding was re-assigned to Commissioner Clifford Rechtschaffen on May 3, 2021.

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code §§ 1801-1812²:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of prehearing conference:	2/11/2019	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI filed:	3/12/2019	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 Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling issued in proceeding number:	Application (A.) 18-03-009	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	9/26/2019	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.18-03-009	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	9/26/2019	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.20-12-005	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	12/11/2020	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	2/8/2021	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

² All statutory references are to California Pub. Util. Code unless indicated otherwise.

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

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>1. A4NR focused its efforts on Scoping Memo Issue 1, as applied to the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant (“DCNPP”), <i>i.e.</i>, whether or not PG&E’s proposed revenue requirements, proposed costs, and proposed recovery mechanisms for TY 2020 are just and reasonable and whether these should be adopted by the Commission. This was PG&E’s first GRC since D.18-10-19 modified the PCIA calculation of above-market costs at Diablo Canyon and designated (at 112) GRCs as an appropriate forum for consideration of imprudently incurred costs of utility-owned generation. After extensive discovery, A4NR submitted expert testimony challenging the reasonableness, in light of sharp erosion in bundled load, of continuing to incur avoidable O&M and capital costs at a significantly above-market plant like DCNPP. A4NR’s testimony emphasized PG&E’s burden of proving that a prudent manager would incur an additional \$1.124 billion in avoidable costs during this GRC cycle at a plant already costing \$410 – 523 million above-market each year and the departed load portion of</p>	<p>As presiding officers, on September 6, 2019 ALJs Lirag and Lau denied (without prejudice) PG&E’s Motion to Strike A4NR’s testimony and allowed to become moot PG&E’s Motion to Shorten Time for responses to the Motion to Strike. The significance of the issues raised by A4NR’s testimony is reflected in the written reactions of other parties. Joining A4NR in filing separate responses opposing the Motion to Strike were TURN, Women’s Energy Matters, and L. Jan Reid, while CUE filed in support of PG&E. The ALJs’ Ruling noted (at 3) that “the proposed disallowances in A4NR’s testimony concern cost effectiveness of DCNPP in light of available alternatives,” and referred “(i)ssues related to the proper shutdown or closure date” to a Petition for Modification of D.18-01-022. “Any relevant decision pursuant to a petition to modify D.18-01-022 ... shall be incorporated in the decision for this proceeding.” (ALJs’ Ruling, at 2)</p>	<p>Verified</p>

<p>service territory demand soaring above the 50% level – a precipitous change in business position since PG&E’s 2016 announcement of DCNPP’s early retirement. A4NR’s testimony also pointed out the plant’s contribution to increasing renewable curtailments and the exorbitant, non-competitive cost per metric tonne of valuing DCNPP as a source of GHG emissions.</p>		
<p>2. Responding to the direction of the ALJs September 6, 2019 ruling (which had invited PG&E to renew its motion during evidentiary hearings “pursuant to the guidance provided in this ruling”), A4NR filed a PFM for D.18-01-022. While A4NR’s interest was limited to pursuing a burden-of-proof argument regarding specific DCNPP costs during the 2020-2022 GRC cycle, failing to file the PFM could have left A4NR’s testimony vulnerable to a renewed motion to strike at hearing. A4NR’s PFM of D.18-01-022 emphasized (at 1) that significant changes in material facts meant that “continuing to incur DCNPP costs which are avoidable – like the DCNPP 2020 – 2022 O&M and capital expenditure budgets – would be unreasonable and inconsistent with just and reasonable rates.” Both TURN and Women’s Energy Matters filed responses in the A.16-08-006 docket</p>	<p>Although the Commission did not approve the PFM, A4NR was pleased with the language in the Proposed Decision (and its potential impact on the PG&E GRC) and recommended its adoption. (See February 24, 2020 A4NR Comments on PD) D.20-03-006 states (at 5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •“D.18-01-022 does not prevent the Commission from reviewing the reasonableness of Diablo Canyon costs in a GRC or other proceeding.” •“PG&E cannot in good faith assert that the costs of operating Diablo Canyon are not subject to review while simultaneously asserting that Diablo Canyon must keep operating.” •“Diablo Canyon continues to be a PG&E asset that is being paid for by ratepayers, and the rates paid by ratepayers for Diablo Canyon must continue to be reasonable. D.18-01-022 did not change that.” •“The Commission does not agree with the argument in the Joint Response that it cannot order Diablo Canyon to be retired before 2024/2025.” 	<p>Noted. Discussions on Petition for Modification (PFM) are outside the scope of this proceeding. Deductions were made to all work done including filings on PFM.</p>

urging the Commission to grant A4NR's PFM of D.18-01-022.		
3. PG&E's Motion to Strike A4NR's Testimony also asserted that a PFM of D.19-04-040 was required. Out of an abundance of caution, A4NR filed a virtually identical PFM in Rulemaking (R.) 16-02-007 to request "conforming changes to D.19-04-040 that may be appropriate should the Commission choose to modify D.18-01-022 as requested by A4NR." (PFM at 2) Upon the Commission's adoption of D.20-03-006, A4NR immediately advised the ALJ in R.16-02-007 that its PFM of D.19-04-040 was moot (See March 12, 2020 A4NR Informal Non-Party Comments on ALJ Proposed Decision).	Noting correctly (at 77) that "A4NR did not actually request that the Commission reevaluate the [DCNPP] retirement dates," D.20-03-028 states (at 78): "The venues for arguments about the reasonableness of these costs are either the general rate case and/or the PCIA proceedings, and parties may continue to make cost-effectiveness arguments in those venues. And we do agree with A4NR that PG&E still has the burden to justify why its costs for operating Diablo Canyon during the next few years prior to retirement are just and reasonable."	Noted. Discussions on Petition for Modification (PFM) are outside the scope of this proceeding. Deductions were made to all work done including filings on PFM.
4. Pending resolution of the PFMs, A4NR focused its participation in the A.18-12-009 evidentiary hearings (in close coordination with TURN) on PG&E's deficient economic analysis of the DCNPP Unit 2 Main Generator Stator Replacement Project (See A4NR Opening Brief, at 4 – 9; A4NR Opening Comments on Proposed Settlement Agreement, at 3 – 6). TURN was the only other party to challenge a DCNPP capital expenditure and sought a disallowance of	The Commission-approved Settlement Agreement reduced the revenue requirements originally requested by PG&E by \$474 million in 2020, \$138 million in 2021, and \$122 million in 2022 (D.20-12-005 at 2).	Verified

<p>25% (A4NR sought 100%) of the \$90.4 million estimated cost of the Unit 2 Main Generator Stator Replacement Project. Shortly after the conclusion of evidentiary hearings, PG&E initiated settlement discussions with selected parties (including TURN), but A4NR was not invited to participate in these negotiations. As later stated by the Settling Parties, “TURN originally proposed a 25% disallowance of the costs of the stator replacement project on similar grounds to those asserted by A4NR, but supports the resolution of this issue in the Agreement as part of the total package of compromises made by Settling Parties.”</p> <p>(See February 5, 2020 Joint Reply Comments, at 18)</p> <p>Section 2.4.2 of the Proposed Settlement Agreement included a provision that, in the event the Commission granted A4NR’s PFMs, would enable any party (including a Settling Party) to propose modifications to the Agreement to reflect the reasonable capital and expenses to be recovered by PG&E in light of potential changes to the timing of the DCNPP retirement. Although not a Settling Party, A4NR’s focused and intense litigation of DCNPP costs for the 2020 – 2022 GRC cycle – including but not limited to the Unit 2 Main Generator Stator Replacement Project – was a</p>		
---	--	--

substantial contributor to the negotiating environment that produced the proposed Settlement Agreement (and, by extension, the Commission decision approving it).		
A4NR's efforts included filing a Protest; conducting discovery; submitting prepared testimony; responding to PG&E's Motion to Strike (and its Motion to Shorten Time); filing PFMs in ancillary Commission proceedings in response to the September 6, 2019 ALJs' Ruling; cross-examination of PG&E's DCNPP witness, filing a Motion for Oral Argument; filing an Opening Brief on disputed issue outside the Settlement Agreement; filing Comments to the Settlement Motion; conducting oral argument; and filing Comments on the Proposed Decision.	D.20-12-005 at 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 146, 342, 343. Transcript at 2627 – 2646; 3116 – 3123.	Verified

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

	Intervenor's Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Verified
c. If so, provide name of other parties: TURN and Women's Energy Matters		Verified
d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication: In 2018, as PG&E gained permission for a 120-day delay in filing its GRC and began discussing bankruptcy in Sacramento, A4NR collaborated extensively with TURN in analyzing PG&E's deteriorating financial profile and its ramifications for DCNPP costs and the 2020 GRC. Post-filing, A4NR coordinated with		Noted.

TURN and Women’s Energy Matters on the appropriateness of the GRC forum for review of the reasonableness of the DCNPP revenue requirements. A4NR’s specific focus was broader than TURN’s (which centered on the Unit 2 Main Generator Stator Replacement Project) and narrower than Women’s Energy Matters’ (which recommended an accelerated shutdown of the plant). A4NR consistently adhered to a burden-of-proof strategy, arguing that PG&E was required to prove that all of the 2020 – 2022 DCNPP revenue requirement is just and reasonable in light of significant changes in bundled load and plant economics.	
---	--

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: A4NR’s burden-of-proof argument applied to \$1.124 billion of O&M and capital costs forecast for the 2020 – 2022 period. The approved Settlement Agreement, to which A4NR’s Commission-acknowledged litigative efforts were an exogenous contributor, reduced PG&E’s projected revenue requirements by \$734 million over this same three-year period. Because dollars are fungible and the settlement negotiations were confidential, it is impossible to apply a cause-and-effect assessment to any specific reductions from PG&E’s original request. Even if arbitrarily compared only to the 25% of the Stator Replacement Project (<i>i.e.</i> , \$22.6 million) that TURN found satisfactorily resolved “as part of the total package of compromises made by Settling Parties,” A4NR’s contribution produced ratepayer benefits more than 78 times larger than this compensation request.	Noted
b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: A4NR applied previous Commission decisions to properly frame the evaluation of the DCNPP revenue requirement in this GRC. Prior to the 120-day GRC filing delay granted to PG&E, when it appeared that PG&E’s financial difficulties would have considerable impact on DCNPP operations during the GRC cycle, A4NR collaborated extensively with TURN to evaluate different bankruptcy and securitization ramifications on DCNPP costs. After the ALJs’ Ruling confirmed that A4NR’s testimony on DCNPP cost-effectiveness was in scope, A4NR sought clarification from the full Commission, as directed, that this economic challenge was not inconsistent with the Commission’s Integrated Resource Planning process and properly lodged within the GRC. A4NR’s participation in the GRC was consistently focused on issues that proved relevant to the Commission’s decision, collaborative with the other parties engaged on DCNPP issues,	Noted

and productive of ratepayer savings (even though A4NR was not a settling party) of many multiples of the cost of the hours A4NR invested.	
c. Allocation of hours by issue: A4NR total hours were 584.06: 1. Pre-filing issues impacting DCNPP's above-market cost profile: 52.67 hours, or 9% 2. Reasonableness of DCNPP revenue requirement: 274.57 hours, or 47% 3. DCNPP PFM in response to ALJs' Ruling: 56.43 hours, or 10% 4. DCNPP Unit 2 Main Generator Stator Replacement Project: 181.55 hours, or 31% 5. General: 18.82 hours, or 3%	Verified

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
John Geesman	2018	51.07	600	D.19-09-049	30,642.00	51.07	600	\$30,642.00
John Geesman	2019	287.45	615	D.19-09-049 and Res. ALJ-357	176,781.75	234.68[1]	615	\$144,328.20
John Geesman	2020	66.22	630	D.19-09-049 and Res. ALJ-387	41,718.60	65.72 [1]	630	\$41,403.60
Al Pak	2019	22.85	615	D.18-10-050 and Res. ALJ-357	14,052.75	21.45 [1]	615	\$13,191.75
Rochelle Becker	2018	7.39	145	D.18-10-050	1,071.55	7.39	145	\$1,071.55
Rochelle Becker	2019	30.57	150	D.19-09-049 and Res. ALJ-357	4,585.50	29.59 [1]	150	\$4,438.50
Rochelle Becker	2020	11.61	155	D.19-09-049 and Res. ALJ387	1,799.55	11.58 [1]	155	\$1,794.90
David Weisman	2018	9.25	130	D.18-10-050	1,202.50	9.25	\$130	\$1,202.50
David Weisman	2019	35.08	140	D.18-10-050 and Res. ALJ-357	4,911.20	34.33	\$140	\$4,806.20

David Weisman	2020	13.23	145	D.18-10-050 and Res. ALJ-387	1,918.35	13.20	\$145	\$1,914.00
Subtotal: \$278,683.75						Subtotal: \$244,793.20		
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Al Pak travel	2019	2.5	307.50	D.18-10-050 and Res. ALJ-357	768.75	2.5	\$307.50	\$768.75
Rochelle Becker travel	2019	12	75	D.19-09-049 and Res. ALJ-357	900.00	12	\$75	\$900.00
David Weisman travel	2019	16	70	D.18-10-050 and Res. ALJ-357	1,120.00	16	\$70	\$1,120.00
Subtotal: \$2,788.75						Subtotal: \$2,788.75		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
John Geesman	2019	.52	307.50	D.19-09-049 and Res. ALJ-357	159.90	.52	\$307.50	\$159.90
John Geesman	2021	12.3	349.52	Res. ALJ-393 (See Comment 1 below)	4,299.10	10.3 [2]	\$330 [A]	\$3,399.00
David Weisman	2021	6	98.46	Res. ALJ-393 (See Comment 2 below)	590.76	4 [2]	\$97.50 [B]	\$390.00
Subtotal: \$5,049.76						Subtotal: \$3,948.90		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.	travel/lodging	travel/lodging costs to attend evidentiary hearings and meeting with Energy Division staff. Itemization in Attachment 6 below.			1,879.50	\$1,879.50		
Subtotal: \$1,879.50						Subtotal: \$1,879.76		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 288,401.76						TOTAL AWARD: \$253,410.61		

*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.

**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate

ATTORNEY INFORMATION

Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation
John L. Geesman	6/28/77	74448	No
Alvin S. Pak	5/31/79	85502	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Time Records of John Geesman
3	Time Records of Al Pak
4	Time Records of Rochelle Becker
5	Time Records of David Weisman
6	Travel/lodging receipts
7	Spreadsheet verification of calculations
8	Current resume for John Geesman
9	Current resume for David Weisman
COMMENT 1	A4NR believes John Geesman should be compensated at the top of the range for the Attorney category in the new methodology adopted by Res. ALJ-393, consistent with multiple Commission decisions since 2012 that have placed him at the top of the authorized range under the previous methodology.

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

	Mr. Geesman has possessed high level legal experience as a utility regulator since his service as Executive Director of the California Energy Commission from 1979 to 1983. He later served as the attorney member of the California Energy Commission from 2002 to 2008. He was also Chair of the California Power Exchange, Chair of the California Managed Risk Medical Insurance Board, President of the Board of Directors of TURN, and Member of the Board of Governors of the CAISO while working as an investment banker between 1983 and 2002. He has been an active member of the California State Bar since 1977.
COMMENT 2	A4NR believes David Weisman should be compensated at the median level of the range for the Advocate – Community Development Program Director category in the new methodology adopted by Res. ALJ-393. As A4NR’s Outreach Coordinator, he has been responsible for each of the multiple tasks identified in the L4 Ventures Hourly Rate Chart for Community Development Program Director since A4NR’s first Commission intervention in 2003. He is a graduate of New York University and an award-winning documentary filmmaker.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Deduction based on Petition for Modification	<p><u>Discussion on Petition for Modification (PFM)</u></p> <p>According to timesheets submitted by A4NR, representatives spent a total of 56.43 hours on the DCNPP PFM issue. Discussion on PFM are outside the scope of this proceeding. The ALJ Ruling issued 6/9/20 addressed this issue stating: “... issues relating to the proper shutdown or closure date of DCNPP are better raised in a Petition for Modification of D.18-01-022 and thus these issues shall not be considered and addressed in this GRC.” (See 6/9/2020 ALJ Ruling at 2.). The work that A4NR performed on the PFM, particularly after the issuance of the ALJ Ruling which specified that these issues related to the DCNPP are out of scope, cannot be recovered through this proceeding.</p> <p>Deductions were made on all work and/or discussions on PFM, including filings on PFM as follows:</p> <p>Geesman 2019 52.77 hours disallowed</p> <p>Geesman 2020 0.5 hours disallowed</p> <p>Pak 2019 1.4 hours disallowed</p> <p>Becker 2019 0.98 hour disallowed</p> <p>Weisman 2020 0.03 hour disallowed</p> <p>Weisman 2019 0.75 hour disallowed</p>

<p>[2] Incomplete Claim Preparation: PART IV and Appendix</p>	<p>A4NR did not fully complete Part IV and Appendix of the claim. Claim preparation hours includes completion of all parts to be completed by intervenor. We find the IComp hours claimed excessive for the work produced and make the following deductions from Geesman and Weisman's IComp prep time:</p> <p>Geesman 2021 2 hours disallowed</p> <p>Weisman 2021 2 hours disallowed</p>
<p>[A] Adoption of New Rate for Geesman</p>	<p><u>Request for 2021 Hourly Rate Pursuant to Resolution ALJ-393</u></p> <p>Although A4NR requests a 2021 hourly rate of \$699.03 for Geesman, we ultimately adopt an hourly rate of \$660. Geesman has 19 years' experience as a practicing attorney in areas related to the Commission's work. According to the hourly rate chart implemented by ALJ Resolution-393, the rate range for Attorney, Level V (15+ years) is \$486 to \$699. We find a rate on the high end of the range appropriate for Geesman.</p>
<p>[B] Adoption of New Rate for Weisman</p>	<p><u>Request for 2021 Hourly Rate Pursuant to Resolution ALJ-393</u></p> <p>Although A4NR requests Weisman be compensated based on the Community Development Program Director category, Level V, we find the Expert, Communications Specialist, Level III, more appropriate based on his experience and education listed in the resume provided. According to the hourly rate chart implemented by Res. ALJ-393, the rate range for Expert, Communications Specialist, Level III (5-10 years), is \$165 to \$272. Weisman has over nine years' experience as A4NR's Outreach Coordinator performing the duties of a Communications Specialists, and an additional 8 years' experience as a consultant in the same role. A rate between the low and median of the range is appropriate for Weisman. We adopt a 2021 hourly rate of \$195.</p>

PART IV: OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

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

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

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility has made a substantial contribution to D.20-12-005.
2. The requested hourly rates for Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility'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 are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$253,410.61.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Alliance For Nuclear Responsibility is awarded \$253,410.61.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility 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 April 24, 2021, the 75th day after the filing of Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

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

This decision is effective today.

Dated July 14, 2022 at Diamond Bar, California.

ALICE REYNOLDS

President

CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN

GENEVIEVE SHIROMA

DARCIE L. HOUCK

Commissioners

Commissioner John Reynolds, being
necessarily absent, did not participate.

APPENDIX**Compensation Decision Summary Information**

Compensation Decision:	D2207020	Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2012005		
Proceeding(s):	A1812009		
Author(s):	ALJ Lau & ALJ Lirag		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility	2/8/2021	\$288,401.76	\$253,410.61	N/A	See CPUC Comments. New Rates For 2021 Established.

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
John	Geesman	Attorney	\$600	2018	\$600
John	Geesman	Attorney	\$615	2019	\$615
John	Geesman	Attorney	\$630	2020	\$630
John	Geesman	Attorney	\$699.03	2021	\$660
Al	Pak	Attorney	\$615	2019	\$615
Rochelle	Becker	Advocate	\$145	2018	\$145
Rochelle	Becker	Advocate	\$150	2019	\$150
Rochelle	Becker	Advocate	\$155	2020	\$155
David	Weisman	Advocate	\$130	2018	\$130
David	Weisman	Advocate	\$140	2019	\$140
David	Weisman	Advocate	\$145	2020	\$145
David	Weisman	Advocate	\$196.92	2021	\$195

(END OF APPENDIX)