



Decision _____

FILED02/09/21
12:39 PM

**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 Filed December 13, 2018
--	--

**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE
TECHNOLOGY AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM
OF CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY**

NOTE: After electronically filing a PDF copy of this Intervenor Compensation Claim (Request), please email the document in an MS WORD and supporting EXCEL spreadsheet to the Intervenor Compensation Program Coordinator at Icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Intervenor: Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision D.20-12-005
Claimed: \$12,604.50	Awarded: \$
Assigned Commissioner: Laine Randolph [Note that Commissioner Randolph is no longer at the Commission, but the proceeding has not yet be reassigned]	Assigned ALJ: Elaine Lau, Rafael L. Lirag
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).	
Signature:	/s/ Melissa W. Kasnitz
Date: 2/9/2021	Printed Name: Melissa W. Kasnitz

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Brief description of Decision:	This Decision addresses the Test Year (TY) 2020 General Rate Case (GRC) application of Pacific Gas and Electric
--	---

	Company (PG&E) and adopts a multi-party settlement agreement that includes CforAT. The settlement and decision adopt a Memorandum of Understanding between CforAT and PG&E addressing accessibility commitments during the GRC cycle.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	2/11/2019	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	3/11/2019	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
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:	CforAT's most recent ruling regarding eligible customer status was issued in R.20-01-007	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	5/29/20	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	CforAT's most recent ruling regarding significant financial hardship was issued in R.20-01-007	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	5/29/20	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.20-12-005	
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	12/11/2020	
15. File date of compensation request:	2/9/2021	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

C. Additional Comments on Part I: (use line reference # as appropriate)

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059): (For each contribution, support with specific reference to the record.)

Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
1. Memorandum of Understanding on Access Issues: Before PG&E filed its GRC Application, CforAT negotiated with PG&E to reach an agreement that builds on previous Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) adopted in prior GRC cycles. The prior MOUs, negotiated between PG&E and CforAT and/or our predecessor, Disability Rights Advocates, were approved in the final decisions in each GRC. The parties have continued to work	In this GRC, as has been done in past GRC cycles, CforAT negotiated a Memorandum of Understanding with PG&E regarding various commitments to continuously improve and effectively serve utility customers with disabilities. The MOU was incorporated into the Application and included in the comprehensive settlement agreement. It was not subject to any modification, and it was subsequently adopted in the Final Decision. <i>See</i> D.20-12-005 at pp. 177-178, p. 181. The MOU reflects CforAT's continuing efforts to work collaboratively with PG&E to support effective service for customers with disabilities. It covers four specific issue	

on institutionalizing accessibility improvements and ongoing commitments to serving customers with disabilities. No party opposed the accessibility proposals (including funding for ongoing accessibility commitments) at any time.	areas: (1) PG&E’s continued staffing of a Disability Access Coordinator position or positions to oversee accessibility activities company-wide; (2) website accessibility (continued implementation of WCAG 2.0 standards, training, testing); (3) communication access issues (including discussions regarding an emphasis on information about wildfire safety and de-energization, information on a customer disability database, tracking preferred communications, large print and alternative communication methods); and (4) access to PG&E’s local offices and neighborhood payment centers, as well as access around construction sites and pole locations. The agreement also sets forth funding obligations and procedural requirements, including an annual reporting process	
--	---	--

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?²	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: While other parties advocated for the interests of consumers generally, and while no party opposed the positions advocated by CforAT, no other party had a focus on accessibility concerns for customers with disabilities.		
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: As stated above, there were multiple parties representing the interests of consumers in this proceeding, but there were no other parties addressing		

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

<p>disability access issues or examining how PG&E ensures that its services and communications are accessible. This was the focus of CforAT's participation. Because no other party addressed this issue, there was no duplication of effort. In addition to our direct work on accessibility, CforAT engaged in the proceeding in a limited manner to monitor its process and ensure that the interests of our constituency were protected, as well as to provide limited input on select issues of interest to our constituency. In response to direct requests from PG&E, CforAT also participated in various aspects of the overall settlement process and defense of the settlement upon release of a Proposed Decision, even when the issues under review did not relate to the accessibility agreement. These activities were not unreasonably duplicative of work by any other party.</p>	
---	--

C. Additional Comments on Part II: (use line reference # or letter as appropriate)

#	Intervenor's Comment	CPUC Discussion

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor's claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>The only substantive issues addressed by CforAT were those focused on the unique needs of people with disabilities, including ongoing efforts to institutionalize PG&E's commitment to effectively serving customers with disabilities via improved physical access to its services and facilities and communication access for disabled customers who cannot access information presented in standard formats. These issues were within the scope of the proceeding and built on agreements reached in prior GRC cycles. The joint proposal developed by PG&E and CforAT was not contested by any party and was adopted in the comprehensive settlement agreement and in the final decision without modification. In addition to the work to develop the joint proposal, CforAT monitored the overall proceeding to ensure that the interests of our constituency were protected, and worked to oversee continuing implementation of the prior accessibility agreement that was in effect while this proceeding was pending. We also provided limited input on select issues of interest to our constituency,</p>	

<p>Given the results obtained for CforAT's constituency and the fact that these results were part of an extended GRC proceeding, CforAT's costs were modest and reasonable. Overall, CforAT obtained valuable commitments on behalf of PG&E's customers with disabilities, based on a modest commitment of time and resources on merits work.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>The total amount of time claimed by CforAT is very modest, and is reasonable given the scope and length of this proceeding. CforAT's time records reflect CforAT's focused attention on those limited issues where we are uniquely placed to address the needs of our constituency. In keeping with the narrow focus on accessibility and the interests of PG&E customers with disabilities, the total amount of time spent on this effort was constrained, notwithstanding the extensive overall scope and length of the proceeding.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2018 Time - Kasnitz (Total Hours: 6.0)</p> <p>Settlement: 3.7 hours (62%) The issue area "Settlement" includes time spent negotiating the MOU between CforAT and PG&E as well as time spent supporting the final multi-party settlement in the proceeding.</p> <p>Annual: 0.9 hours (15%) The issue area "Annual" includes time spent in annual meetings and reviewing annual reports regarding PG&E's compliance with its accessibility obligations.</p> <p>General Participation: 1.4 hours (23%) The issue area "General Participation" includes time spent monitoring the proceeding as a whole and participating as needed in support of the interests of our constituency. While this is a relatively large percentage of our very modest time commitment, it represents only limited work as needed given the complexity of the proceeding overall.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2019 Time - Kasnitz (Total Hours: 9.0)</p> <p>Settlement: 3.3 hours (37%)</p> <p>Annual: 1.8 hours (20%)</p> <p>General Participation: 3.9 hours (43%)</p>	

<p align="center">2020 Time – Kasnitz (Total Hours: 4.3)</p> <p>Settlement: 1.0 hours (23%)</p> <p>Annual: 1.7 hours (40%)</p> <p>General Participation: 1.6 hours (37%)</p> <p align="center">2018 Time – Woodford (Total Hours: 2.4)</p> <p>Annual: 0.2 hours (8%)</p> <p>General Participation: 2.2 hours (92%)</p> <p align="center">2019 Time – Woodford (Total Hours: 3.7)</p> <p>Annual: 1.5 hours (41%)</p> <p>General Participation: 2.2 hours (59%)</p>	
---	--

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2018	6.0	\$475	D.18-11-049	\$2,850.00			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2019	9.0	\$485	D.19-12-053	\$4,365.00			
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2020	4.3	\$500	D.20-11-012	\$2,150.00			
Kate Woodford	2018	2.4	\$150	D.18-11-049	\$360.00			
Kate Woodford	2019	3.7	\$155	D.19-12-053	\$573.50			
Subtotal: \$10,298.50						Subtotal: \$		
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 \$						
[Person 1]														
[Person 2]														
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$								
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **														
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$						
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2018	0.8	\$232.50	½ standard rate	\$186.00									
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2021, but see below	8.0	\$250	½ approved rate for 2020; see note below	\$2,000.00									
Kate Woodford	2021, but see below	1.5	80.00	½ approved rate for 2020; see note below	\$120.00									
Subtotal: \$2,306.00						Subtotal: \$								
COSTS														
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount								
1.														
2.														
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$								
TOTAL REQUEST: \$12,604.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$								
<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
Melissa W. Kasnitz	1992	162679	No

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:
(Intervenor completes; attachments not attached to final Decision)

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Time on Compensation: Because all merits work in this proceeding was complete in calendar year 2020, and the only work conducted in 2021 has been the work on this request for compensation, CforAT is seeking compensation for time spent on this request at ½ hour standard hourly rates for 2020. CforAT reserves our right to request updated rates for 2021 in accordance with the market study and formulas adopted by the Commission in Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020, when we submit a request for compensation that includes merits time recorded in 2021.

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments (CPUC completes)

Item	Reason

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?	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion

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

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	
---	--

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

(Green items to be completed by Intervenor)

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to **D.20-12-005**.
2. The requested hourly rates for **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY**'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 \$_____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, [satisfies/fails to satisfy] all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** shall be awarded \$_____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** the total award. [for multiple utilities: "Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY** their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional [industry type, for example, electric] revenues for the ^ calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data is unavailable, the most recent [industry type, for example, electric] revenue data shall be used."] 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 [date], the 75th day after the filing of **CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY**'s request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision [is/is not] waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D.20-12-005		
Proceeding(s):	A. 18-12-009		
Author:			
Payer(s):			

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	2/9/2021	\$12,604.50		N/A	

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$475.00	2018	
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$485.00	2019	
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$500.00	2020	
Kathryn	Woodford	Advocate	\$150.00	2018	
Kathryn	Woodford	Advocate	\$155.00	2019	

(END OF APPENDIX)