

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Rulemaking regarding whether, or subject to what Conditions, the suspension of Direct Access may be lifted consistent with Assembly Bill 1X and Decision 01-09-060.

Rulemaking 07-05-025  
(Filed May 24, 2007)

**L. JAN REID  
NOTICE OF INTENT TO  
CLAIM INTERVENOR COMPENSATION**

**1. Summary**

Pursuant to Public Utilities (PU) Code §1804(a, I, L. Jan Reid, hereby notify the Commission and all parties in this proceeding that I intend to claim compensation in this proceeding. I request a finding that I am a customer as defined in the PU Code, a finding of significant financial hardship, and a ruling that I am eligible for compensation in Rulemaking (R.) 07-05-025.

In preparing this NOI, I have relied on eligibility rules and information requirements set forth in Decision (D.) 98-04-059, as modified by D.99-02-039. The format of the NOI is consistent with the Commission's "Intervenor Compensation Program Guide" dated April 2005.

**2. Timely Filing**

Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Thomas Pulsifer convened a prehearing conference in this proceeding on November 5, 2010 in San Francisco. On November 6, Reid filed a motion to become a party in this proceeding. Reid's motion was granted by ALJ Pulsifer on November 24. The due date for filing the NOI is Monday, December 6. I will send this pleading to the Docket Office using

the Commission's electronic filing system on Saturday, December 4, intending that it be timely filed.

### **3. Customer Status**

Public Utilities (PU) Code §1802(b) defines "customer" in three ways: Category 1 applies to a participant representing consumers; Category 2 applies to a representative authorized by a customer; and Category 3 applies to a representative of a group or organization that is authorized by its articles or bylaws to represent the interests of residential customers. I meet the definition of a Category 1 customer.

I receive electric and gas service from Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) at 3185 Gross Road, Santa Cruz, California, 95062. Although I represent myself in this proceeding, I will take positions that I believe will benefit all residential customers of PG&E and not just myself. It is my understanding that in order to receive an award of compensation, a Category 1 customer must describe how its "participation goes beyond the customer's self-interest and benefits other customers generally." (See Intervenor Compensation Program Guide, p. 9)

For these reasons, I am a Category 1 customer as that term is defined in PU Code §1802(b) and I am qualified to file this NOI.

### **4. Adequacy of Representation**

In D.98-04-059, the Commission determined that to be eligible for compensation an intervenor must show that it will represent customer interests that would otherwise be underrepresented.

The best test of the adequacy of representation will come after this proceeding is submitted for decision. Only then will the Commission know whether my work has duplicated the efforts of other parties.

However, the Commission should recognize at this stage of the proceeding that I am the only intervenor that will act specifically on behalf of all PG&E residential customers. The Commission's Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) is a party, but in this proceeding, DRA does not represent the specific interests of residential customers. DRA acts on behalf of all customers and must balance its positions when large and small customers might not agree. The Utility Reform Network (TURN) is also a party in this proceeding. I anticipate that my positions on disputed issues will complement, but not duplicate, the positions of TURN and the DRA.

As ALJ Angela Minkin noted in Application 98-09-003 *et al*:

Participation in Commission proceedings by parties representing the full range of affected interests is important. Such participation assists the Commission in ensuring that the record is fully developed and that each customer group receives adequate representation. (Ruling issued July 7, 1999, p. 3.)

I am qualified to participate in this matter. I left the Commission in 2005 after almost seven years of experience in risk management, and analysis of energy supply and other utility issues on behalf of the Commission's Office of Ratepayer Advocates. Since 2005, I have represented Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet) in Commission proceedings involving long-term procurement plans, procurement of renewable resources, gas hedging plans, electric and natural gas procurement, cost-of-capital, resource adequacy, and demand response. I have served on PG&E's core gas hedging advisory group and on the procurement review groups of PG&E, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company. My knowledge and experience should support and complement, but not duplicate, the work of DRA and TURN.

## 5. Significant Financial Hardship

PU Code §1804(a)(2)(B) allows a customer to include in the NOI a showing that participation in the proceeding will pose a significant financial hardship. Alternatively, the customer may include the required showing in its request for compensation. I elect to make this showing now.

PU Code §1802(g) defines significant financial hardship:

"Significant financial hardship" means either that 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, or that, 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.

PU Code §1804(b)(1) states:

A finding of significant financial hardship shall create a rebuttable presumption of eligibility for compensation in other commission proceedings commencing within one year of the date of that finding.

On April 15, 2008, ALJ Kenney issued a written ruling (Ruling) in Application (A.) 07-12-021, the application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company regarding the Ruby pipeline, in which he ruled that Reid was a customer, met the significant financial hardship requirement, and met the eligibility requirements for intervenor compensation. (See Ruling, p. 5)

The instant rulemaking commenced within one year of the date of ALJ Kenney's ruling, in accordance with PU Code §1804(b)(1).

On May 6, 2010, the Commission found that:

L. Jan Reid has met the customer status and financial hardship requirements rendering him eligible to claim intervenor compensation in this [A.08-07-014] proceeding. (D.10-05-017, Finding of Fact 2, slip op. at 15.)

L. Jan Reid has fulfilled the requirements of §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and is entitled to intervenor compensation for his claimed expenses, as adjusted herein, incurred in making substantial contributions to D.08-09-013 and D.09-09-021. (D.10-05-017, Conclusion of Law 1, slip op. at 16.)

Based on my estimate of the cost of effective participation as compared to my income, expenses, and assets, I do not have the resources to pay for the costs of effective participation. I believe that I qualify for a ruling of eligibility for compensation on the merits of this pleading and through the rebuttable presumption created in A.07-12-021.

## **6. Nature and Extent of Planned Participation**

PU Code §1804(a)(2)(A)(i) requires that an NOI include a statement of the nature and extent of the customer's planned participation. I intend to participate in this proceeding by conducting discovery, participating in workshops, serving testimony, and filing other necessary pleadings. I expect to focus my work on the following issues: switching rules, energy service provider (ESP) financial security requirements, transitional bundled service rates, uniform resource requirements, direct access process improvements, and non-bypassable charges. I may address other issues as the proceeding unfolds.

I recognize the Legislative intent expressed in PU Code §1801.3(f) that the Commission should administer its intervenor compensation program in a manner that avoids unproductive, unnecessary or duplicative participation. I will confer with the Division of Ratepayer Advocates and The Utility Reform Network regarding the issues identified in this proceeding, in order to minimize duplication of effort regarding issues of concern to residential customers.

## 7. Itemized Estimate of Costs of Participation

PU Code §1804(a)(2)(A)(ii) requires that the NOI shall include an itemized estimate of the compensation that I expect to request, given the likely duration of the proceeding and an authorized rate of \$185/hour. I expect to request compensation in the amount of \$60,375, as shown in the table below. Pursuant to Rule 17.1(c), my expected budget for participating on each issue is: general costs (10% of the total), : switching rules (10%), energy service provider (ESP) financial security requirements (5%), transitional bundled service rates (25%), uniform resource requirements (5%), direct access process improvements (5%), and non-bypassable charges (50%).

|                |  |
|----------------|--|
| \$ 58,830      | 318 hours of professional time by L. Jan Reid, at \$185 per hour |
| <u>+ 1,295</u> | 14 hours of compensation time, at \$92.50 per hour               |
| \$ 60,125      | Subtotal, compensable time                                       |
| 100            | Copies   |
| 100            | Postage, overnight delivery                                      |
| <u>+ 50</u>    | FAX charges  |
| \$ 250         | Subtotal, compensable other costs                                |
| \$ 60,375      | Total Estimated Cost Of Participation                            |

I will provide time records, expense records, and justification for hourly rates in a request for an award of compensation, if I eventually file one.

## 8. Conclusion

I respectfully request that ALJ Pulsifer issue a preliminary ruling in which he: (1) finds that L. Jan Reid is a customer as defined in PU Code §1802(b); (2) finds that L. Jan Reid has made an adequate showing of significant financial hardship; (3) in consultation with Assigned Commissioner Michael Peevey, concludes that L. Jan Reid has met the requirements of PU Code §1804(a) for eligibility for compensation; and (4) rules that L. Jan Reid is eligible for compensation in this proceeding. I recognize that a finding of significant financial hardship in no way ensures eventual compensation, as explained in PU Code §1804(b)(2).

\* \* \*

Dated December 4, 2010, at Santa Cruz, California.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_

L. Jan Reid  
3185 Gross Road  
Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
Tel/FAX (831) 476-5700  
janreid@coastecon.com

## VERIFICATION

I, L. Jan Reid, make this verification on my behalf. The statements in the foregoing document are true to the best of my knowledge, except for those matters that are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated December 4, 2010, at Santa Cruz, California.

/s/

---

L. Jan Reid  
3185 Gross Road  
Santa Cruz, CA 95062  
Tel/FAX (831) 476-5700  
[janreid@coastecon.com](mailto:janreid@coastecon.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that I have this day by electronic mail served a true copy of the original attached "L. Jan Reid Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation" on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record. I will serve a paper copy of the pleading on Commissioner Michael Peevey, and on Administrative Law Judge Thomas Pulsifer.

Dated December 4, 2010, at Santa Cruz, California.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
L. Jan Reid