

Decision _____

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, 2011 (U39 M)	Application 09-12-020 (Filed December 21, 2009)
Order Instituting Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Pacific Gas and Electric Company.	Investigation 10-07-027 (Filed July 29, 2010)

CLAIM AND DECISION ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION

Claimant: Disability Rights Advocates (DisabRA)	For contribution to D.11-05-018
Claimed (\$): 110,701.42	Awarded (\$):
Assigned Commissioner: Michael R. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: David K. Fukudome
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/	
Date: 7/12/11	Printed Name: Rebecca S. Williford

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

A. Brief Description of Decision: D.11-05-018 adopted, with some modifications and clarifications, the unopposed settlement agreement reached between most of the active parties to this proceeding, which resolved all but one issue in Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E)'s test year 2011 general rate case. The settlement agreement also recommended Commission approval of the separately negotiated Memorandum of Understanding between PG&E and Disability Rights Advocates addressing various disability access issues

regarding PG&E facilities, services and communications, and D.11-05-018 approved this recommendation. Finally, with respect to the one issue not covered by the settlement agreement, D.11-05-018 determined that the undepreciated plant balance of electric meters that are replaced with SmartMeters will be amortized over a six-year period with the associated rate of return on the unamortized balance reduced to 6.3%.

B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Public Utilities Code §§ 1801-1812:

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	February 19, 2010	
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI Filed:	March 22, 2010	
4. Was the notice of intent timely filed?		
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-02-005	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 18, 2010	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-02-005	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	May 18, 2010	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		

13. Identify Final Decision	D.11-05-018	
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	May 13, 2011	
15. File date of compensation request:	July 12, 2011	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
5, 9	X		The ALJ has not yet issued a ruling on the Notice of Intent filed by any party to this proceeding. Rather than restate its justifications for customer-related status and significant financial hardship, DisabRA cites above to a recent ALJ ruling in another proceeding in which DisabRA made the same showing in its NOI as it has made in this proceeding.
5	X		DisabRA's customer status has never been questioned. However, due to recent discussions of customer status in the context of other parties' compensation requests, DisabRA has recently amended its bylaws to explicitly conform to the statute that serves as the basis for customer eligibility. See Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b)(1)(C). Article I states, in part, that Disability Rights Advocates' mission includes "representation of the interests of disabled residential customers, and small commercial customers who receive bundled electric service from an electrical corporation and other disabled customers of utilities." These amended bylaws were submitted as Attachment 2 to D.10-04-024, Decision Awarding Intervenor Compensation to Disability Rights Advocates in Application 08-12-021.

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

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner Claimant's contribution to the final decision (see § 1802(i), § 1803(a) & D.98-04-059) (For each contribution, support with specific reference to final or record.)

Contribution	Citation to Decision or Record	Showing Accepted by CPUC
1. In connection with PG&E's 2007 general rate case (A.05-12-002), DisabRA raised a number of issues regarding the impact of PG&E's practices on people with disabilities. On June 26, 2006, the Parties entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to address these issues (June 26, 2006 MOU). The June 26, 2006 Memorandum of Understanding was	D.11-05-018, pp. 12, 21 and 33, Findings of Fact 7 and 18	

approved by the Commission in Decision 07-03-044. On December 23, 2009, the Parties entered into an Addendum to the June 26, 2006 Memorandum of Understanding, extending its termination date and modifying certain terms. The June 26, 2006 Memorandum of Understanding and its Addendum are collectively referred to herein as the "Prior MOU."

In connection with this general rate case, A.09-12-020, DisabRA again raised several issues in its Prehearing Conference Statement related to the impact of PG&E's practices on people with disabilities. Some of these issues concern PG&E's ongoing commitment to items raised in the Prior MOU, including: (1) the accessibility of PG&E local offices; (2) the accessibility of third party pay stations under contract with PG&E; (3) PG&E's implementation and use of accessibility guidelines for temporary construction projects in the pedestrian right of way; and (4) the need for PG&E to take steps to ameliorate the extent to which utility poles impede access to people with disabilities along pedestrian rights of way. DisabRA Prehearing Conference Statement at pages 1-6. DisabRA also raised additional concerns related to communications access for PG&E's disabled customers in connection with PG&E's use of TTY (text telephone) and relay service, customer bills, website and written customer notifications (both for customers in general and specifically for customers enrolled in the medical baseline/life support program). DisabRA Prehearing Conference Statement at pages 6-11.

Following numerous discussions

between DisabRA and representatives of PG&E between February and May of 2010, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was reached between DisabRA and PG&E which laid out PG&E's commitments to make specific improvements in all of the areas described above, as well as establishing reporting and dispute resolution procedures. Some of the commitments addressed in the MOU include:

- * With respect to local offices, addressing accessibility issues identified in follow-up surveys conducted while the Prior MOU was in effect by removing remaining barriers, installing automatic door openers and working to identify and install doormats that do not impede wheelchair access;
- * Continuing to engage a third-party accessibility expert to conduct follow-up inspections of local offices that have not yet been surveyed, and committing to remove promptly any barriers identified in those surveys;
- * Preparing and distributing training materials to local office staff to educate them on specific disability access issues set forth in the MOU;
- * Ensuring that all newly purchased self-service kiosks for local offices will be enabled to provide audio instructions so customers with visual disabilities can operate the kiosks independently;
- * With respect to third-party pay stations, continuing to engage a third party accessibility expert

<p>to survey the transaction-related elements of accessibility at 2.5% of pay stations per year and continuing to add to its network only those pay stations whose transaction-related elements are fully compliant with legal requirements for disabled access (unless, after consulting with DisabRA, PG&E determines that an exception should be granted);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Continuing to maintain and make reasonably available to the public – including by listing on its website – a list of pay stations that PG&E believes fully comply with legal requirements for disabled access;* With respect to PG&E construction in pedestrian rights of way, continuing to include the New Access Guidelines in its Work Area Protection Guide, a copy of which is generally maintained in all PG&E crew trucks dispatched to job sites;* Refining the training for PG&E field staff regarding the content of the New Access Guidelines pursuant to detailed procedures set forth in the MOU;* Continuing to engage a disability access consultant to monitor PG&E’s compliance with protocols it has established regarding temporary routes around construction projects that impede pedestrian rights of way pursuant to monitoring procedures set forth in the MOU;* Instituting a pilot program for		
---	--	--

<p>use of audible alert technology at PG&E construction sites;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* With respect to ameliorating accessibility barriers posed by utility poles in public rights of way, placing all new utility poles located in pedestrian rights of way in locations designed to ensure an adequate path of travel for disabled pedestrians, provided there is sufficient area within the existing public right of way to permit placement of the pole facilities, including the overhead wires, cross-arms and equipment;* Agreeing to jointly develop and submit a request for a modification to PG&E's Tariff Rule 20A to add wheelchair access as one of the factors to be considered in defining the boundaries of projects pursuing undergrounding of existing overhead electric facilities;* With respect to improving communications access for PG&E customers with disabilities, adding certain features to its outgoing TTY message, modifying its training of customer service representatives with responsibility for TTY calls, and updating information about appropriate responses to TTY and relay calls in a key database used by customer service representatives;* Agreeing to appoint a disability lead access person in PG&E's Web Content group, taking steps to insure that all its		
--	--	--

<p>website content will remain compliant with Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) Priority 1 access standards, and that any portions of the website that are redesigned in 2010 or 2011 will be upgraded to WCAG Priority 2 standards at the time of the redesign, and committing by December 2011 to engage an independent consultant to audit and report on the accessibility of the most trafficked sections of the www.pge.com website (making up 99% of the page views), and to complete changes recommended by the consultant no later than December 31, 2012;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">* Agreeing to use reasonable efforts throughout the GRC period to insure that certain key information described in the MOU will appear in large print in written notices sent to customers and to provide annual training in disability access issues to certain staff who design or develop content for customer notices;* Conducting outreach in the form of a targeted mailing to current medical baseline/life support customers to identify those customers who would prefer to receive their emergency notifications by an alternative means of communication (i.e., other than by mail) and revising its enrollment process for the emergency notification program to allow new medical baseline/life support customers		
---	--	--

<p>to specify their preferred means of contact for emergency notifications;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Developing and implementing appropriate business processes and system capabilities to provide medical baseline/life support customers with emergency notifications via their preferred alternative mode of communication within two years of the MOU's effective date; and * Agreeing to work toward providing as many written customer notices as practical in formats other than standard print, including but not limited to e-mail and text message, and agreeing to use reasonable efforts to establish a system for obtaining and storing customers' preferred means of communication and to use this information to direct as many types of customer notices as practical using the customers' preferred format. <p>On May 26, 2010, DisabRA and PG&E jointly submitted this MOU as part of Exhibit PG&E-16. The Settlement Agreement that was later reached by seventeen of the twenty active parties to this proceeding included as one of its provisions that the MOU between PG&E and DisabRA be approved, and the Commission approved it by adopting the settlement, with certain modifications not relevant here, in D.11-05-018. The Commission's analysis in D.11-05-018 included the adoption of the MOU between DisabRA and PG&E as a term of the settlement that was both reasonable and</p>		
---	--	--

in the public interest.		
2. In addition to its direct negotiations with PG&E, DisabRA participated in broader negotiations among the settling parties and advocated in those discussions to ensure that the final settlement in which it partially joined was fair to the constituency of residential and small commercial customers with disabilities that DisabRA represents.	D.11-05-018, pp. 6-7	

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: In addition to PG&E and DRA, the Settling Parties included Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet), California City-County Street Light Association (CAL-SLA), California Farm Bureau Federation (CFBF), Coalition of California Utility Employees (CCUE); Consumer Federation of California (CFC), Direct Access Customer Coalition (DACC), Energy Producers and Users Coalition (EPUC), Engineers and Scientists of California, Local 20 (ESC), Merced Irrigation District (Merced ID), Modesto Irrigation District (Modesto ID), South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID), The Utility Reform Network (TURN), Western Power Trading Forum (WPTF), and Women’s Energy Matters (WEM). In addition, the Greenlining Institute, City and County of San Francisco, and Southern California Edison Company (SCE) were active intervenors, but did not join the settlement.		
d. Describe how you coordinated with DRA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party: Although DisabRA coordinated to some extent in settlement discussions with other parties, such as TURN and Aglet, who represent large cross sections of residential customers, most of our efforts in this proceeding were focused on direct two-party negotiations with PG&E regarding access for customers with disabilities to PG&E facilities, services and communications. Thus there was very little overlap between DisabRA’s efforts in this proceeding and those of other parties, as DisabRA was the only party to the proceeding focusing primarily or exclusively on these access issues.		

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
			N/A

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

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

Concise explanation as to how the cost of claimant's participation bears a reasonable relationship with benefits realized through participation (include references to record, where appropriate)	CPUC Verified
<p>The MOU that DisabRA secured after extensive negotiations with PG&E will yield multiple concrete benefits for PG&E customers with disabilities, including improved access to PG&E offices and third-party pay stations, greater awareness among PG&E construction crews of protocols that will minimize barriers to disabled access posed by construction occurring in public rights of way, new efforts to ameliorate barriers caused by utility poles in public rights of way, and steps to enhance PG&E's communications with its disabled customers, including its acceptance of TTY and relay calls, the content of its website, and its printed notices sent to Medical BaseLine and other customers. In short, DisabRA's efforts through this comprehensive MOU will improve disabled customers' experience in nearly every facet of their interactions with PG&E. These contributions are both substantial and unique in that no other party was focused on these access issues, which are of paramount importance to many people with disabilities. In light of these substantial benefits which would not have been realized without DisabRA's involvement, DisabRA considers its compensation request of \$110,701.42 to be reasonable.</p> <p>DisabRA's request is also reasonable because we were efficient in staffing this proceeding and pursuing our results. At all times, this proceeding was staffed by a senior attorney, Melissa Kasnitz, who supervised all of DisabRA's work before the Commission, in conjunction with one or sometimes two other attorneys. During the course of the proceeding, several other attorneys worked with Ms. Kasnitz, but DisabRA does not seek compensation for time for new attorneys to come up to speed on the docket, and each such attorney worked on discrete portions of the negotiations or case management work. In addition, DisabRA attempted to transfer work on the proceeding to more junior attorneys with lower compensation rates whenever feasible, as when Karla Gilbride took over implementation work on the prior MOU from Ron Elsberry during 2009.</p> <p>Finally, as previously agreed by DisabRA and PG&E and stated in DisabRA's NOI filed on March 22, 2010, DisabRA seeks compensation in this rate case for time reasonably spent monitoring the implementation of</p>	

the terms of the prior MOU. This implementation work is recorded beginning in 2007 and is reasonable because it made possible and directly led to the advancements reflected in the current MOU.

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUCA WARD				
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES										
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2007	2.0	\$390	D.08-01-033	\$780					
Roger Heller	2007	8.3	\$280	D.09-03-018	\$2,324					
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2008	9.9	\$420	D.09-03-018	\$4,158					
Ron Elsberry	2008	17.8	\$400	D.09-03-018	\$7,120					
Roger Heller	2008	8.7	\$300	D.09-03-018	\$2,610					
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2009	11.5	\$420	D.09-07-017	\$4,830					
Ron Elsberry	2009	13.0	\$420	D.09-10-025	\$5,460					
Karla Gilbride	2009	15.6	\$160	D.10-04-024	\$2,496					
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2010	121.0	\$420	D.10-07-013	\$50,820					
Ron Elsberry	2010	0.6	\$420	See comment 2 below.	\$252					
Karla Gilbride	2010	69.7	\$200	D.10-07-013	\$13,940					
Kara Werner	2010	5.0	\$150	See comment 3 below.	\$750					
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2011	12.3	\$420	See comment 4 below.	\$5,166					
Karla Gilbride	2011	13.1	\$210	See comment 5 below.	\$2,751					
Kara Werner	2011	1.2	\$160	See comment 6 below.	\$192					
					Subtotal:	\$103,649				Subtotal:
EXPERT FEES										
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$	
N/A										
					Subtotal:	\$0				Subtotal:

OTHER FEES									
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are claiming (paralegal, travel, etc.):									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Paralegal	2008	1.0	\$110	D.09-03-018	\$110				
Kaitlin Anderson (paralegal)	2009	1.5	\$110	D.09-07-017	\$165				
Lauren Roberts (paralegal)	2009	0.3	\$110	D.09-07-017	\$33				
Beau Saccoccia (paralegal)	2010	28.3	\$110	D.10-07-013	\$3,113				
Kaitlin Anderson (paralegal)	2010	6.9	\$110	D.10-07-013	\$759				
Raziya Brumfield (paralegal)	2010	2.1	\$110	D.10-07-013	\$231				
Subtotal:					\$4,411	Subtotal:			
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2009	0.2	\$210	½ of rate set in D.09-07-017	\$42				
Ron Elsberry	2009	1.1	\$210	½ of rate set in D.09-10-025	\$231				
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2010	3.5	\$210	½ of rate set in D.10-07-013	\$735				
Beau Saccoccia (paralegal)	2010	1.0	\$55	½ of rate set in D10-07-013	\$55				
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2011	4.8	\$210	See comment 7 below.	\$1,008				
Karla Gilbride	2011	0.2	\$105	See comment 8 below.	\$21				
Subtotal:					\$2,092	Subtotal:			
COSTS									
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount			
	Photocopies & Printing	See comment 9 below.			\$492.25				
	Postage	See comment 9 below.			\$5.22				
	Telephone &	See comment 9 below.			\$1.35				

	Fax			
	Travel	See comment 9 below.	\$50.60	
Subtotal:			\$549.42	Subtotal:
TOTAL REQUEST \$:			110,701.42	TOTAL AWARD \$:

When entering items, type over bracketed text; add additional rows as necessary.

*If hourly rate based on CPUC decision, provide decision number; otherwise, attach rationale.

**Reasonable claim preparation time typically compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate.

C. Attachments or Comments Documenting Specific Claim (Claimant completes; attachments not attached to final Decision):

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	DisabRA does not seek a 2010 rate for Ron Elsberry but rather seeks compensation for his time spent in 2010 at his 2009 rate of \$420, which was approved in D.09-10-025.
3	DisabRA requests a 2010 rate for attorney Kara Werner of \$150 per hour. This rate has not yet been evaluated by the Commission. Ms. Werner is a 2010 graduate of New York University School of Law and was admitted to the California State Bar in December 2010. As a new attorney, Ms. Werner has not previously had a rate set by the Commission. Since she began work at Disability Rights Advocates in September 2010, however, she worked and billed time on several Commission proceedings, including A.10-11-015, A.10-12-005, A.10-12-006, A.09-12-020, and I.10-07-027. The requested rate of \$150 is appropriate for an attorney in the 0-2 year range.
4	As stated in DisabRA's request for intervenor compensation filed on July 11, 2011 in Investigation 07-01-022, Application 06-09-006, Application 06-10-026, Application 06-11-009, Application 06-11-010, and Application 07-03-019, DisabRA is not seeking a rate increase for Melissa Kasnitz in 2011. Her requested 2011 rate remains at \$420.
5	DisabRA seeks a 2011 rate for Ms. Gilbride of \$210 per hour. This rate has not yet been evaluated by the Commission. Ms. Gilbride is a 2007 graduate of Georgetown University Law Center. Her 2010 PUC rate of \$200 was approved in D.10-07-013 and D.11-01-022. This rate is the minimum of the range for attorneys with 3-4 years of experience. For 2011, we apply her first 5% step increase for the applicable level of experience as authorized in D.07-01-009 and Resolution ALJ-267. Thus, \$200 x 5% = \$10; adding this amount to Ms. Gilbride's 2010 rate results in a rate of \$210, which is within the range for attorneys with her experience (\$200-\$235).
6	DisabRA requests a 2011 rate for attorney Kara Werner of \$160 per hour. This rate has not yet been evaluated by the Commission. Ms. Werner is a 2010 graduate of New York University School of Law and was admitted to the California State Bar in December 2010. In DisabRA's Request for Intervenor Compensation in Application 09-12-020 and Investigation 10-07-027, filed on July 12, 2011 (in this same request, see comment 3 above), we requested a 2010 rate for Ms. Werner of \$150. This rate is the minimum of the range for attorneys with 0-2 years of experience. For 2011, we apply her first 5% step increase for the applicable level of experience as authorized in

	D.07-01-009 and Resolution ALJ-267. Thus, $\$150 \times 5\% = \7.50 ; with rounding, the increase is \$10. Adding this amount to Ms. Werner's 2010 rate results in a rate of \$160, which is within the range for attorneys with her experience (\$150-\$205).
7	Because DisabRA is not requesting a 2011 rate increase for Ms. Kasnitz as discussed in comment 4 above, her time in preparing this compensation request is being charged at $\frac{1}{2}$ of her 2010 rate of \$420, which was approved in D.10-07-013 and D.11-01-022.
8	DisabRA seeks a rate of \$105 for Ms. Gilbride's time preparing this compensation request in 2011, which constitutes $\frac{1}{2}$ of the 2011 rate of \$210 requested for her merits time as described in comment 5 above.
9	<p>In this compensation request, DisabRA seeks recovery of \$549.42 in costs. The largest component of these costs is for in-house printing of documents that were filed and served electronically or circulated between multiple parties. Because many drafts of the MOU and other related documents were prepared and circulated between DisabRA and PG&E, a great deal of printing was required, despite the fact that DisabRA routinely makes efforts to avoid printing documents that are not relevant to issues of concern to our constituency. In addition, because several meetings between DisabRA and PG&E representatives during the negotiation of the MOU took place at PG&E headquarters in San Francisco at PG&E's request, travel expenses were somewhat higher than for other proceedings where less face-to-face negotiation is involved.</p> <p>DisabRA believes that the other modest itemized costs, telephone/fax and postage, are self-explanatory. However, DisabRA is happy to prepare a more detailed description and/or provide receipts if such documentation would assist the Commission in evaluating and processing this request for compensation.</p>
10	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Disability Rights Advocates' Allocation of Time by Activity</u></p> <p>In calculating our request for compensation, DisabRA has allocated its merits time spent into the following activity, or issue, categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * <u>Case Management</u>: Time spent in mandatory activities regarding participation in the proceeding, such as reviewing party comments, preparing for and attending the prehearing conference, and participating in broad settlement negotiations. Overall, 20.01% of the merits time recorded was spent on case management. * <u>General Access</u>: Time spent investigating and negotiating directly with PG&E over requested improvements to PG&E facilities and services impacting people with disabilities. This includes time spent reviewing the initial application to identify access issues as well as time spent on settlement efforts that were exclusively focused on disability access issues. Overall, 33.76% of the merits time recorded was spent addressing general access. * <u>Communication</u>: Time spent addressing the communications needs of people with disabilities, particularly regarding alternative formats for printed materials for blind/low vision consumers, accessibility improvements to PG&E's website, and procedures for handling TTY and relay calls from deaf/hard-of-

	<p>hearing customers. Overall, 6.78% of the merits time recorded was spent on communication issues.</p> <p>* <u>Follow-up</u>: Time spent on issues that were addressed in PG&E's prior general rate case and that required further research or analysis during the negotiations in this proceeding. Overall, 8.35% of the merits time recorded was spent on follow-up issues.</p> <p>* <u>Implementation</u>: Time spent prior to opening PG&E's new general rate case, as well as various status calls during the pendency of this proceeding, that involved monitoring and implementation of the term of the prior MOU negotiated during PG&E's 2007 general rate case and approved in D.07-03-044. Overall, 31.10% of the merits time recorded was spent on implementation issues.</p>
11	Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a summary of DisabRA's time spent on the merits.
12	Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a detailed report of DisabRA's time spent on the merits.
13	Attached hereto as Exhibit C is a summary of DisabRA's time spent on this compensation request.
14	Attached hereto as Exhibit D is a detailed report of DisabRA's time spent on this compensation request.
15	Attached hereto as Exhibit E is an activity summary of DisabRA's time spent on the merits divided by activity, or issue, category.

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):

#	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))

(CPUC completes the remainder of this form)

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the claim (Y/N)?

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Disposition

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

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) _____.
2. The claimed fees and costs [, as adjusted herein,] are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The total of reasonable contribution is \$ _____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Claimant is awarded \$ _____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay claimant the total award. Payment of the award shall include interest at the rate earned on prime,

three-month commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning _____, 200__, the 75th day after the filing of claimant's request, and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision [is/is not] waived.
4. [This/these] proceeding[s] [is/are] closed.
5. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

**Attachment 1:
Certificate of Service by Customer**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing **CLAIM AND ORDER ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION** by (check as appropriate):

hand delivery;
 first-class mail; and/or
 electronic mail

to the following persons appearing on the official Service List:

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: WESTERN POWER TRADING
FORUM/ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY
MARKETS/EQUINIX, INC./DIRECT ACCESS
CUSTOMER COALITION

KAREN N. MILLS
ATTORNEY AT LAW
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

STEPHANIE C. CHEN
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE

STEVEN KELLY
POLICY DIRECTOR
INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000
FOR: INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS
ASSOCIATION

HAYLEY GOODSON
STAFF ATTORNEY
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

KEVIN J. SIMONSEN
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
646 E. THIRD AVE.
DURANGO, CA 81301
FOR: ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES

FRANCIS MCNULTY
ATTORNEY AT LAW
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON

KEITH MELVILLE
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
101 ASH STREET, HQ 13D
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC/SOUTHERN
CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

DAVID J. BYERS, ESQ.
ATTORNEY AT LAW
MCCRACKEN, BYERS & HAESLOOP, LLP
870 MITTEN ROAD
BURLINGAME, CA 94010
FOR: CALIFORNIA CITY-COUNTY STREET
LIGHT ASSOCIATION

RACHAEL E. KOSS
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BOULEVARD, SUITE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
EMPLOYEE

LAURA J. TUDISCO
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5032
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

WILLIAM K. SANDERS
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682
FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

FOR: DIVISION OF RATEPAYERS ADVOCATE

NORA SHERIFF
ALCANTAR & KAHL
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: ENERGY PRODUCERS & USERS COALITION

PATRICK G. GOLDEN
ATTORNEY AT LAW
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MAIL CODE B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
FOR: PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY

BRIAN T. CRAGG
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY & LAMPREY
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
FOR: ENGINEERS AND SCIENTISTS OF
CALIFORNIA LOCAL 20

EDWARD W. O'NEILL
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533
FOR: SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN IRRIGATION
DISTRICT

BRIAN K. CHERRY
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77N BEALE ST., PO BOX 770000, MC B10C
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

REBECCA WILLIFORD
LD ACCESS/Ryder FNDTN FELLOWSHIP ATTY.
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704-1204
FOR: DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES

BARBARA GEORGE
WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS
PO BOX 548
FAIRFAX, CA 94978-0548
FOR: WOMERN'S ENERGY MATTERS

JAMES WEIL
DIRECTOR
AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE
PO BOX 1916
SEBASTOPOL, CA 95473
FOR: AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE

NICOLE A. BLAKE
STAFF ATTORNEY
CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA
1107 9TH ST., STE. 625
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
FOR: CONSUMER FEDERATION OF CALIFORNIA

ANN L. TROWBRIDGE
DAY CARTER MURPHY LLC
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE 205
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864
FOR: MERCED IRRIGATION DISTRICT/MODESTO
IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Information Only

ASHAR KHAN
VISIUM ASSET MANAGEMENT
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

CLEO ZAGREAN
MACQUARIE CAPITAL (USA)
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

DONN DAVY
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LAUREN DUKE
DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

NAAZ KHUMAWALA
MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, TX 00000

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MRW & ASSOCIATES, LLC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JUDY PAU
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

MARTIN HOMEC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000
FOR: WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS

MICHELLE GRANT
DYNEGY, INC.
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, TX 00000-0000

SCOTT SENCHAK
DECADE CAPITAL
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000-0000

JACK D'ANGELO
CATAPULT CAPITAL MANAGEMENT LLC
650 5TH AVENUE, 32ND FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10019

JULIEN DUMOULIN-SMITH
ASSOCIATE ANALYST
UBS INVESTMENT RESEARCH
1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10019

ADAR ZANGO
ANALYST
ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS
535 MADISON - 6TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

ANDREW YIM
ZIMMER LUCAS PARTNERS
535 MADISON AVE., 6TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

IVANA ERGOVIC
JEFFERIES & COMPANY, INC.
520 MADISON AVENUE, 19TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NY 10022

JAMES J. HECKLER
LEVIN CAPITAL STRATEGIES
595 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

ANDERS NIELSEN
OPEN TOP SIGHTSEEING SAN FRANCISCO, LLC
5500 TUXEDO ROAD
HYATTSVILLE, MD 20781

ROBERT BERMAN
BERMAN ECONOMICS
1915 GRAND COURT
VIENNA, VA 22182

JIM ROSS
RCS, INC.
500 CHESTERFIELD CENTER, SUITE 320
CHESTERFIELD, MO 63017

HERB EMMRICH
SAN DEIGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO., GT14D6
555 WEST 5TH STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

ANDREW STEINBERG
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS CO.
555 W. 5TH STREET, GT 14D6
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013-1034

CASE ADMINISTRATION
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, ROOM 370
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

KRIS G. VYAS
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY
QUAD 3-B
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

CENTRAL FILES
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC CO.
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31E
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

MICHAEL TURNIPSEED
EXEC. DIR.
KERN COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
331 TRUTUN AVENUE
BAKERSFIELD, CA 93301
FOR: KERN COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

PAUL KERKORIAN
UTILITY COST MANAGEMENT LLC
6475 N. PALM AVENUE, SUITE 105
FRESNO, CA 93704

ROBERT RATHIE
WELLINGTON LAW OFFICE
857 CASS STREET, SUITE D
MONTEREY, CA 93940

SUE MARA
CONSULTANT
RTO ADVISORS, LLC
164 SPRINGDALE WAY
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062

MARC D. JOSEPH
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO
601 GATEWAY BLVD. STE 1000
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94080
FOR: COALITION OF CALIFORNIA UTILITY
EMPLOYEES

THOMAS J. LONG
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

FRASER D. SMITH
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
SAN FRANCISCO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

MANUEL RAMIREZ
SAN FRANCISCO PUC - POWER ENTERPRISE
1155 MARKET STREET, 4TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

ROBERT FINKELSTEIN
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
115 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

BRUCE P. FRASER
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

KAREN TERRANOVA
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1850
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

WILLIAM MITCHELL
COMPETITIVE POWER VENTURES, INC.
55 2ND STREET, SUITE 525
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, B30A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1814

EDWARD G. POOLE
ANDERSON & POOLE
601 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 1300
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108-2812

SALLE E. YOO
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

VIDHYA PRABHAKARAN
DAVIS WRIGHT & TREMAINE LLP
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 800
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

MARTIN A. MATTES
ATTORNEY
NOSSAMAN, LLP
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4799

CALIFORNIA ENERGY MARKETS
425 DIVISADERO ST. STE 303
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94117-2242

CASE ADMINISTRATION
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

SEAN P. BEATTY
DIR - WEST REGULATORY AFFAIRS
GENON ENERGY, INC.
PO BOX 192
PITTSBURGH, CA 94565

WILLIAM F. DIETRICH
ATTORNEY AT LAW
DIETRICH LAW
2977 YGNACIO VALLEY ROAD, NO. 613
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598-3535

DAVID MARCUS
PO BOX 1287
BERKELEY, CA 94701

REED V. SCHMIDT
BARTLE WELLS ASSOCIATES
1889 ALCATRAZ AVENUE
BERKELEY, CA 94703-2714

SAMUEL S. KANG
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 2ND FLR.
BERKELEY, CA 94704

ENRIQUE GALLARDO
LEGAL COUNSEL
THE GREENLINING INSTITUTE
1918 UNIVERSITY AVE., 2ND FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704-1051

KARLA GILBRIDE
DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES
2001 CENTER STREET, 4TH FLOOR
BERKELEY, CA 94704-1204

ELIZABETH RASMUSSEN
PROJECT MGR.
MARIN ENERGY AUTHORITY
781 LINCOLN AVENUE, SUITE 320
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901

WENDY L. ILLINGWORTH
ECONOMIC INSIGHTS
320 FEATHER LANE
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060

JAN REID
COAST ECONOMICS CONSULTING
3185 GROSS ROAD
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95062

JOY A. WARREN
MODESTO IRRIGATION DISTRICT
1231 11TH STREET
MODESTO, CA 95354

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH
44810 ROSEWOOD TERRACE
MENDOCINO, CA 95460

GARRICK JONES
JBS ENERGY
311 D STREET
WEST SACRAMENTO, CA 95605

CAROLYN KEHREIN
ENERGY MANAGEMENT SERVICES
2602 CELEBRATION WAY
WOODLAND, CA 95776

SCOTT BLAISING
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN, P.C.
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

LYNN HAUG
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.
2600 CAPITAL AVENUE, SUITE 400
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5931

RICHARD MCCANN
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP
8801 FOLSOM BOULEVARD, SUITE 290
SACRAMENTO, CA 95826-3250

JOHN LARREA
CALIFORNIA LEAGUE OF FOOD PROCESSORS
1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, STE 250
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

RALPH R. NEVIS
DAY CARTER & MURPHY LLP
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DR., SUITE 205
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864

State Service

SCOTT MURTISHAW
CPUC
EMAIL ONLY
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BELINDA GATTI
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CLAYTON K. TANG
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAO A. PHAN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID K. FUKUTOME
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES
ROOM 5042
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID PECK
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH
ROOM 4103
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DONALD J. LAFRENZ
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

DONNA-FAY BOWER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ELAINE CHAN LAU
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NICHOLAS SHER
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 4007
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ROBERT M. POCTA
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

TRUMAN L. BURNS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
ENERGY COST OF SERVICE & NATURAL GAS BRA
ROOM 4205
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

douglass@energyattorney.com
kmills@cxbf.com
stephaniec@greenlining.org
steven@iepa.com
hayley@turn.org
kjsimonsen@ems-ca.com
francis.mcnulty@sce.com
KMelville@SempraUtilities.com
dbyers@landuselaw.com
rkoss@adamsbroadwell.com
ljt@cpuc.ca.gov
william.sanders@sfgov.org
nes@a-klaw.com
pgg4@pge.com
bcragg@goodinmacbride.com
edwardoneill@dwt.com
bk7@pge.com
rwilliford@dralegal.org
wem@igc.org
jweil@aglet.org
blake@consumercal.org
atrowbridge@daycartermurphy.com
akhan@visiumfunds.com
cleo.zagrean@macquarie.com
dfdavy@well.com
lauren.duke@db.com

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

KARL MEEUSEN
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
EXECUTIVE DIVISION
ROOM 5217
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

RICHARD A. MYERS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
MARKET STRUCTURE, COSTS AND NATURAL GAS
AREA 4-A
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

SARAH R. THOMAS
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
LEGAL DIVISION
ROOM 5033
505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

naaz.khumawala@baml.com
DWTCPUCDOCKETS@dwt.com
mrw@mrwassoc.com
judypau@dwt.com
martinhomerc@gmail.com
michelle.d.grant@dynegy.com
scott.senchak@decade-llc.com
jdangelo@catapult-llc.com
julien.dumoulin-smith@ubs.com
zango@zimmerlucas.com
Yim@ZimmerLucas.com
IErgovic@Jefferies.com
jheckler@levincap.com
anders@opentopsightseeing.com
BermanEconomics@gmail.com
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
HEmmrich@SempraUtilities.com
ASteinberg@SempraUtilities.com
case.admin@sce.com
kris.vyas@sce.com
CentralFiles@SempraUtilities.com
kerntax@kern taxpayers.org
pk@utilitycostmanagement.com
info@dcisc.org
sue.mara@RTOadvisors.com
mdjoseph@adamsbroadwell.com
thomas.long@sfgov.org
fsmith@sflower.org
mramirez@sflower.org
bfinkelstein@turn.org
bpf2@pge.com
filings@a-klaw.com
will.mitchell@cpv.com
lawpucases@pge.com
epoole@adplaw.com
salleyoo@dwt.com
vidhyaprabhakaran@dwt.com
mmattes@nossaman.com
cem@newsdata.com
RegRelCPUCcases@pge.com
sean.beatty@genon.com
dietrichlaw2@earthlink.net
dmarcus2@sbcglobal.net
rschmidt@bartlells.com
samuelk@greenlining.org
enriqueg@greenlining.org
pucservice@dralegal.org
erasmussen@marinenergyauthority.org
wendy@econinsights.com
janreid@coastecon.com

joyw@mid.org
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
garrick@jbsenergy.com
cmkehrein@ems-ca.com
blaising@braunlegal.com
lmh@eslawfirm.com
rmccann@umich.edu
john@clfp.com
rnevis@daycartermurphy.com
SGM@cpuc.ca.gov
beg@cpuc.ca.gov
ckt@cpuc.ca.gov
dao@cpuc.ca.gov
dkf@cpuc.ca.gov
dbp@cpuc.ca.gov
dlf@cpuc.ca.gov
dfb@cpuc.ca.gov
ec2@cpuc.ca.gov
kkm@cpuc.ca.gov
nms@cpuc.ca.gov
ram@cpuc.ca.gov
rmp@cpuc.ca.gov
srt@cpuc.ca.gov
txb@cpuc.ca.gov

Executed this 12th day of July 2011, at Berkeley, California.

/s/

Raziya Brumfield
Disability Rights Advocates
2001 Center St. Fourth Floor
Berkeley Ca. 94704