

Decision _____

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

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U338E) for Approval of its 2009-2011 Energy Efficiency Program Plans and Associated Public Goods Charge (PGC) and Procurement Funding Requests.	Application 08-07-021 (Filed July 21, 2008)
And Related Matters	Application 08-07-022 Application 08-07-023 Application 08-07-031 (Filed July 21, 2008)

CLAIM AND DECISION ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR COMPENSATION

Claimant: The Utility Reform Network	For contribution to D.10-12-054, D.11-04-005, and D.11-07-030.
Claimed (\$): \$126,933	Awarded (\$):
Assigned Commissioner: Florio	Assigned ALJ: Gamson
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 4).	
<p align="right">Signature: /s/</p>	
Date: 9/7/11	Printed Name: Robert Finkelstein

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

A. Brief Description of Decision:

This request for compensation includes TURN's work on the three decisions addressing matters raised in the petition for modification filed by PG&E, SCE, SDG&E and SoCalGas on September 17, 2010. In D.10-12-054, the Commission addressed freezing *ex ante* values based on 2008 DEER version 2.05, co-branding requirements, the Prescriptive Whole House Retrofit Program, and the California Advanced Home Program. In D.11-04-005, the Commission adopted a second set of

modifications to D.09-09-047, addressing issues related to benchmarking, the degree of variation to permit in statewide programs, and the definition of allowable administrative costs for energy efficiency programs. Finally, in D.11-07-030, the Commission addressed issues concerning determination of non-DEER (including custom project) *ex ante* energy savings values. During this period, TURN was also very active in a number of areas for implementation of the energy efficiency programs adopted in D.09-09-047 and the ongoing evaluation, measurement and verification (EM&V) activities. TURN has included in this request for compensation the reasonable amounts of time and resources devoted to those efforts.

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:	August 11, 2008	
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	None	
3. Date NOI Filed:	September 10, 2008	
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:	A.08-05-023	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 22, 2009	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
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:	A.08-05-023	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	April 22, 2009	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision	D.11-07-030	
14. Date of Issuance of Final Decision:	7/22/11	
15. File date of compensation request:	9/7/11	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
	X		In D.11-06-012 the Commission awarded compensation to TURN for its substantial contributions to the decisions issued through mid-2010. Pursuant to Rule 17.2 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, having been found eligible for an award of compensation in the earlier phase of this proceeding means TURN remains eligible in this later phase of the same proceeding.

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
<p>The IOUs' Petition for Modification effectively created a second phase of the review of the utilities consolidated applications for the 2009-2011 (now 2010-2012) energy efficiency. Three separate decisions issued, each addressing a portion of the issues associated with the Petition for Modification. Each decision reflects TURN's substantial contribution achieved through our joint efforts with the Division of Ratepayer Advocates, as will be described in further detail below.</p> <p>In addition to the substantial contributions to the adopted decisions, TURN has also continued to make a substantial contribution through our ongoing participation in the various informal processes associated with this proceeding. The implementation of D.09-09-047 continued through the last half of 2010 and the first half of 2011, with numerous workshops and other meetings with staff, the utilities and other interested parties. Once again, TURN's critique and analysis were instrumental in helping the effort seeking to move the utility applications closer to compliance with prior Commission decisions and rulings, and to developing the necessary information needed in order to accurately assess the costs and benefits of the proposed</p>	<p>Joint Utilities' Petition for Modification of D.09-09-047 (9/17/10)</p> <p>D.10-12-054</p> <p>D.11-04-005</p> <p>D.11-07-030</p>	

<p>programs. These efforts do not lend themselves to easy identification of substantial contributions, since they are not captured in final decisions or rulings. However, in a proceeding such as this one, the Commission should continue its practice of recognizing such efforts as a critical part of an intervenor's substantial contribution to the decision-making process.</p>		
<p><u>D.10-12-054 -- PFM Decision #1:</u> The initial response to the IOUs' Petition for Modification addressed the full range of issues raised in that petition. TURN and DRA worked together in responding to the petition, with TURN taking the lead for <i>ex ante</i> value issues and DRA for all other issues.</p> <p>At the initial prehearing conference conducted on October 22, 2010, it became clear that certain information concerning Energy Division implementation of matters related to <i>ex ante</i> values (particularly for non-DEER and custom measures) should be included in the proceeding's formal record. Pursuant to an October 29, 2010 ALJ Ruling, parties could comment on the various material added to the record. TURN and DRA again submitted joint comments and reply comments, with TURN primarily responsible for drafting both documents since the subject matter had to do with the <i>ex ante</i> value issues.</p> <p>In D.10-12-054, the Commission addressed some of the issues raised in the PFM. On the <i>ex ante</i> issues, it acknowledged the TURN/DRA concern that the utilities' position would effectively give them veto power over Energy Division updates to <i>ex ante values</i> and disavowed that as being the intent of D.09-09-047. The Commission reaffirmed its preference for using the best available information, consistent with the TURN/DRA position, but opted for a different approach in order to provide greater certainty. Therefore the Commission froze <i>ex ante</i> values as they exist in 2008 DEER version 2.05. In doing so, the Commission reaffirmed its expectation that DEER values would be updated and set using the best available information for the next energy efficiency</p>	<p>TURN/DRA PFM Response (October 18, 2010).</p> <p>TURN/DRA Comments Pursuant to ALJ Ruling (November 5, 2010); TURN/DRA Reply Comments (November 12, 2010).</p> <p>TURN/DRA PFM Response (October 18, 2010), pp. 3-11. D.10-12-054, pp. 7-8.</p>	

<p>portfolio cycle, with the values determined and frozen before the upcoming cycle begins. The Commission deferred acting on other <i>ex ante</i> value issues.</p> <p>In D.10-12-054, the Commission also addressed the co-branding issue. TURN and DRA had opposed the utilities' request for greater discretion as to when to use or not use the Engage 360 brand, as it would undermine the goal of providing clear, consistent information about energy efficiency programs. The Commission denied the IOUs' petition on this issue in all but one minor aspect.</p> <p>The Commission also addressed the Whole House Program and Advanced Home Programs issues raised in the PFM. DRA and TURN had not opposed the requested reduction of the savings goal for the Whole House Program. Similarly, DRA and TURN agreed that the bonus level for single-family homes appeared excessive when made available for each unit in a multi-family unit. In D.10-12-054, the Commission adopted these uncontested changes.</p>	<p>D.10-12-054, p. 9.</p> <p>TURN/DRA Response to PFM, pp. 21-22.</p> <p>D.10-12-054, pp. 21.</p> <p>TURN/DRA Response to PFM, pp. 22-23, 25.</p> <p>D.10-12-054, pp. 25, 27-28.</p>	
<p><u>D.11-04-005 -- PFM Decision #2:</u></p> <p>The Commission's second decision on the IOU's Petition for Modification addressed several issue areas deferred from D.10-12-054: benchmarking, the variations permitted for statewide program, and the definition of administrative costs as applied to certain sponsored events or activities.</p> <p>In addition to the material included in the initial TURN and DRA response to the IOUs' PFM, TURN and DRA filed reply comments on the PD (with DRA taking the lead in drafting the pleading). Consistent with the DRA/TURN position, the Commission: rejected the utilities' request to deem ESPM as</p>		

<p>the exclusive benchmarking tool; embraced a phased approach that emphasized benchmarking of larger facilities first; adopted limited modifications to the reporting requirements for statewide programs (rejecting the other proposed changes as “too far-reaching” as argued by DRA/TURN); and defining sponsorship costs as allowable costs for energy efficiency programs.</p>	<p>TURN/DRA PFM Response, October 18, 2010, pp. 19-20, 23-24.</p> <p>D.11-04-005, pp. 6-8, 11-12, and 14-17.</p>	
<p><u>D.11-07-030 -- PFM Decision #3:</u></p> <p>In D.11-07-030, the Commission resolved the remaining issues from the IOUs’ Petition for Modification.</p> <p>One of the core principles that TURN and DRA had promoted throughout the pendency of the PFM was that the Commission should not permit delay to overrule the concepts for adopting <i>ex ante</i> values as set forth in D.09-09-047. The Commission embraced that principle in D.11-07-030.</p> <p>For non-DEER values, the Commission agreed with the following positions supported by TURN and DRA: the effective date of ED reviewed and approved values that differ from the utility-proposed values would be January 1, 2010; maintaining a “dual baseline” for calculating cost-effectiveness of early retirement measures; and adopted on a wholesale basis the ED recommendations for non-DEER HIM <i>ex ante</i> values.</p> <p>On custom projects, the Commission adopted a gross realization rate (GRR) of 0.90, splitting the difference between the 0.80 figure embedded in D.09-09-047 and the 1.0 figure requested by the utilities, NRDC, and third-party implementers. TURN and DRA had supported the lower ED recommendations, with the existing 0.80 figure as an acceptable alternative. While the Commission’s 0.90</p>	<p>TURN/DRA Response to PFM (10/18/10), pp. 3-19; TURN/DRA Response to ALJ Ruling Seeking Comment (11/5/10); TURN/DRA Reply Comments to ALJ Ruling Seeking Comment (11/12/10).</p> <p>D.11-07-030, p. 9.</p> <p>Case Management Statement, pp. 10-11 (effective date); 13-14 (installation rate); 16-17 (dual baseline); 21-22 (non-DEER HIM values).</p> <p>D.11-07-030, pp. 19-20 (effective date); 22-23 (installation rate); 25-26 (dual baseline); 29-30 (non-DEER HIM values).</p> <p>D.11-07-030, pp. 37-38; Case Management Statement, pp. 26-27.</p>	

<p>figure exceeded those figures, the explanation of why the 1.0 figure was unacceptable relied on arguments put forward by TURN and DRA.</p> <p>As with the effective date for the non-DEER values, the Commission adopted January 1, 2010 as the effective date for the amended GRR value and any <i>ex ante</i> values that differed from the utility-proposed values. Similarly, the Commission adopted the same outcome for “dual baseline” issues that arise in custom project settings. TURN and DRA were the only parties to support both these outcomes.</p>	<p>D.11-07-030, p. 38; Case Management Statement, pp. 30-31 and 33-34.</p>	
<p>Program Performance Metrics – In the discussion of market transformation in D.09-09-047, the Commission adopted a process to develop and apply Program Performance Metrics to the 2010-12 portfolios and beyond. The goal was to ensure that specific programs were advancing the Commission’s market transformation goals, and to determine what interventions might be required when the market has been transformed. Energy Division issued a draft resolution in November 2010. TURN’s comments addressed a number of procedural and substantive points. TURN objected to the process for obtaining public input, pointing out that Energy Division had worked exclusively with the utilities to develop a proposed set of market transformation indicators (MTI) that was then attached to a draft resolution and shared with the non-utility parties. Resolution E-4385 reaffirmed that workshops should be held on the initial MTIs in the resolution. TURN also called for modifications so that the resolution explained how the proposed metrics meet the objectives set in D.09-09-047. The final resolution included a summary of how the criteria from D.09-09-047 were met with the initial PPMs and MTIs. And TURN and DRA each called for clarification that none of the MTIs developed through this process would prejudice the outcome of the Risk Reward Incentive Mechanism (RRIM). The final resolution agreed with TURN and DRA that the MTIs did</p>	<p>TURN Comments on Draft Resolution E-4385 (November 22, 2010).</p> <p>Resolution E-4385, pp. 18-20.</p>	

<p>not prejudice any RRIM outcome.</p>		
<p>Informal Process – 7/1/10 through 8/31/11</p> <p>EM&V – TURN continued to be active in several elements of the EM&V-related activity during this period. TURN participated in the ongoing work on the 2006-08 EM&V, both in terms of conducting the review and for getting the results of that review reflected in the current portfolio’s programs. TURN also participated in the EM&V associated with the 2010-12 portfolio programs, including the Macro Consumption Metrics.</p> <p>60-day Report – The utilities served a report in late May 2010 entitled “Responses to EM&V Impact, Process, and Market Assessment Recommendations” (also known as the 60-day Report because it was due within 60 days of ED posting final EM&V results). The report was to address the important questions surrounding the changes, if any, that would be made to programs and portfolios once the final EM&V results were available. TURN’s comments on the report sought to focus the review on program design and implementation changes, rather than mere adjustments to claimed accomplishments. To this end, TURN submitted an extensive analysis in the comments provided on August 10, 2010.</p> <p>HVAC – In D.09-09-047 the Commission committed substantial amounts of funding to HVAC programs. The 2006-08 EM&V results found a number of problems with quality control for the residential and commercial HVAC programs, leading to additional efforts to review and modify the programs to improve the quality. TURN was an active participant in this ongoing effort throughout the mid-2010 to mid-2011 period.</p> <p>Strategic Lighting – In D.09-09-047, as part of the effort to move the energy efficiency lighting programs away from basic CFL programs, the Commission directed Energy Division to create a Strategic Lighting Plan, with a process that included meetings and public workshops to permit interested parties to be engaged in the process. (D.09-09-047, p. 144). TURN participated in that process.</p>		

<p>Whole House Retrofits – The Commission also directed the utilities to focus greater amounts of attention and resources to whole house retrofits during the 2010-12 portfolio cycle. (D.09-09-047, FOF 46, COL 30, OP 21). TURN reviewed the utility-proposed implementation plans, and played an active role in their modification, resulting in a pilot program targeting moderate income households. TURN also joined other parties in supporting a pilot program targeting multi-family units. Most of TURN’s efforts occurred during the period covered by the earlier request for compensation, but TURN’s involvement continued through the first few months covered by the current request.</p>		

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<p>a. Was DRA a party to the proceeding? (Y/N)</p>	Yes	
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding? (Y/N)</p>	Yes	
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</p>	<p>The parties that were most active in the efforts that led to the three formal decisions were the four regulated utilities, NRDC, third-party installers such as EnerNOC and NAESCO, and DRA and TURN.</p>	
<p>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:</p>	<p>For the efforts associated with the IOUs’ Petition for Modification, TURN worked jointly with DRA. In this way TURN and DRA managed to almost completely avoid duplication, as each group took responsibility for particular issue areas, so only one of the groups performed the lion’s share of the drafting on any given issue area, while the other group’s work was a more limited editing and review process. There were a few occasions where both TURN and DRA were active, such as at the PHCs and the all-party meetings convened with the ALJ and, later, with several Commissioners. However, given that the discussions generally pitted TURN and DRA against the combined efforts of the four major energy utilities, NRDC, and the representatives of third-party installers, the Commission should conclude that the overlap that occurred in these forums served to better ensure that the Commission heard from all sides during the discussion.</p> <p>With regard to the ongoing efforts through workshops, webinars, and informal submissions to Energy Division or to the service list, TURN closely coordinated with</p>	

<p>DRA but for the most part presented positions distinct from the staff. In many cases this reflected TURN’s deeper and broader involvement in these efforts, as DRA played a less active role than TURN did in most of these informal settings. TURN was in regular contact with DRA to discuss strategies for presenting positions in these forums, and to keep DRA abreast of the direction TURN was heading in with regard to the underlying issues.</p> <p>In sum, the Commission should find that TURN took all reasonable steps to avoid duplication and, to the extent that there was any overlap, TURN’s work supplemented and complemented that of DRA and the other parties who worked on the same issues addressed by TURN.</p>	
--	--

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

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>TURN’s advocacy reflected in D.10-12-054, D.11-04-005, and D.11-07-030 addressed policy matters rather than specific rates or disputes over particular dollar amounts. As a result, TURN cannot easily identify precise monetary benefits to ratepayers from our work related to these decisions. However, given that the utilities’ petition for modification sought to address core elements of what the Commission had adopted in D.09-09-067, and given how TURN’s earlier participation in this proceeding helped to achieve a \$600 million reduction from the spending authorization sought by the four utilities, the Commission could deem TURN’s ongoing efforts to be tied to our continuing work on the energy efficiency issues from the 2010-2012 portfolio period, and to the substantial savings achieved through that work. In addition, TURN’s participation on non-monetary and policy issues also produced benefits that, while harder to quantify in terms of dollars saved, were still quite substantial.</p> <p>In the face of these ongoing cost savings to California ratepayers, TURN’s request for compensation of approximately \$125,000 for work spanning a year-long period is a very small fraction of the benefits realized through our participation.</p> <p>Equally as valuable (but more difficult to quantify in monetary figures) are the benefits of TURN’s participation on matters of program selection and design, EM&V, and other work seeking to maximize the likelihood that the energy efficiency programs will meet California’s ambitious goals for such programs in a cost-effective manner. TURN submits that our participation resulted in improvements to the energy efficiency programs should result in reduced customer costs or greater savings (or both). While hard to quantify, TURN further submits that these benefits also far exceed the cost of TURN’s participation as described in this request for compensation.</p>	

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD			
ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein	2010	82.0	\$470	Res. ALJ-247	\$ 38,540				
R. Finkelstein	2011	49.5	\$470	Res. ALJ-267	\$ 23,265				
Subtotal:					\$ 61,805	Subtotal:			
EXPERT FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Cynthia Mitchell	2010	125.0	\$180	D.11-06-012 ¹	\$ 22,500				
C. Mitchell	2011	55.25	\$180	D.11-06-012	\$ 9,945				
Gillian Court	2010	48.0	\$150	D.11-06-012	\$ 7,200				
G. Court	2011	32.0	\$150	D.11-06-012	\$ 4,800				
Reuben Deumling	2010	63.7	\$150	D.11-06-012	\$ 9,555				
R. Deumling	2011	44.75	\$150	D.11-06-012	\$ 6,713				
Subtotal:					\$ 60,713	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 \$
C. Mitchell Travel	2010	6.0	\$90	½ approved hourly rate	\$ 540				
Subtotal:					\$ 540	Subtotal:			
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Robert Finkelstein	2011	13.25	\$235	50% of \$470	\$ 3,114				
Subtotal:					\$ 3,114	Subtotal:			
COSTS									

¹ D.11-06-012 approved these rates for Ms. Mitchell's, Dr. Court's, and Dr. Deumling's work performed in 2010; Energy Economics has not changed its rates for any of these individuals since then.

#	Item	Detail	Amount	Amount
1	Photocopies	TURN Pleadings	\$ 10	
2	Lexis/Nexis	Computerized research	\$ 0	
3	Phone and postage	Proceeding-related phone calls and TURN pleadings	\$ 4	
4	Consultant Travel	Travel from Reno office to SF PHCs and workshops. Air fare, parking, taxis and BART	\$ 608	
5	Consultant lodging	Hotels while in SF for proceeding	\$ 139	
Subtotal:			\$ 761	Subtotal:
TOTAL REQUEST			\$ 126,933	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 ½ 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
Attachment 1	Detailed Time Reports for TURN's Attorney and Consultants
Attachment 2	Detail of TURN's Expenses
Attachment 3	Certificate of Service
Comment 1	<p>Reasonableness of TURN Hours: The total number of hours that TURN's attorney and consultants devoted to this proceeding since mid-2010 is both substantial and substantially smaller than the hours included in the previous compensation request covering the preceding two-year period. The issues associated with implementation of D.09-09-047 were generally narrower than those considered and addressed in that decision, so the demands on TURN's resources were generally smaller with regard to the work associated with the adopted decisions. However, as with TURN's work during the period covered by the compensation award of D.11-06-012, TURN's consultants devoted substantial time and effort to the ongoing implementation of D.09-09-047, both in terms of review of the utility program's and efforts to further pursue and develop avenues identified in D.09-09-047, such as Strategic Lighting and HVAC. TURN also continued to devote substantial resources to the ongoing work in Evaluation, Measurement and Verification (EM&V). Furthermore, TURN recorded approximately 180 hours to work associated with the IOUs' petition for modification, with approximately 120 hours for TURN's attorney and 60 hours for the consultants. Given the breadth of issues raised in the PFM and the extended nature of the review of those issues (resulting in several sets of comments, an extensive case management statement, and three separate decisions), there should be no doubt that these hours are reasonable. As described further below, the Commission should find that the number of hours for each TURN representative is reasonable under the circumstances present here.</p> <p><u>TURN Staff Hours:</u> Robert Finkelstein was the sole TURN attorney assigned to this</p>

proceeding, and the Commission should find the hours requested for his work reasonable. His work was almost entirely devoted to dealing with the utilities' PFM, an effort that extended over many months and resulted in three separate decisions. Given the nature of the issues, the various all-party events, and the alignment of interests (with TURN and DRA on one side and the combined forces of the utilities, NRDC, and third-party providers typically on the other), the approximately 160 hours is a reasonable figure that should be compensated in full.

TURN Consultant hours: As was the case with TURN's first compensation request in this proceeding, the majority of the hours included in this request is for the work of TURN's outside consultants. TURN's broad contributions to the various decisions and in the less formal forums conducted in this proceeding reflects the excellent analysis performed by those consultants. For the approximately 12-month period covered by this request, Energy Economics Inc. (Cynthia Mitchell's firm) recorded approximately 375 total hours, an average of about 30 hours per month. The Commission should find the number of hours for each firm reasonable and award compensation for the full amount of requested hours.

Once again, Ms. Mitchell recorded the largest number of hours, but relied on Dr. Court and Dr. Deumling to perform supporting analysis and, on occasion, to step in as TURN's representative at workshops and other events. This approach enabled TURN to achieve broader coverage at the proceeding at a reasonable additional cost (since Ms. Mitchell relied on firm members with lower hourly rates).

And as was the case with the compensation request TURN submitted earlier in this proceeding, a significant number of the entries for TURN's consultants reflect communications with DRA and Energy Division staff members. The Commission should find this reasonable under the circumstances, given our joint participation with DRA with all pleadings in this phase of the proceeding, our ongoing coordination with DRA in the workshops and other informal activities tied to the proceeding, and Energy Division's prominent and continuing role in the proceeding. TURN submits that it was not uncommon for every active party to regularly contact Energy Division, sometimes to solicit the staff's view of matters, sometimes for information regarding upcoming events (such as workshops), and sometimes to provide drafts of documents or other materials in response to staff inquiries. Again, the fact that such contacts occurred regularly does not demonstrate that the contacts represent inefficiency or unnecessary work in any way.

Meetings, travel time, and compensation-related time: A very small number of hourly entries reflect meetings attended by TURN's attorney and consultant, or by more than one of TURN's consultants. In past compensation decisions the Commission has deemed such entries as reflecting internal duplication that is not eligible for an award of intervenor compensation. This is not the case here. These meetings were essential to TURN developing and implementing its strategy for this proceeding. TURN's requested hours are limited to those where the attorney's or expert witness's presence at a meeting was necessary in order to achieve the meeting's purpose. TURN submits that such meetings can be part of an intervenor's effective advocacy before the Commission, and that intervenor compensation can and should be awarded for the time of all participants in such meetings where, as here, each participant needed to be in the meeting to advance the intervenor's advocacy efforts.

There is also travel time associated with TURN's expert witness's attendance at an all-party meeting and an HVAC workshop. This travel was not "general commuting," as Ms. Mitchell and her colleagues only rarely come to the CPUC for business, and would not have traveled to San Francisco on any of the days in question but for the workshops or prehearing conferences in this proceeding.

	Finally, TURN is requesting compensation for 13.25 hours devoted to preparation of this request for compensation. TURN submits this is a reasonable amount of hours for a proceeding that produced three decisions and included substantial amounts of time and resources devoted to workshops, webinars and other meetings.																		
Comment 2	<p>Allocation of Hours: TURN has allocated its time entries by the following activity codes:</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>GP (General Participation)</td> <td>This category typically includes time for activities necessary to participate in the docket that tend not to vary by the number of issues addressed, such as initial review of applications, participation in prehearing conferences and ex parte meetings, and similar activities.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PFM</td> <td>TURN's work on the Joint IOUs' Petition for Modification was very closely coordinated with DRA. TURN took the lead on the DEER, non-DEER and custom measure issues, while DRA took the lead on all other issues. If the Commission desires a further break-down of hours between the issues covered by the PFM, TURN submits that a reasonable estimate is 90% on the DEER, non-DEER and custom measure <i>ex ante</i> value issues, and 10% on all other issues.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PPM</td> <td>Program Performance Metrics – Mostly around review of the draft resolution and comments leading up to Resolution E-4385.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bridge</td> <td>Review of the ED report on 2009 Bridge Funding adopted earlier in this proceeding, and participation in the webinar on this subject. (Hours devoted to 2013 Bridge year issues are recorded in R.09-11-014.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>HVAC</td> <td>Work devoted to participating in the Energy Division-led effort to assess the various HVAC elements to develop a sound foundation for better developing strategies and programs to reduce peak load, consistent with directive of D.09-09-047 (pp. 199-200).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compliance</td> <td>Review of compliance advice letters and other matters, and other activities regarding approved and implemented 2010-12 budgets and programs.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EM&V</td> <td>This category reflects ongoing work and analysis associated with the 2006-2008 portfolio. The results of this work and analysis have directly flowed into the work the parties and Energy Division have performed for analyzing the programs in the 2010-12 portfolio, as well as development of general energy efficiency policies. As with TURN's initial request for compensation in this proceeding, TURN is including these hours in this request. In D.11-06-012, the Commission recognized the appropriateness of including such hours in a request for compensation in this proceeding.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EM&V 2010-2012</td> <td>This category reflects ongoing work and analysis associated with EM&V for the 2010-12 portfolio. This category is distinct in time period as compared to the 2006-08 portfolio efforts, but otherwise is very similar in nature to that work.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>60-Day Report</td> <td>The 60-day report is an offshoot of an earlier energy efficiency decision that required the utilities to submit for review and</td> </tr> </table>	GP (General Participation)	This category typically includes time for activities necessary to participate in the docket that tend not to vary by the number of issues addressed, such as initial review of applications, participation in prehearing conferences and ex parte meetings, and similar activities.	PFM	TURN's work on the Joint IOUs' Petition for Modification was very closely coordinated with DRA. TURN took the lead on the DEER, non-DEER and custom measure issues, while DRA took the lead on all other issues. If the Commission desires a further break-down of hours between the issues covered by the PFM, TURN submits that a reasonable estimate is 90% on the DEER, non-DEER and custom measure <i>ex ante</i> value issues, and 10% on all other issues.	PPM	Program Performance Metrics – Mostly around review of the draft resolution and comments leading up to Resolution E-4385.	Bridge	Review of the ED report on 2009 Bridge Funding adopted earlier in this proceeding, and participation in the webinar on this subject. (Hours devoted to 2013 Bridge year issues are recorded in R.09-11-014.)	HVAC	Work devoted to participating in the Energy Division-led effort to assess the various HVAC elements to develop a sound foundation for better developing strategies and programs to reduce peak load, consistent with directive of D.09-09-047 (pp. 199-200).	Compliance	Review of compliance advice letters and other matters, and other activities regarding approved and implemented 2010-12 budgets and programs.	EM&V	This category reflects ongoing work and analysis associated with the 2006-2008 portfolio. The results of this work and analysis have directly flowed into the work the parties and Energy Division have performed for analyzing the programs in the 2010-12 portfolio, as well as development of general energy efficiency policies. As with TURN's initial request for compensation in this proceeding, TURN is including these hours in this request. In D.11-06-012, the Commission recognized the appropriateness of including such hours in a request for compensation in this proceeding.	EM&V 2010-2012	This category reflects ongoing work and analysis associated with EM&V for the 2010-12 portfolio. This category is distinct in time period as compared to the 2006-08 portfolio efforts, but otherwise is very similar in nature to that work.	60-Day Report	The 60-day report is an offshoot of an earlier energy efficiency decision that required the utilities to submit for review and
GP (General Participation)	This category typically includes time for activities necessary to participate in the docket that tend not to vary by the number of issues addressed, such as initial review of applications, participation in prehearing conferences and ex parte meetings, and similar activities.																		
PFM	TURN's work on the Joint IOUs' Petition for Modification was very closely coordinated with DRA. TURN took the lead on the DEER, non-DEER and custom measure issues, while DRA took the lead on all other issues. If the Commission desires a further break-down of hours between the issues covered by the PFM, TURN submits that a reasonable estimate is 90% on the DEER, non-DEER and custom measure <i>ex ante</i> value issues, and 10% on all other issues.																		
PPM	Program Performance Metrics – Mostly around review of the draft resolution and comments leading up to Resolution E-4385.																		
Bridge	Review of the ED report on 2009 Bridge Funding adopted earlier in this proceeding, and participation in the webinar on this subject. (Hours devoted to 2013 Bridge year issues are recorded in R.09-11-014.)																		
HVAC	Work devoted to participating in the Energy Division-led effort to assess the various HVAC elements to develop a sound foundation for better developing strategies and programs to reduce peak load, consistent with directive of D.09-09-047 (pp. 199-200).																		
Compliance	Review of compliance advice letters and other matters, and other activities regarding approved and implemented 2010-12 budgets and programs.																		
EM&V	This category reflects ongoing work and analysis associated with the 2006-2008 portfolio. The results of this work and analysis have directly flowed into the work the parties and Energy Division have performed for analyzing the programs in the 2010-12 portfolio, as well as development of general energy efficiency policies. As with TURN's initial request for compensation in this proceeding, TURN is including these hours in this request. In D.11-06-012, the Commission recognized the appropriateness of including such hours in a request for compensation in this proceeding.																		
EM&V 2010-2012	This category reflects ongoing work and analysis associated with EM&V for the 2010-12 portfolio. This category is distinct in time period as compared to the 2006-08 portfolio efforts, but otherwise is very similar in nature to that work.																		
60-Day Report	The 60-day report is an offshoot of an earlier energy efficiency decision that required the utilities to submit for review and																		

		consideration their proposals for modifying their programs in the current portfolio period consistent with the <i>ex ante</i> results of ongoing EM&V of programs from earlier periods. The utilities presented such a report in late May 2010, and TURN devoted time and resources to reviewing and preparing comments in late July and early August, 2010.
	I-DSM	Preparation for and participation in a workshop on integrated demand side management issue, conducted per D.09-09-047 (p. 216).
	Strategic Lighting	In D.09-09-047 the Commission directed Energy Division to develop a Strategic Lighting Plan, with public input obtained through a combination of meetings and workshops. TURN was an active participant in this work.
	Whole House	Ongoing efforts for participation in development of Whole House strategy, including review and analysis of proposals and attending workshops.
	Policy	Policy and counting issues raised in utility applications and addressed in D.09-05-037
	On Bill Finance	On bill financing proposals that were presented and considered in this proceeding
	Travel	Time devoted to travel related exclusively to work in this proceeding.
	Comp	Time devoted to compensation-related pleadings.
	TURN submits that under the circumstances this information should suffice to address the allocation requirement under the Commission's rules. Should the Commission wish to see additional or different information on this point, TURN requests that the Commission so inform TURN and provide a reasonable opportunity for TURN to supplement this showing accordingly.	
Comment 3	<p>Hourly Rate for TURN attorney and consultants in 2010 and 2011:</p> <p>TURN's request for compensation uses 2010 and 2011 hourly rates for its attorney and for its consultants at JBS Energy at levels previously authorized in prior Commission decisions for work performed in 2010 or before. TURN does not seek in this request for compensation any change to the hourly rate approved for Mr. Finkelstein's work in 2008 and applied to his work in 2010 and 2011 here. Similarly, Energy Economics has not changed the hourly rates charged for its members' work since 2010, as noted in the table above.</p>	
Comment 4	<p>Reasonableness of Expenses: The Commission should find TURN's direct expenses reasonable. The expenses consist of photocopying and postage expenses for pleadings and other documents produced specifically for this proceeding; and travel-related expenses for TURN's consultant attending workshops in this proceeding (airfare, ground transport and parking, and hotel). As explained in comment 1 above with regard to the reasonableness of the travel-related hours included in this request, the travel-related expenses are reasonable. TURN's consultant kept the travel expenses to a minimum by only appearing in person for two of the multitude of events related to this proceeding during the 2010-2011 period.</p>	



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:

Detailed Time Reports for TURN's Attorneys and Consultants in A.08-07-021

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
Attorney: BF				
10/4/2010	BF	PFM	Review PFM; begin outline of response	1.25
10/7/2010	BF	PFM	Review PFM; conf call w/ DRA and CKM re: response coordination	1.25
10/10/2010	BF	PFM	Review prior rulings, pleadings on ""freeze""	1.75
10/11/2010	BF	PFM	Further review of rulings, pleadings, other file materials; p/c w/ CKM re: strategy; p/c w/ DRA, CKM, ED re: activities btwn decn and present	2.75
10/12/2010	BF	PFM	Draft response Section 1	2.50
10/13/2010	BF	PFM	Research and draft response section 1;	3.25
10/14/2010	BF	PFM	Draft and edit response section 1 (specific proposals)	2.25
10/15/2010	BF	PFM	Finish draft and edit response section 1; review ckm cmmts; edit DRA-drafted sections	3.25
10/16/2010	BF	PFM	Review DRA draft of entire protest; e-mail comments to DLee	1.00
10/18/2010	BF	PFM	Final review and edit of jt. Response	0.50
10/19/2010	BF	PFM	Review EnerNOC response; draft e-mail note to SMyers re: same	0.75
10/20/2010	BF	PFM	P/c w/ CKM re: PFM PHC strategy; prep for and conf call w/ EnerNOC; draft e-mail memo re: conf call;	2.25
10/21/2010	BF	PFM	Review pleadings; e-mail to DRA and CKM re: PHC issues	1.00
10/22/2010	BF	PFM	Prep for and attend PHC	4.50
10/25/2010	BF	Compliance	Review staff ""disposition"" letter for PG&E; draft e-mail memo to CKM and team re: next steps	0.75
10/29/2010	BF	PFM	Initial review ALJ ruling; e-mail to CKM on strategy	0.50
10/31/2010	BF	PFM	Review ALJ Ruling and attachments of ED material in prep for conf call, drafting comments	2.50
11/1/2010	BF	PFM	P/cs w/ CKM and DRA re: strategy; review ruling and attachments; outline comments	3.75

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
11/2/2010	BF	PFM	Draft cmmts on ex ante for custom measures issues for ALJ Ruling; draft e-mail to CKM re: same	4.25
11/3/2010	BF	PFM	Revise, edit and draft cmmts on custom ex ante; e-mail to DRA	3.00
11/5/2010	BF	PFM	Final review and edit of DRA/TURN cmmts; e-mail xchgs re: same; initial review EnerNOC and Util Cmmts	2.75
11/8/2010	BF	PFM	Detailed review of EnerNOC and Jt. Utils. Cmmts; draft e-mail memos summarizing each to DRA, CKM; draft e-mail re: strategy for reply cmmts	4.25
11/9/2010	BF	PFM	p/c w/ DL re: reply cmmts strategy; draft e-mail memo re: same	1.25
11/10/2010	BF	PFM	Draft reply commtns; exchange e-mails w/ DLee and CKM re: same; review and edit DRA draft sections	5.75
11/11/2010	BF	PFM	Review and edit full draft reply cmmts	0.75
11/12/2010	BF	PFM	Final review and edits; e-mail to DL	0.75
11/16/2010	BF	PFM	Initial reiev of PD and AD on PFM; e-mail memo to DRA and CKM	1.00
11/19/2010	BF	PPM	Review Draft Resolution; e-mails to DL and CKM re: strategy	1.25
11/20/2010	BF	PPM	Draft cmmts on Drft Res.; e-mail w/notes to CKM	3.25
11/21/2010	BF	PPM	e-mail exchanges w/ CKM re: draft, strategy	1.00
11/22/2010	BF	PPM	Final edits to cmmts on draft res.; initial review util and NRDC cmmts	1.75
11/23/2010	BF	PPM	Review opening cmmts; e-mail memo to CKM re: reply	0.75
11/28/2010	BF	PPM	Outline and draft reply cmmts; e-mail cover memo to CKM	3.25
11/29/2010	BF	PPM	Draft and edit reply cmmts	0.75
12/5/2010	BF	PFM	Review and edit DLee draft of comments; e-mail memo re: same to DLee, CKM	1.75
12/6/2010	BF	PFM	Review draft cmmts on PD/AD, e-mails re: edits and additions	1.25

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
12/9/2010	BF	PFM	Review opening cmmts; draft e-mail re: new util proposal on custom measures	3.75
12/12/2010	BF	PFM	Draft reply comments; review feedback from CKM	3.75
1/3/2011	BF	PFM	e-mails re: workshop preparation	0.50
1/4/2011	BF	PFM	Review materials for pre-w/s p/c; participate in p/c w/ DRA and others; prepare questions for w/s discussion	3.25
1/5/2011	BF	PFM	Prep for and attend workshop; p/c w/ CKM post w/s for debriefing	6.50
1/21/2011	BF	PFM	p/c w/ PMiller of NRDC re custom measures	0.50
1/26/2011	BF	PFM	p/c CKM re: upcoming w/s on non-DEER and custom measure	1.25
1/28/2011	BF	PFM	Prep for and participate in mtg (by phone) on non-DEER and custom measures	6.50
2/3/2011	BF	PFM	P/c w/ JHirsch; p/c w/ DLee re: upcoming steps	1.00
2/8/2011	BF	PFM	Review DRA version of CSM, draft additions; p/cs w/ DLee re: same	2.75
2/10/2011	BF	PFM	Review DRA edits to CSM, edit; draft e-mail to DLee	0.50
2/14/2011	BF	PFM	Review ED compilation of parties positions on Case Mngmt Statement; e-mail DRA re: same	2.25
2/15/2011	BF	PFM	Further review ED compilation of parties' inputs; e-mails w/ DRA re: response options to util attachment of prior ""agreed"" document	1.25
2/22/2011	BF	PFM	Initial review PD on limited set of issues	0.50
3/8/2011	BF	PFM	E-mails re: request of others to have TURN respond on conf. sponsorship	0.25
3/15/2011	BF	PFM	Review util opening comments on PD; p/c w/ DLee re: strategy on reply cmmts	0.50
3/17/2011	BF	PFM	p/c w/ DL about reply comments	0.25
3/18/2011	BF	PFM	Review and edit draft reply cmmts	0.25
3/23/2011	BF	PFM	Exchange e-mails w/ D.Lee re: strategy on PG&E mtn resposne	0.25

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
3/30/2011	BF	PFM	Review and edit DRA Draft reply cmmts	0.25
4/8/2011	BF	PFM	p/cs w/ DLee, CKM re: strategy, process for going forward	0.50
4/26/2011	BF	PFM	Initial review of PD on non-DEER and custom measures	0.50
5/8/2011	BF	PFM	p/c w/ DLee re: upcoming comments; review PD re: same; e-mail memo to DLee re: same	1.75
5/11/2011	BF	PFM	p/c w/ JHirsch re: non-DEER and custom proj questions	0.75
5/12/2011	BF	PFM	Review and edit DRA draft jt cmmts on PD	0.50
5/15/2011	BF	PFM	E-mails w/ DL re: final edits and strategy on opening comments; initial review opening comments of other parties	1.25
5/17/2011	BF	PFM	Draft e-mail to CKM and MA re: strategy, next steps (50% to R.09-03-014)	0.25
5/20/2011	BF	PFM	Review open cmmts; review and edit DRA draft reply cmmts	2.75
5/21/2011	BF	PFM	Draft reply cmmts on PD3	3.75
5/22/2011	BF	PFM	Final review and edit of reply cmmts	0.50
6/3/2011	BF	PFM	Draft notes re: all-party mtg strategy; draft e-mail to CKM, MA re: same	0.25
6/4/2011	BF	PFM	Review materials and develop strategy for all-party meeting; e-mail re: same to CKM	1.25
6/5/2011	BF	PFM	Draft e-mails re: all-party mtg strategy	0.50
6/6/2011	BF	PFM	Prep for and participate in all-party meeting	4.25
6/7/2011	BF	PFM	Draft e-mail re: next steps after all-party mtg	0.75
6/8/2011	BF	PFM	Review and edit request to reopen record	0.75
6/13/2011	BF	EM&V 2010-2012	Review draft pre-workshop cmmts for 6/15 EM&V workshop	0.25

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/1/2011	BF	PFM	review revised PD of ALJ; draft e-mails re: same; p/c w/ DLee re: same	0.50
Total: BF				131.50
8/29/2011	BF	Comp	Review files, decisions, other materials for	1.75
8/30/2011	BF	Comp	Review hourly records; draft request	2.25
9/2/2011	BF	Comp	Draft Request, review files and decisions	3.50
9/3/2011	BF	Comp	Draft and edit request	3.00
9/6/2011	BF	Comp	Finish drafting request, review records	2.75
Total: BF -- comp				13.25
7/1/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	review IOUs data responses to ED data request re.status of HVAC programs, changes and cancellations; email re. same to A Premo	1.25
7/1/2010	C Mitc	On Bill Finance	disucssion w/ Hank Ryan re. status of CA IOUs OBF and various Off-Bill Financing; detailed discussion re. ""contractor"" issues, that is EE contractors	0.75
7/7/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	email exchanges with A Premo re. HVAC issues	0.25
7/7/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	reivew ALJ Ruling Strategic Lighting; limited review IOUs Advice Letter and ED draft chapter Strategic Lighting for CPUC long term plan	0.50
7/8/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	A Premo phone call re. various HVAC QM issues	1.00
7/8/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	more detailed review documents above, research on IOUs continued reliance on CFLs	2.00
7/12/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	discussion R Deumling additional work and analysis to complete TURN review and analysis of IOUs 60 Day Report	1.00

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/12/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	work with G Court on adjustments to her end use and lighting key measure data breakout GWH and MW 2006-08 and 2010-12 IOU EE Portfolio s	1.00
7/13/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	P/c re: next day HVAC meeting on proposal for Third Party \$60 M residential QM contract	0.25
7/13/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	review G Court data revisions, begin draft comments for MB Ang; work with R Deumling on draft data request for Energy Division to in part determine the extent to which the IOUs are still providing ratepayer-discounted CFLs to big box Wal-Mart, Home Depot, et. al.; emails back and forth with P Wellner ED re. basis of statement in Strategic Lighting chapter that residential lighting load is on peak, ask G Court to track down Pam reference to UC Davis lghting study	3.50
7/14/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	participate in HVAC meeting re. R Bacchus and other VSP contractors presentation of proposal for Third Party \$60 M residential QM contract; work on budget comparion IOUs Nov compliance and June 2010 data request response on HVAC budgets and savings	2.50
7/14/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	draft comments Strategic Lighting to MB Ang TURN; more emails P Wellner trying to track down analytical basis for ED statement that residential lighting is on peak	3.50
7/15/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	check-in Rueben re. status work product, limited dicussion	0.25
7/15/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	emails back and forth with A Premo and S Baker re. possible meeting / conf call to disucss HVAC matters including R Bacchus & VSPs proposal for Third Party residential QM program	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/15/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	review data / information from P Wellner ED re. analytical basis for residential lighting on peak; write comments and forward to MB Ang	0.50
7/16/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	limited organizing and review of key HVAC documents from last 2-3 years including CPUC Long Term Strategic Plan and CEC M Messenger June 2008 ""Strategic Plan to Reduce the Energy Impact of Air Conditioners""	3.00
7/16/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	work with MB Ang TURN on TURN comments; provide my draft to C Cox DRA, quick discussion of new TURN data and analysis	2.50
7/19/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	prepare summary document for S Baker for Tuesday ED meeting re. TURN findings and recommendations HVAC Opportunities and Challenges, including attempt to reconcile IOUs Nov 2009 HVAC budgets and projected savings with data provided in response to ED data request , conduct research / review some key documents	3.00
7/19/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	review comments other parties; respond to L Ettenson NRDC request for copy of IOUs' May 28th Advice Letter filing on strategic lighting	1.25
7/20/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	limited preparation for meeting; conference call meeting w/ S Baker, C Fogel, and A Premo, ED re. HVAC Opportunities and Challenges, consensus on need fo ED to step in and develop work plan to move issues forward; drafting meeting summary notes and action items	3.00
7/21/2010	C Mitc	Compliance	PG&E Advice Letter 3065-G A/3562-E-A: Supplement to prior advice letter implementing PG&E's EE portfolio budget and other directives per D09-09-047; limited review	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/21/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	more work on summary meeting notes and action items for ED, discussion additional HVAC issues and possible resolutions	2.00
7/21/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	notes to MB Ang re. TURN reply comments; discussion C Cox DRA re. same, additional analysis re. end use breakout GWH and MW 2006-08 and 2010-12 IOU EE Portfolios	3.00
7/22/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	quick review R Deumling draft ""TURN Response to IOUs 60-Day Report"", email back to R Deumling	0.50
7/22/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	respond to C Cox DRA questions re. IOUs 60-Day Report;	0.50
7/22/2010	C Mitc	Compliance	send AL to G Court with email re. pulling some of the data on changes in budget and savings, how admin. and non-incentive costs recorded, other areas	0.25
7/22/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion J Hirsch re: development RFP for HVAC lab work and field activity; review related HVAC documents	1.00
7/22/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	work with MB Ang TURN on TURN reply comments	0.50
7/23/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	discussion R Deumling draft ""TURN Response to IOUs 60-Day Report"" and draft attachment summarizing the key findings and recommendations from the consultants' M&V reports re. program design changes	1.00
7/23/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	continued review of R Deumling draft ""TURN Response to IOUs 60-Day Report"" and draft attachment summarizing the key findings and recommendations from the consultants' M&V reports re. program design changes	1.00

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/26/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion A Premo ED re. various HVAC matters; return phone call of R Bacchus VSP contractor re. his Third Party proposal; organize recent HVAC materials	1.25
7/27/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	respond to J Hirsch phone call re. TURN concerns / issues in moving fwd. with ED HVAC solutions process; follow-up discussion A Premo of ED	1.00
7/27/2010	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	review reply comments of other parties; forward to G Court and R Deumling with specific directions re. limited review	1.00
7/28/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	begin edits of R Deumling draft ""TURN Response to IOUs 60-Day Report""; emails and discussions R Deumling	3.50
7/28/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	HVAC working group meeting, review of real-time monitoring; post-meeting p/c w/ A. Premo ED	1.50
8/1/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	work with R Deumling on completing comments	2.00
8/2/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	more work on completing report	3.00
8/3/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	draft to B Finkelstein	2.00
8/6/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	final attachments to B Finkelstein	2.50
8/7/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	revisions; final to B Finkelstein	1.75
8/17/2010	C Mitc	60 Day Report	limited review TURN / Energy Economics filing of comments on IOUs 60-Day Report	0.50
8/23/2010	C Mitc	Whole House Retrofit	review email re. Sept 9th All Party; emails to various TURN and DRA staff re: coverage and strategy for same	0.50
8/24/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion A Premo ED re. status of August action items -- lab testing and field activity -- from S Baker HVAC meeting July 20th	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
9/7/2010	C Mitc	Compliance	disucssion P Stoner LGC Stwd Coordinator status various LGP issues	0.75
9/10/2010	C Mitc	Whole House Retrofit	review proposed agenda; emails M Wheeler re. upcoming All Party	0.25
9/14/2010	C Mitc	Compliance	emails and discussions ED re. status of ex ante freeze 2010-12 portfolio	0.50
9/15/2010	C Mitc	Whole House Retrofit	review Multi-Family working group materials and proposed report re. Whole House, upcoming workshop same; emails Heather Larson subcommittee chair and StopWaste.org	1.00
9/20/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion A Premo status various HVAC issues	0.75
9/20/2010	C Mitc	PFM	review IOUs' PFM; review B Finkelstein email re. same	1.25
9/21/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion R Bacchus third party contractor re. HVAC concerns and ""Green Net Real Time Pricing"" PPT	0.50
9/23/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	review and respond to S Baker ED proposed meeting re. HVAC and discussion topics / issues	0.50
9/29/2010	C Mitc	PFM	discussion P Lai re. status of ex ante freeze	0.50
10/4/2010	C Mitc	PFM	additional review PFM, email file notes to B Finkelstein re. suggested TURN comments	1.00
10/6/2010	C Mitc	Whole House Retrofit	prep for ALL PARTY, review materials on Whole House; discussions M Wheeler Commission Staff, Tom Conlon W House contractor to prepare for meeting	2.50
10/7/2010	C Mitc	Compliance	limited discussion C Cox DRA re. status various compliance issues including IOUs continued activity in CFLs	0.50
10/7/2010	C Mitc	Compliance	discussion M Haramati ED re. IOUs' 2010- 12 continued investement in basic CFLs	0.75

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
10/7/2010	C Mitc	PFM	conf call DRA D Lee & K Mahoney w/B Finkelstein re. joint TURN / DRA comments	0.50
10/7/2010	C Mitc	Travel	travel from Reno to SF 10/6/10 3.0 hrs; return 10/7/10 3.0 hrs. @ \$90 hr -- Whole House Retrofit	3.00
10/7/2010	C Mitc	Whole House Retrofit	CPUC ALL PARTY Whole House Retrofit renamed ""Energy Upgrade California"" ; 10-3 (.75 lunch); post-wkshp discussions	4.75
10/10/2010	C Mitc	PFM	additional notes B Finkelstein re. possible TURN comments	0.75
10/11/2010	C Mitc	PFM	conf call ED P Lai with DRA D Lee & K Mahoney, and B Finkelstein TURN, clarification of issues discussion	1.00
10/14/2010	C Mitc	PFM	review B Finkelstein first draft comments	0.75
10/15/2010	C Mitc	PFM	more review Bob draft, more comments and edits; review DRA D Lee sections, comments back	1.25
10/21/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	prep for HVAC workshop, review various materials, documents and D09-09-047	1.50
10/21/2010	C Mitc	PFM	conf call ED P Lai with DRA D Lee & K Mahoney, and B Finkelstein TURN, additional clarification of issues discussion	0.50
10/22/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	HVAC workshop ED S Baker organized w/ IOUs and TURN, presentations IOUs re. status QM / QI 2010 activities & programs	3.00
10/22/2010	C Mitc	PFM	attend PHC	1.00
10/22/2010	C Mitc	Travel	travel from Reno to SF 10/22/10 3.0 hrs; return 10/22/10 3.0 hrs. @ \$90 hr -- HVAC	3.00
11/1/2010	C Mitc	PFM	conf call TURN Bob and DRA D Lee & K Mahoney re. comments to ALJ's Ruling Seeking Addtl Information re. IOUs PFM; read ALJ Ruling	1.00
11/2/2010	C Mitc	PFM	notes to Bob re. designated areas / topics / issues for possible draft comments including ""retroactive"" and ""baseline of gross savings""	2.00

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
11/3/2010	C Mitc	PFM	review and comment Bob 1st draft	0.50
11/5/2010	C Mitc	PFM	additional reviews and comments combined TURN and DRA draft	0.50
11/8/2010	C Mitc	PFM	review TURN-DRA comments as filed, comments Jt IOUs and EnerNOC; review Bob emails re reply comments	0.50
11/8/2010	C Mitc	PPM	limited review ED Resolution	0.50
11/9/2010	C Mitc	PFM	more review Bob emails re. reply comments; more review Jt IOUs and EnerNOC comments	1.00
11/9/2010	C Mitc	PPM	more review ED Resolution	0.50
11/10/2010	C Mitc	PFM	discussion DRA D Lee re. reply comments; write up notes for Bob TURN; review Bob draft, comments	3.25
11/11/2010	C Mitc	PFM	limited review additional TURN-DRA drafts	0.50
11/15/2010	C Mitc	On Bill Finance	review materials and D09-09-047 re financing, discussion H Ryan Small Business Calif, On-Bill Financing	1.00
11/15/2010	C Mitc	PPM	more review ED Resolution; email B Finkelstein proposed TURN opening comments	1.50
11/16/2010	C Mitc	On Bill Finance	ED EE Financing Workshop 9:30 - 4 pm: commercial, industrial, institutional	3.00
11/17/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	email S Baker TURN request for de-brief and follow-up discussion re. IOUsOct 22nd HVAC presentation	0.25
11/17/2010	C Mitc	On Bill Finance	ED EE Financing Workshop 9:30 - 4 pm: residential customers; follow-up discussion H Ryan re. key / priority issues OBF	2.00
11/17/2010	C Mitc	PPM	email K Mahoney DRA notes re. TURN possible opening comments, discussion K Mahoney re. same; follow-up email B Finkelstein	0.75
11/18/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	more emails S Baker, Anne Premo re. utils HVAC presentation	0.25
11/18/2010	C Mitc	PFM	limited review ALJ PD and Grueniech APD	0.25
11/19/2010	C Mitc	Bridge	limited review ED report	0.25

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
11/19/2010	C Mitc	On Bill Finance	followu-up email to J Finningan ED re. finance workshops and materials	0.25
11/19/2010	C Mitc	PPM	discussion B Finkelstein ED's filing, TURN opening comments	0.25
11/21/2010	C Mitc	PPM	review B Finkelstein draft, emial additonal points and issues, discussion G Court re. data on breakdown of 2010-2012 portfolio costs resource and non-reesource per D 00-09-047 and IOUs Nov 2009 Compliance Advice Letter Filings	1.00
11/22/2010	C Mitc	Bridge	more review ED report, participate in ED webinar	1.00
11/23/2010	C Mitc	PPM	review TURN, DRA, and IOUs filings Nov 22	0.75
11/29/2010	C Mitc	PFM	discussion D Lee DRA re. PD and APD on ex ante freeze, discussion B Finkelstein & G Court re. same, follow-up email to D Lee DRA re. some questions and reasearch matters	1.25
11/29/2010	C Mitc	PPM	review B Finkelstein draft, emial additonal points and issues	0.50
11/30/2010	C Mitc	PPM	review TURN, DRA, and IOUs filings Nov 22	0.25
12/2/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	conf call ED S Baker, K Fogel, A Premo - follow-up to October ED-TURN-IOUs meeting w/ IOUs presentation HVAC QM research field work; review materials for DR to SCE per conf call discussion	2.25
12/2/2010	C Mitc	PFM	work with G Court on compiling results of ED's C/E TRC analysis with moderate changes to ex ante data to reflect most significiant 06-08 M&V results / best available data	0.50
12/9/2010	C Mitc	PFM	email and discussions re. IOUs revisions to ED custom projects process q	0.50
12/11/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	review HVAC file, new materials	1.50
12/11/2010	C Mitc	PFM	emails B Finkelstein and D Lee DRA re, reply comments	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
12/12/2010	C Mitc	PFM	review B Finkelstein draft; emails back and forth D Lee and B Finkelstein	1.50
12/13/2010	C Mitc	PFM	additional analysis, text drafting for comments; more reviews B Finkelstein and D Lee drafst; emails back and forth D Lee and B Finkelstein	2.50
12/20/2010	C Mitc	HVAC	more discussion A Premo re. wrap-up of HVAC issues / transition with Premo retirement	1.50
12/28/2010	C Mitc	PFM	review final decision in prep for early Jan w/s	1.00
1/4/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion L Herman & E Taylor Enalysis (3P HVAC contractor) on-going persistent HVAC issues, particularly re. Quality Maintenance	1.00
1/5/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion R Mowris (3P HVAC contractor) on-going persistent HVAC issues, particularly re. Quality Maintenance; limited emails S Baker ED Planning Director	1.50
1/11/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review ED Dec 2010 200+ page Work Plan	1.00
1/12/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review ED Dec 2010 200+ page Work Plan; write and post on energydataweb TURN comments	3.00
1/13/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	discuss w/ R Deumling how to present at workshop, represent TURN	0.75
1/14/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	limited participation in workshop via conf call line, discuss with R Deumling issues / matters at lunch break	3.00
1/17/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	post-workshop de-briefing with R. Deumling including directions on next steps, TURN follow-up for R Deumling	0.75
1/21/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion E Taylor re HVAC contractor layoffs due to PG&E program cancellation	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
1/22/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion E Taylor re HVAC contractor layoffs due to PG&E program cancellation	0.25
1/25/2011	C Mitc	PFM	ex ante data non-DEER and Custom measures discussion B Finkelstein, P Lai	0.50
1/26/2011	C Mitc	PFM	ex ante data non-DEER and Custom measures discussion B Finkelstein, P Lai	1.50
1/27/2011	C Mitc	PFM	ex ante data non-DEER and Custom measures discussion B Finkelstein, P Lai	0.50
1/28/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	follow-up email ED Z Conway re. TURN issues and concerns, request written response	0.50
1/28/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion L Herman Enalaysis re. new HVAC M&V report out demonstrating IOUs' cancelled programs should be reinstated.	0.50
2/2/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	discussion Pete Skala new supervisor ED EM&V re. TURN interests, concerns with M&V in general and 2010-2012 cycle, TURN interest in supporting ED	1.00
2/3/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	informal meeting with Zeny and staff per Zeny request for brainstorming assistance on how to make ED's EGGA website more user friendly, recommendation to borrow formatting from CALMAC (multidimensional), work through with J Tagnipas and others	1.00
2/3/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	discussion Tim and Zeny ED re. TURN outstanding questions from Friday prior EM&V workshop	0.50
2/3/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussions S Baker and M Tisdale re. HVAC issues, likelihood / ability of Quality Maint. Starting back up Spring 2011; respond to more emails from VSPs	0.75

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
2/11/2011	C Mitc	Compliance	review available information and data re. IOUs CFL program implementation to date; draft TURN data request, submit to MB Ang for filing with electric IOUs	1.50
2/11/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion L Herman HVAC consultant re. upcoming meeting with S Baker ED and J Hirsch re. QM, no programs of IOUs, L Herman requesting TURN participation in meeting	0.50
2/15/2011	C Mitc	Compliance	begin limited review SDG&E response; email to MB Ang re. SDG&E requirement of non-disclosure agreement	0.50
2/18/2011	C Mitc	Compliance	continue review SDG&E response, begin review of SCE and PG&E responses	1.50
2/22/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review notice for upcoming quarterly workshop, quick review of status of ED response to TURN questions from 1st workshop	0.25
2/28/2011	C Mitc	Compliance	more detailed review of responses to TURN data request, some analysis, follow-up DR, discussion, email G Court re. additional analysis	1.00
3/7/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review ED response to TURN Jan data request on various aspects of 2010-12 EM&V, including early M&V for high priority impact verification work	1.50
3/8/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	ED webinar re. new EEGA site redesign to more readily facilitate M&V postings, review, comments on all process and impact M&V studies and reports, interim and final, 2010-2012 portfolios, ED consultants' work, IOUs work, and parties rounds of comments	2.00
3/15/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	emails and discussion S. Baker ED Planning Supervisor re. status of HVAC IOU Programs	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
3/16/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	review S Baker email response, respond back	0.25
3/18/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	long email to S Baker re. apparent IOUs' upcoming launch of HVAC quality maintenance programs built around annual service contracts; concerns that TURN not allowed to provide any input while still at conceptual level	0.50
3/24/2011	C Mitc	I-DSM	review ED consultants' report on cost-effectiveness for I-DSM	1.00
3/25/2011	C Mitc	I-DSM	participate in workshop	1.50
3/29/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	prepare for HVAC workshop, review strategic action plan draft	1.00
3/30/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	HVAC workshop in SF; Strategic Planning Action Plan	5.00
3/31/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	discussion Luke Herman Enalysis re. IOUs' response to ED-TURN data request, in particular Q 8 as to whether there is any economic value to RCA	0.25
4/1/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	review HVAC data response about upcoming HVAC QM program; email S Baker ED back with additional questions, provide all to MB Ang	1.25
4/5/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	Monisha DRA discussion re. history and background of lighting and CFLs in particular in IOUs EE portfolios, reference documents provided	0.50
4/5/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	write-up TURN issues and concerns re. CLFs and 2010-2012 M&V and share with DRA, provide to MB Ang	1.50
4/6/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review electric IOUS lighting PIPs (program implementation plans) to better understand the types of M&V needed	0.50
4/6/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	write up TURN comments on HVAC strategic plan draft, file with S Baker ED	2.00
4/8/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	discussion w/ M Haramati TURN questions about how IOUs are implementing CFLs current program cycle; participate in lighting webinar	2.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
4/14/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	discussion w/ J Tagnipes ED's determination of HIMs (high impact measures for 2010-2012; discussion T Drew ED M&V research on MCMs (macro consumption metrics)	0.50
4/20/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	long email to S Baker re. upcoming HVAC meetings first week of May Northern / Southern CA, information TURN would like to see presented, provided	1.50
5/3/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	HVAC conf call w/ all electric IOUs and TURN and DRA to give us an overview of what the IOUs intend to present at the HVAC workshops Northern & Southern CA on Th and Friday this week	1.50
5/19/2011	C Mitc	PFM	review TURN / DRA joint comments on proposed 3rd decision	0.25
5/22/2011	C Mitc	PFM	notes to B Finkelstein re. response to his research questions for TURN opening comments PD on ex ante data	0.50
5/23/2011	C Mitc	PFM	review B Finkelstein draft TURN comments, minor notes, commetns	0.25
5/24/2011	C Mitc	PFM	review all parties comments	0.50
6/3/2011	C Mitc	HVAC	HVAC conf call w/IOUs re. status of residential quality maintenance program implementation	1.00
6/5/2011	C Mitc	PFM	respond to B Finkelstein emails re. TURN discussion and debate points for All Party	0.25
6/6/2011	C Mitc	PFM	Call in to All Party meeting re. debate and discussion of PD re. ex ant custom projects to provide suppor tto B Finkelstein	1.00
6/7/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	discussion w/ R Deumling re. ED EM&V workshop June 14th on working with DRA on establishing key issues, providing to ED and service list written summary prior to workshop.	0.25

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
6/11/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review R. Deumling draft of TURN pre-workshop comments for ED quarterly EM&V workshop, make changes, provide direction to R Deumling re. additional comments needed	0.50
6/12/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	Review R Deumling next draft TURN M&V comments, make additional comments, additional direction to R Deumling re. finalizing	0.50
6/25/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	email R Deumling re. EE goals and GHG emission reductions, how to quantify to GWH energy savings net of renewable portfolio standard and assuming electricity sector responsible for 40% of state's AB 32 GHG reduction requirements.	0.50
6/26/2011	C Mitc	EM&V 2010-2012	review R Deumling write-up on EE goals and GHG emission reductions per AB32, TURN need to assess extent to which CA potentials and goals setting process will lead to meaningful contribution to AB32	0.50
6/29/2011	C Mitc	Strategic Lighting	email Monisha DRA re. TURN CFL concerns re. overall IOUs lighting portfolio, including additional information and data to Monisha	0.25
Total: C Mitchell				186.25
7/15/2010	G Cour	Strategic Lighting	Text for Attachment to Strategic Lighting Comments with documentation of lighting breakdown for 2010-2012 and end use analysis.	3.00
7/20/2010	G Cour	HVAC	Update HVAC analysis of savings with data from November 2009 Compliance filing placemats for SDGE and SCG. Make changes to HVAC table sent by CM. Email CM.	1.00

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/23/2010	G Cour	Strategic Lighting	Email A. Gupta ED with details of data sources for analysis, links to data sources, and description of analysis undertaken.	1.50
7/28/2010	G Cour	Compliance	Review PG&E Supplemental Compliance Filing and Advice Letter filed 6/20/10. Assess and summarize changes relative to November 2009 Compliance Filing Tables.	1.00
7/29/2010	G Cour	Compliance	Analysis of 2010-2012 IOU budgets and breakdown by major budget category, incentives vs. non-incentives. Review issue of transfer payments and incentive/admin costs in 2006 Ruling.	4.00
7/29/2010	G Cour	Strategic Lighting	Phone call A Gupta re comparison of program savings and budget data for 2006-2008 and 2010-2012. Email with files from the IOUs' 2010-2012 November 2009 and June 2010 Compliance Filings.	0.50
7/30/2010	G Cour	60 Day Report	Review and edit of 60-day document draft attachment. Email CM and RD.	1.50
7/30/2010	G Cour	Compliance	Analysis of IOU budgets and budget categories. Phone call Anne Premo; phone call and email CM.	2.50
8/2/2010	G Cour	60 Day Report	Update Lighting Savings pie charts to reflect new PG&E data submitted in Compliance Filing	2.00
8/3/2010	G Cour	60 Day Report	Update Lighting Savings pie charts to reflect new PG&E data submitted in Compliance Filing; Edits to charts for 60-day Document	1.50
8/4/2010	G Cour	60 Day Report	Final edits to pie charts for 60-day Document; Incentive costs vs. non-incentive costs analysis; emails CM	1.00

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
8/16/2010	G Cour	Compliance	Detailed response to DRA request for help assessing changes in budgets and savings between the 2006-2008 and 2010-2012 program cycles; multiple emails Ujvalla Gupta; multiple phone calls Ujvalla Gupta, relatively new staffer at DRA	3.00
8/17/2010	G Cour	Compliance	Detailed assessment of changes in budgets and savings between the 2006-2008 and 2010-2012 program cycles; e-mails and p/cs w/ UGupta of DRA	3.00
11/21/2010	G Cour	PPM	Budget data table for 2010-2012 IOU Portfolios; phone call CM; email CM	1.00
11/29/2010	G Cour	PFM	Download and access files posted by ED in response to DRA/TURN data request for information on the work ED has done regarding savings parameter values, cost-effectiveness tests, and updating existing DEER. Phone calls CM, Bob Finkelstein. Web meeting and phone call Jeff Hirsch, Diana Lee, CM, Peter Lai, Kevin.	5.50
11/30/2010	G Cour	PFM	Analysis of IOU Workpapers and E3 calculators to establish the extent to which the IOUs have updated their savings parameters for key measures to reflect recent EM&V findings; email CM	5.00
12/1/2010	G Cour	PFM	Research on Basecamp IOU filing dates; phone call JH; emails CM and Diana Lee	3.50
12/2/2010	G Cour	PFM	Review of Workpapers and filing dates on Basecamp; compare DEER 2.05 and 3.02 for lighting measures; TRC data for low/high CFL scenarios in ED adjusted E3 files; emails CM and Diana Lee; phone call CM	7.00
12/3/2010	G Cour	PFM	Check Workpaper dates file; phone call CM; email Kevin Madison and CM	0.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
2/24/2011	G Cour	PFM	PGE data on deemed and custom savings - create table of data for Chris U. Email Chris U. with data and respond to reply emails from him.	1.50
7/13/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Analysis of CA electricity consumption, IOU savings, and goals from EE	3.00
7/21/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Assessment and analysis of Energy Division Consultants' Sanstad and Loudermilk and Cadmus White Papers on MCMs	2.00
7/22/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Assessment and analysis of Cadmus and Horowitz White Papers on MCMs.	2.50
7/25/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Draft MCM Comments: detail how consultants' MCM proposals overlap with CEC work; review details of CEC forecasting models and summarize difference of approach and similarities of overall data; review Itron's approach to goal setting and potential analysis for contrast with MCM approach. Phone call R Deumling (5 mins); emails R Deumling on MCM comments.	6.00
7/26/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Draft MCM Comments: sections on three White Papers and overview section on MCMs; phone call RD (5mins); email C Mitchell and R Deumling	4.50
7/27/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Add Introduction and section on changes since 2010 to Comments; review June 2010 TURN Comments and Greuneich's Scoping Memo for details of MCM history; summarize MCM approaches and history; phone calls C Mitchell to discuss revisions to MCM Comments and additions to comments (30 mins).	4.50
7/28/2011	G Cour	EM&V	MCM Comments: revise and add to Comments; draft email to C Mitchell and R Deumling	2.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/29/2011	G Cour	EM&V	Revise TURN Comments on MCM White Papers; write Conclusion to Comments; phone call R Deumling (10 mins); phone call C Mitchell (5 mins).	5.50
Total: G Court				80.00
6/30/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	revisions & expansions to TURN Comments responding to IOUs' 60-day report;	2.00
7/1/2010	R Deum	Strategic Lighting	conversation M Haramati (ED) about filing a DR to ascertain the continuing presence of rebated basic CFL in big box stores	0.50
7/2/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	review summary document of findings and recommendations culled from all 06-08 EM&V reports for themes--common findings that were oft repeated; revisions to TURN comments and incorporated these themes	3.75
7/12/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	confer C Mitchell (1hr) about expansions to draft as well as consolidating the 200 page summar of findings and recommendations to a more manageable 50 pages with text from ED's 4/15 Draft Evaluation Report	1.50
7/12/2010	R Deum	Strategic Lighting	Wrote Data Request draft on subject of continued subsidy of basic CFLs in big-box retail stores (1hr); follow up with T Drew by telephone; edits to DR	1.50
7/14/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	resume consolidating Findings & Recommendations master document down to 50 pages	2.50
7/15/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	resume consolidating Findings & Recommendations master document down to 50 pages	4.75

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/16/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	Began re-drafting TURN summary of the otherwise overlooked implications that emerge from a careful reading of the EM&V final reports, ED Draft Evaluation Report	3.75
7/16/2010	R Deum	Strategic Lighting	further revisions to DR; sent to T Drew, J Tagnipes, Z Conway (ED)	0.75
7/19/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	Continue re-drafting TURN summary of the otherwise overlooked implications that emerge from a careful reading of the EM&V final reports, ED Draft Evaluation Report	2.00
7/21/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	Continue re-drafting TURN summary of the otherwise overlooked implications that emerge from a careful reading of the EM&V final reports, ED Draft Evaluation Report	2.50
7/22/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	Continue re-drafting TURN summary of the otherwise overlooked implications that emerge from a careful reading of the EM&V final reports, ED Draft Evaluation Report	5.00
7/26/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	(.75 hrs) confer C Mitchell about revisions to TURN summary document; formatting of condensed document; proceed to revise and condense	2.75
7/27/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	continue reformatting condensed summary of findings and recommendations	2.50
7/28/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	continue reformatting condensed summary of findings and recommendations (3hrs); confer C Mitchell (0.75 hrs); more revisions per conversation with C Mitchell (2hrs); begin review of Summary Comments (0.5 hrs)	6.25
7/30/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	final revisions to TURN attachment (0.75 hrs); confer C Mitchell (.25 hrs); edits to TURN comments on 60 Day report following C Mitchell edit/format (3.75 hrs)	4.75

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
8/1/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	edits to TURN comments on 60 Day Report following conversation with C Mitchell about format and strategy	2.50
8/2/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	revisions to TURN comments on 60-Day Report, incorporate C Mitchell edits	4.75
8/3/2010	R Deum	60 Day Report	continue incorporating C Mitchell edits to TURN comments on 60-Day Report, handed over to C Mitchell	3.50
12/8/2010	R Deum	Compliance	discuss strategy around continued dereliction by the IOUs on CFLs w/ C Mitchell, revise into work assignment (0.75 hrs); begin reading various TURN comments filed with service list; review August data responses on, among other topics, the continued IOU placement of CFLs in big-box stores	2.00
12/13/2010	R Deum	Compliance	0.9hr confer G Court; 0.3 hr confer M Haramati, confer by e-mail w/ R Greenburg about CFL buydown rates in big-box stores; assemble info for CFL summary document to TURN (3hrs)	4.20
1/4/2011	R Deum	PFM	read D-10-12-054 in preparation for conference call (0.75hrs); conference call with DRA, TURN, ED, etc. about tomorrow's workshop on ex ante freeze, HIM workbooks, extensions, etc. (1.5 hrs)	2.25
1/5/2011	R Deum	PFM	confer C Mitchell (.25 hrs), check w/ J Tagnipes (ED) re. clarification of figures related to eval. savings and goals ratio for 2006-08	0.75
1/10/2011	R Deum	EM&V	researched the components of the savings goal figure and the ratio of savings to goals as listed in Table 24 of the July 2010 final 06-08 EM&V report; prepare for trip to San Francisco	1.50
1/11/2011	R Deum	EM&V	review TURN comments on EM&V workshop; consult with C Mitchell	2.25

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
1/11/2011	R Deum	EM&V	review EM&V Work Plan in preparation for Friday meeting in SF	2.00
1/11/2011	R Deum	EM&V	review GHG Decision with Macro Consumption Metric M&V project; also reviewed EM&V work plan	1.75
1/14/2011	R Deum	EM&V	all day EM&V meeting , SF, lunch with NRDC, preparation	7.00
1/18/2011	R Deum	EM&V	summarized key aspects of Friday's EM&V workshop and NRDC meeting and sent e-mails to B Finkelstein, et al.	1.50
1/20/2011	R Deum	EM&V	summary questions about EM&V process going forward to Z Conway, ED	0.75
1/25/2011	R Deum	Compliance	compile TURN responses on ARP from past year+ for M Haramati in response to her request	0.75
1/30/2011	R Deum	EM&V	outlined TURN objections to using M Horowitz paper and econometric model for purposes of framing the Macro Consumption Metric White Paper RFP	1.75
1/31/2011	R Deum	EM&V	Conversation T Drew about the Macro Consumption Metric White Paper solicitation and how it is being framed; reiterate TURN's objections to relying on M Horowitz model which we had critiqued in June/2010, T Drew requested TURN Scoping memo comments from June/2010; continued outline and draft of four-page summary of our concerns, sent to C Mitchell for review	2.75
3/23/2011	R Deum	EM&V 2010-2012	.75 hrs confer C Mitchell; revise Macro Consumption Metric summary document for ED EM&V scoping of RFP to consultants for MCM work; incorporate C Mitchell comments;	3.50

Date	Atty	Task	Description	Time Spent
3/24/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	reviewed IDSM docs; .75 hr conversation C Mitchell about IDSM in preparation for tomorrow's workshop	1.50
3/28/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	more revisions to TURN position paper on MCM for ED EM&V; sent to C Mitchell.	1.25
4/8/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	participated in Draft Lighting EM&V Webina, discussions with ED re. status of CFLS	1.00
5/25/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	Attended to remaining questions left over in Macro Consumption Metric (MCM) summary critique of Horowitz	0.50
5/27/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	final revisions to Macro Consumption Metric summary critique of Horowitz paper; sent to ED, DRA, etc.	0.75
6/10/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	extensive communication with M Ang, C Mitchell, M Ganghopadhyay (DRA); fleshing out details of EM&V comments to be filed on service list	1.25
6/13/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	draft and revise comments; confer M Ganghop., D Lee, B Finkelstein, C Mitchell	4.50
6/14/2011	R Deun	EM&V 2010- 2012	all day EM&V stakeholder meeting (call - in for me) 9:30-3pm with prep before and during lunch hour.	5.50
Attorney: R Deumling				108.45

Attachment 2:

Detail of TURN's Expenses in A.08-07-021

Date	Activity	Description
Activity: \$Cons Travel		
10/6/2010	Cons. Travel	Airfare: Reno to Oakland and back
10/7/2010	Cons. Travel	taxi
10/22/2010	Cons. Travel	parking
10/22/2010	Cons. Travel	taxi
10/22/2010	Cons. Travel	Airfare: Reno to Oakland and back
Total: \$Cons Travel		

Activity: \$Copies		
1/14/2011	Photocopies	Comments on the Workshop Summary. 10pp x 2
4/21/2011	Photocopies	Joint Consumer Comments on Proposed Decision. 15pp x 2cc
Total: \$Copies		

Activity: \$Lodging		
10/7/2010	Hotel	hotel
Total: \$Lodging		

Activity: \$Postage		
1/14/2011	Postage	Comments on the Workshop Summary. 10pp x 2
4/21/2011	Postage	Joint Consumer Comments on Proposed Decision. 15pp x 2cc
Total: \$Postage		

Grand Total

Billed

\$305.40
\$8.00
\$14.00
\$8.00
\$272.40

\$607.80

\$4.00
\$6.00

\$10.00

\$139.18

\$139.18

\$2.10
\$2.16

\$4.26

\$761.24

Attachment 3:

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:

9watts@gmail.com
ABesa@SempraUtilities.com
achang@efficiencycouncil.org
adam@agp-llc.com
aeo@cpuc.ca.gov
agarcia@energy.state.ca.us
alex.kang@itron.com
aliddell@icfi.com
ameliag@ensave.com
andrew.mcallister@energycenter.org
andrew.wood3@honeywell.com
andrew_meiman@newcomb.cc
ann.kelly@sfgov.org
Ann.Peterson@itron.com
ann_mccormick@newcomb.cc
annette.beitel@gmail.com
ashish.goel@intergycorp.com
ashley.watkins@energycenter.org
atencate@rsgrp.com
atr@cpuc.ca.gov
awatson@quest-world.com
bbarkett@summitblue.com
ben@cpuc.ca.gov
bernardo@braunlegal.com
bfinkelstein@turn.org
bill@jbsenergy.com
bkc7@pge.com
bmatulich@egia.com
bmcdonnell@mdwh2o.com

bmfinkelor@ucdavis.edu
bob.ramirez@itron.com
bobbi.sterrett@swgas.com
bobho@mid.org
brad.bergman@intergycorp.com
brbarkovich@earthlink.net
brian.hedman@cadmusgroup.com
bruce.foster@sce.com
Bruce@BuildItGreen.org
burtt@macnexus.org
cadickerson@cadconsulting.biz
case.admin@sce.com
cassandra.sweet@dowjones.com
cbarry@iwpnews.com
CBE@cpuc.ca.gov
cem@newsdata.com
CentralFiles@SempraUtilities.com
CentralFiles@SempraUtilities.com
cf1@cpuc.ca.gov
cheryl.collart@ventura.org
chris@cuwcc.org
clamasbabbini@comverge.com
Clark.Pierce@us.landisgyr.com
cln@cpuc.ca.gov
cneedham@edisonmission.com
cperkins@energycoalition.org
cpuc@certichron.com
craigtyler@comcast.net
crogers@energy.state.ca.us
crv@cpuc.ca.gov
cscruton@energy.state.ca.us
cu2@cpuc.ca.gov
cwong@peci.org
cxc@cpuc.ca.gov
cyin@yinsight.net
Cynthiakmitchell@gmail.com
dale@betterbuildings.com
darmanino@co.marin.ca.us
david.gordon@efm-solutions.com
David.Pettijohn@ladwp.com
david.reynolds@ncpa.com
david@nemtzw.com
Dbjornskov@peci.org

ddayton@cleanenergysol.com
dgilligan@naesco.org
dil@cpuc.ca.gov
dmahone@h-m-g.com
dmano@enalsys.com
dmatson@co.santa-barbara.ca.us
dmg@cpuc.ca.gov
don.arambula@sce.com
dsc@cpuc.ca.gov
dwood8@cox.net
edwardoneill@dwt.com
eemblem@3eintinc.net
efm2@pge.com
Elizabeth.DeSouza@csgroup.com
elowe@barakatconsulting.com
elvine@lbl.gov
emahlon@ecoact.org
emello@sppc.com
emily.hallett@positiveenergy.com
epetrill@epri.com
eric@ethree.com
etaylor@enalsys.com
filings@a-klaw.com
fred.coito@kema.com
gandhi.nikhil@verizon.net
garrick@jbsenergy.com
gclayborn@gmail.com
glw@eslawfirm.com
grant.cooke@intergycorp.com
gstaples@mendotagroup.net
gthomas@ecoact.org
gtropsa@ice-energy.com
hammer_chris@hotmail.com
hankryan2003@yahoo.com
hayley@turn.org
hcf@cpuc.ca.gov
hgilpeach@scanamerica.net
hhuerta@rhainc.com
HYao@SemptraUtilities.com
irene.stillings@energycenter.org
jak@gepllc.com
jane@autocell.net
janep@researchintoaction.com

jared@efficiencyfirst.org
jay.bhalla@intergycorp.com
jbazemore@emi1.com
jcelona@sbcglobal.net
jchou@nrdc.org
jci@cpuc.ca.gov
jdr@cpuc.ca.gov
jeanne.sole@sfgov.org
Jeff.Hirsch@DOE2.com
JeffreyH@hellermanus.com
jenna.canseco@us.kema.com
Jennifer.Barnes@Navigantconsulting.com
jennifer.fagan@itron.com
jennifer.porter@energycenter.org
Jennifer.Shigekawa@sce.com
jerryl@abag.ca.gov
jholmes@emi1.com
jimflanagan4@mac.com
jimross@r-c-s-inc.com
jkz1@pge.com
JL2@cpuc.ca.gov
jnc@cpuc.ca.gov
jody_london_consulting@earthlink.net
john.cavalli@itron.com
john@enactenergy.com
john@proctoreng.com
John_Newcomb@newcomb.cc
joyw@mid.org
jparks@smud.org
js@clearedgepower.com
jskromer@gmail.com
jsqueri@goodinmacbride.com
jst@cpuc.ca.gov
jtiffany@ase.org
judi.schweitzer@post.harvard.edu
jweil@aglet.org
JYamagata@SempraUtilities.com
Karin.Corfee@kema.com
kathleen.gaffney@kema.com
keh@cpuc.ca.gov
keith.mccrea@sutherland.com
kenneth.swain@navigantconsulting.com
kgrenfell@nrdc.org

kjk@kjkammerer.com
klewis@energy.state.ca.us
kmills@cbbf.com
ks3@cpuc.ca.gov
KShore@SempraUtilities.com
KWong@SempraUtilities.com
larry.cope@sce.com
Laura.Genao@sce.com
lcasentini@rsgroup.com
lettenson@nrdc.org
lhj2@pge.com
liddell@energyattorney.com
lisa_weinzimer@platts.com
ljimene@smud.org
lmh@eslawfirm.com
lp1@cpuc.ca.gov
LukeH@enalsys.com
M1ke@pge.com
magnuson.leif@epa.gov
mang@turn.org
marcel@turn.org
mary.tucker@sanjoseca.gov
matt@sustainablespaces.com
matt_sullivan@newcomb.cc
mbaker@sbwconsulting.com
mbhunt@ucdavis.edu
mboccardo@dolphingroup.org
mclaughlin@braunlegal.com
mgb@cpuc.ca.gov
mgillette@enernoc.com
mgo@goodinmacbride.com
mharcos@rs-e.com
mharrigan@ase.org
michael@opower.com
michele@boggis.com
mike.rogers@greenhomesamerica.com
mike@calcerts.com
mistib@comcast.net
mkh@cpuc.ca.gov
mking@staplesmarketing.com
mlewis@ctg-net.com
mlong@anaheim.net
mokeefe@efficiencycouncil.org

monica.ghattas@sce.com
mpa@a-klaw.com
mparsons@mwdh2o.com
mrw@mrwassoc.com
msherida@energy.state.ca.us
mtierney-lloyd@enernoc.com
mwbeck@lbl.gov
nes@a-klaw.com
nhernandez@isd.co.la.ca.us
nkarno@yahoo.com
nlong@nrdc.org
norman.furuta@navy.mil
nphall@tecmarket.net
owen_howlett@h-m-g.com
paul.notti@honeywell.com
pcanessa@charter.net
pcf@cpuc.ca.gov
pjacobs@buildingmetrics.biz
pk@utilitycostmanagement.com
pmschwartz@sbcglobal.net
policy.solutions@comcast.net
ppl@cpuc.ca.gov
pstoner@lgc.org
puja@opower.com
pwuebben@aqmd.gov
rachel.harcharik@itron.com
rafi@pge.com
Rasmussen@evergreenecon.com
regrelcpuccases@pge.com
rekl@pge.com
rfox@intergycorp.com
rfretz@quest-world.com
richard@autocell.net
rita@ritanortonconsulting.com
rknight@bki.com
rлаuman@ecosconsulting.com
rmccann@umich.edu
rob@clfp.com
Rob@ConSol.ws
robertg@greenlining.org
rockybacchus@gmail.com
RRubin@SempraUtilities.com
rsapudar@energy.state.ca.us

rscott@cheers.org
rsperberg@onsitenergy.com
rwalther@pacbell.net
Sami.Khawaja@cadmusgroup.com
samsirkin@cs.com
saw0@pge.com
sbarata@opiniondynamics.com
sbender@energy.state.ca.us
scott.bowman@csgroup.com
scott.tomashefsky@ncpa.com
sdhilton@stoel.com
SDPatrick@SempraUtilities.com
sean.harrington@opower.com
seb@cpuc.ca.gov
sephra.ninow@energycenter.org
sesco@optonline.net
sharon@emeter.com
Sharyn.Barata@ltron.com
singh70@gmail.com
skihm@ecw.org
slda@pge.com
sls@a-klaw.com
snr@cpuc.ca.gov
southlandreports@earthlink.net
srm@cpuc.ca.gov
sschiller@efficiencycouncil.org
ssmyers@att.net
staples@staplesmarketing.com
steve@greenplumbersusa.com
steven@moss.net
sthompson@ci.irvine.ca.us
susan.munves@smgov.net
swentworth@oaklandnet.com
tadolf@bpi.org
tam.hunt@gmail.com
tconlon@geopraxis.com
tcr@cpuc.ca.gov
tcrooks@mcr-group.com
TFlanigan@EcoMotion.us
tglassey@certichron.com
tim@marinemt.org
tlmurray@earthlink.net
tmfry@nexant.com

tom@ucons.com
tory.weber@sce.com
TRH@cpuc.ca.gov
twayne@roadrunner.com
TWhite@homeenergy.org
vwood@smud.org
WBlattner@SempraUtilities.com
wem@igc.org
whb@a-klaw.com
wilkinson@es.ucsb.edu
william.sanders@sfgov.org
wjp4@bpconsulting.org
wmcguire@fypower.org
wwester@smud.org
wynne@braunlegal.com
yxg4@pge.com
zap@cpuc.ca.gov
ztc@cpuc.ca.gov

Executed this 7th day of September 2011, at San Francisco,
California.

/s/

Jeffrey Johnson

The Utility Reform Network
115 Sansome Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94104
Tel: (415) 929-8876
Email: adminassistant@turn.org