

Agenda Item ID # _____

Item
Item

Item

Item

Decision ~~D.11-11-012~~, ~~D.11-10-048~~ Item
Item


BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF
Item

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Implementation and Administration Renewables Portfolio Standard Pro	Item	Rulemaking D.11-10-05 (Filed May 15, 2011)
---	------	---

Item
Item
Item

Item

CLAIM AND DECISION ON REQUEST FOR INTERVENOR
Item

Claimant: Clean Coal For contribution (formerly the FID 048)	Item	Item
Claimed (\$9,975)	Item	Awarded (\$)
Assigned Commissioner	Item	Assigned Angelis
I hereby certify that the information I have Claim is true to my best knowledge, conformance with the Rule of Practice. This day upon all required persons (as set attached as Attachment 1).		
Signature:		
Date: 12/30/2011	Printed	Tam

Item
Item
Item

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES (to be completed by)
Item

A. Brief Description Decision: Item	D.11-11-012, Item the Clean C for amendments to SCE's Item D.10-12-048, Item Created the RAM required IOUs to submit adv
-------------------------------------	---

Item

13. Identify the Final Decision	D.11-11-012, 012-0148	
14. Date of Issuance	Nov. 17, D.11-11-012, Dec. 16, D.10-12-048	
15. File date of	December	
16. Was the request for compensation?		

Yes

C. Additional Comments on Part I (use reference #)

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION (to be completed indicated)

A. In the fields below, describe in a concise manner the decision (see §1802(i), 1803 (a) & (b) contribution, specific reference final record.)

A.

Contribution	Citation Decision	Showing Accepted CPUC
<i>D.11-11-012 (CREST)</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clean Coalition petition to revise the CREST program PPA submitted comments reply comments on Decision. We submit motion after learnin 	<p>The Commission agreed to hear our motion and sided with the Clean Coalition in its final decision. summarizes (p. 2): “grants, with modifications motion by Clean Coa</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>many developers that feed-in tariff program wasn't working. Dev and advocates like Clean Coalition had tried with SCE over two years to in program, to no convene a stakeholder reform from nearly but abandoned this. This prompted the Coalition's motion decision was issued to the Clean Coalition, so our contribution in this clear.</p>	<p><i>Motion of Clean Coalition for Immediate Amendments to the CREST Power Purchase Agreement</i></p> <p>Clean Coalition's motion changes to the South Edison Company's (SCE) Renewable Energy Small Power Purchase Agreement so that small renewable have an acceptable federal cash grants under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act projects. We direct 1 advice letter to, changes, (1) modify (Date of Initial Operation Section 4.3) (Term at Termination); (2) modify Section (Term and Termination); (3) Section 12 (Assignment); (4) remove Section (future modifications) and 14.4 for modifications); (5) add new contract sections, Majeure, modification, Curtailment, and Collateral Requirements. We have certain matters regarding interconnection."</p>	
<p>D.10121048 (RAM decision) is important to the Clean Coalition was known as the referred to as such decision.)</p>	<p>the</p>	<p>the</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Made recommendations IOU data sharing requirements re interconnection 	<p>The Decision states (62): "For the initial we adopted the recommendation to require the IOUs to provide "available capacity" at substation and circuit which we define as capacity minus the</p>	<p>the</p>

	<p>and queued capacity. IOUs should provide information in map. If unable to initially, this level of detail, must be the data most detailed level of and work to increase precision of the information over time.”</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argued that requiring avoided cost bids accepted does not federal law 	<p>The decision comments on (List 38): “PG&E, SCE, and that a requirement to bid up established price set at the market a 50% premium viol federal law. They violates state law (Section 399.15(d)) which limitation the IOUs’ procure renewable energy MPR costs. They violates federal law and would require them power at a rate FIT Coalition, Solar, Solar Alliance and IOUs’ arguments about of the proposed decision, example, Vote Solar IOUs’ arguments about and contends that the arguments are based erroneous assumption that prices will exceed the states that the proposed does not violate federal it would only set IOUs’ procurement of products and the cost would be determined market mechanism. In fact, these states (18-19): the proposed decision”</p>	<p>IOU</p>

	<p>would solicit and accept all bids RAM up established appropriate and a capacity cap on the legality of this on both federal and federal law issue in this decision because the IOUs' discretion instances of market non-competitive pricing to other renewable opportunities. See details on project</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended program 	<p>The decision did not state (24): "In response to 1,000 MW cap. Sierra Club, First Solar Community College District Solar and others argue or no cap. For Alliance recommends a MW; Sierra Club recommends (with all FIT included); Coalition recommends (with minimum of 1,000 per year); LA Comm District and Vote no cap (i.e. unlimited</p> <p>The decision included (25): "Parties provide recommendations on the appropriate cap level, unlimited authorization, of ED's 1,000 MW have had mixed experience uncapped programs and adopt this expansion program limit, at least have some evidence We decline to adopt</p>	<p>the</p>

	<p>no cap. The 1, to three IOUs is provide market opportunity being sufficiently small protection against bad the absence of a requirement cap, we DRAs and First Solar nameplate capacity cap MW to be procured IOUs over the next may adjust our 1,000 time based on evidence and</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Argued for increased transparency of prices 	<p>The decision 66 “Parties present a raft of FIT Co-ops that v prices for each project revealed or the key identified by ED (i.e. provides a investment signal) will not</p> <p>The Commission our recommendations (p. expect ED, respondents, to explore all reasons make price and other widely available. At require specific information to be revealed publicly. For received and shortlisted, the IOUs to provide information: names of companies and the per company; number received and shortlisted; size, participating technologies, quantitative summary of projects passed each viability screen, and by county provided. Finally, the IOUs must information on the</p>	<p>price</p>

	project development fair all executed RAM co	
Resolution 44 RAM advice letters	켄	켄
The IOUs submitted letters to implement program and the Coalition submitted substantial comments protests SCE's and letters. Commission agreed with all Clean Coalition's recommendations.	켄	켄
Argued that auction should remain at	The resolution states Decision directs the two auctions per calendar year. In a letter, SCE requests Decision's requirement of two auctions per year. Six months after this request while SCE and Clean Coalition, and oppose it. "The resolution with the Coalition and concludes (p. 5): "The threshold auction never The first auction shall than November 15, and the second auction shall than May 2012."	켄
Argued full capacity deliverability is not required for RAM	The resolution originally and with our comments added additional nuance by deliverability to be could be secured at developer IOUs not require capacity deliverability unless the seller can deliverability with no costs to the seller. We not use achievement of deliverability as a	켄

	project selection criterion they're achieving capacity deliverability status condition precedent to operation."	
Opposed the use of upgrade	The resolution agreed position (p. 13) the estimated transmission upgrade costs resulting most recent interconnecti to the seller's proposals bids. SCE and SDG&E the transmission network cost caps from their protocols and contract."	
Argued that SCE's was not in line with D.10-12-048	The resolution agreed stating (p. 10) the parties that SCE's may provide "available capacity substation and circuit required in the Decision should provide a capacity at the subst circuit level for its locations within 30 resolution."	
Argued that any 10% higher than bid should be IOUs as reasonable	The resolution disagreed this (p. 25) purposely did not determine terms so that the their discretion based nearly ten years of procuring renewable energy through a competitive as a result, the proposal is rejected."	
Argued that IOU forecasting requirements were too rigorous	The resolution agreed in (p. 1) stating the shall work with part more standardized requirements and in limit language in the comp required by this resolution. us, however, on our	

d. Describe how you coordinated with the parties to avoid duplication or how you complemented, or contributed to the

The Coalition's generation should not be reduced for parties. Respect the duplication because the motion is for other

With respect to the Coalition's decision which the Clean Coalition is participating in (and proceeding), we would have been virtual Coalition completely avoid some duplicative parties. Moreover, the Commission has been practically unavoidable in the stakeholder groups. Are we encourage to keep such duplication to a minimum, we happen, our work served to complement the referees. In reviewing other parties' note that the defendants were numerous issues. Moreover, the fact that the Coalition's efforts numerous times in nature of summary, any incidental duplication occurred here we should be found in the Coalition's unique contributions to the process circumstances, no reduction to our jurisdiction is warranted.

C. Additional Comments on Part I (use online reference #

# Claimant	CPU#	Comment
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PART 1. REASONABLENESS OF THE REQUESTED COMPENSATION (to be Claimant except where indicated)

Claimant

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

<p>Concise explanation of how the participation bears through participation where appropriate</p>	<p>CPUC and</p>
<p>With respect to the efforts were directed at program under SCE's umbrella. CREST program and SCE was also in a way that projects. The legislative AB 1969 program was good for required that these projects are environmentally beneficial and renewable for all ratepayers and taxpayers. The benefits of these projects will be that Clean Coalition is seeking Similarly, respect to the comments on the aimed at ensuring program without overly burdensome will tell if our efforts were that our efforts are very likely ratepayers. Our requested compensation than offset by the program. We cannot know at this monetary benefit under the program. An auction program, but given by the Commission for this program ratepayers will realize good value.</p>	<p>Clean program AB program no also legislative for good for projects are renewable for taxpayers will seek Clean to the letters, program at ensuring not burdensome were that very likely compensation to the program. We cannot know at this monetary benefit under the program, but given by the Commission for this program ratepayers will realize good value.</p>

Claimant
Claimant
Claimant

B. Specific Case Attachments Name Records

<p>CLAIMED</p>	<p>CPUC</p>
<p>ATTORNEY AND ADVOCATE FEES</p>	

Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis Rate*	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total
Hunt	2010	18.25	\$315	D.11-10-040 ¹ D.08-04-010	\$5,749				
Hunt	2011	35.5	\$330	D.11-10-040 ¹ and D.08-04-010	\$11,715				
				Subtotal:	\$17,463			Subtotal:	
EXPERT FEES									
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total
Craig Lewis ²	2010	4	\$175	D.08-04-010	\$700				
Craig Lewis	2011	12	\$185	D.08-04-010	\$2,220				
Ted Ko ³	2010	9.75	\$165	D.08-04-010	\$1,609				
Ted Ko	2011	18.75	\$175	D.08-04-010	\$3,281				
Sahm White ⁴	2010	47.75	\$250	D.08-04-010	\$11,938				
Sahm White	2011	27.5	\$270	D.08-04-010	\$7,425				
				Subtotal:	\$27,173			Subtotal:	
OTHER FEES									
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES									

¹ D.11-10-040 approved \$300 an hour for Hunt in 2009 and D.08-04-010 (p. 9) provides for a 5% annual increase each year within each level of experience (p. 8).

² Lewis has 6 years experience in the renewable energy field and over a decade of experience in the telecommunications field. Lewis is the Executive Director of the Clean Coalition.

³ Ko is the Associate Executive Director of the Clean Coalition and has five years of experience in the renewable energy field, with previous experience in the IT field.

⁴ White has 12 years of experience in the energy and clean air field and is the Clean Coalition's Policy Director.

Subtotal: ₩					Subtotal: ₩					
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION										
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for	Total	Year	Hours	Rate	Total	
Dyana Polk	2011	2.5	\$73 ⁵	D.08-04-010	\$183					
Hunt	2011	9.75	\$175	D.11-10-040 and D.08-010	\$1,155					
Subtotal: \$1,338					Subtotal: ₩					
COSTS										
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount				
					₩	₩				
Subtotal: ₩					Subtotal: ₩					
TOTAL REQUIRE					\$45,975	TOTAL AWA				
When entering items, enter any bracketed text; add a *If hourly rate based on CPUC decision, provide rationale. **Reasonable claim preparation time typically comparable to normal hourly rate.										

₩
₩

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

Attachment Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Time record

₩
₩

D. CPUC Disallowances & Adjustments (CPUC completes):

⁵ Polk has two years of experience on CPUC matters, resulting in a rate of \$145 per hour, which divided by two is \$73.

#	Reason

PARTY OPPOSITIONS AND COMMENTS

Within 30 days after service of this claim, or any other party may file a response to

(CPUC completes the remainder of this for
)

A. Opposition: (see in any)	
------------------------------	--

)
)
 If (s)

Party	Reason for opposition	CPUC Disposition
)))
)))

)
)
)

B. Comment Period: (new) waived (see Rule 16(d)(6)) (Y/N)?	
--	--

)
)
 If (s)

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition
)))
)))

)
)
)

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to
2. The claimed fees and costs [as adjusted herein,] to experts and advocates having comparable training and similar res.
3. The total of reasonable contribution is \$_____.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

VERIFICATION

I am an attorney duly qualified in the authorized to make verification on its behalf. I am informed and believe the foregoing pleadings are true

I declare under penalty of perjury and affirmation that I have Executed this document on 11/20/2011, at Santa Barbara, California

Tamara



Attorney for Co