

Decision _____


BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

1

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate and Refine Procurement Policies and Consider Long-Term Procurement Plans	Rulemaking 10-05-006 (Filed May 6, 2010)
--	---

**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF THE GREEN POWER INSTITUTE
AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF THE GREEN
POWER INSTITUTE**

2

Claimant: The Green Power Institute	For contribution to D.12-04-046
Claimed (\$): 204,367	Awarded (\$):
Assigned Commissioner: Pres. Peevey	Assigned ALJ: Peter Allen
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).	
Signature:	
Date: 6/18/12	Printed Name: Gregg Morris

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

3

A. Brief Description of Decision:	D.12-04-046 – Decision on Track I and Rules Track III of the Long-Term Procurement Plan Proceeding and Approving Settlement. Decision approves the Settlement proposed by many of the parties, including the Green Power Institute (GPI), for the 10-year system plan, and makes various determinations on Track III rules, including IOU procurement of greenhouse-gas compliance products. This Decision is the culmination of not only R.10-05-006, but also its predecessor, R.08-02-007 (see note below).
--	--

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 (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
4	1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	Feb. 28, 2011
	2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	Aug. 13, 2010
	3. Date NOI Filed:	Aug. 4, 2010
	4. Was the NOI timely filed?	
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5	5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-05-006
	6. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 16, 2011
	7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	
	8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?	
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(g)):		
6	9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-05-006
	10. Date of ALJ ruling:	March 16, 2011
	11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	
	12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?	
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
7	13. Identify Final Decision:	D.12-04-046
	14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	April 24, 2012
	15. File date of compensation request:	June 18, 2012
	16. Was the request for compensation timely?	

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
8	Part I A. Brief Description of Decision		Decision D.12-04-046 is recorded in Proceeding R.10-05-006, but in fact it is the culmination of two successive Long-Term Procurement Proceedings (LTPP), R.08-02-007, and R.10-05-006. Instead of using R.08-02-007 to run the regular biennial round of LTPPs, that Proceeding was used to structure the next round, which came in R.10-05-006. R.08-02-007 was closed without a definitive decision, and the OIR for R.10-05-006 specified: "Contributions made during the pendency of R.08-02-007 to issues within the scope of this proceeding may be considered for compensation in this proceeding (OIR, pg. 27)." We are claiming hours from both proceedings in this Request.

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 the record.)

9	Contribution	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
	<p>Standardized Planning Assumptions</p> <p>Developing and approving the system plans for the 2010 LTPPs was a four-year process that can be functionally broken down into two phases, the construction of standardized planning assumptions, and the development and approval of the system plans.</p> <p>The construction of the standardized planning assumptions consumed the entirety of R.08-02-007, and the first several months of effort in R.10-05-006, and culminated with the issuance of the Dec. 3, 2010 <i>Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>.</p> <p>We divide our discussion of Substantial Contributions during this phase of the process (Feb. 2008 – Dec. 2010) into three categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data and assumption set • Scenarios • Perspectives on methodology <p>1. Data and assumption set. One of the primary goals of R.08-02-007 was to construct a standardized set of data and assumptions that the utilities would use in developing their LTPPs. The GPI played an active role in the process of developing the common input set. We participated in workshops, worked directly with staff and contractors, and provided pleadings. Our specific Contributions are as follows:</p> <p>One of the principal data sources for the standardized planning assumptions was RETI. GPI Director Gregg Morris was a member of the RETI board, and helped to ensure that the RETI results were correctly applied, and not used in inappropriate ways.</p>	<p>The extensive effort to develop standardized planning assumptions is memorialized in the <i>AC and ALJ Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>, 12/03/10, entire document, including Attachment 1, <i>Standardized Planning Assumptions (Part 1) for System Resource Plans</i>, entire document.</p> <p>Please note that Attachment 2 includes a complete list of GPI Pleadings relevant to this Claim.</p> <p>GPI’s <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 8/15/08, pgs. 4 – 5.</p> <p>GPI’s <i>Homework—33% Analysis</i>, 12/02/08, entire document.</p> <p>UCS/GPI <i>Comments on Straw Proposal</i>,</p>	

<p>The GPI is a recognized authority on bioenergy use in California. We assisted in specifying the input data set for bioenergy technologies in the standardized planning assumptions.</p> <p>Also in its role as bioenergy expert, the GPI assisted in delineating the environmental impacts of bioenergy use, providing inputs for the environmental assessment.</p> <p>In 2008, when planning for the 2010 LTPPs began, the future cost of compliance with AB 32 was very difficult to estimate. The GPI pointed out that while the MPR contained a placeholder for the cost of emissions, the rate was too low to use in the LTPP, and we recommended that a range of \$30 – 35 per ton be used.</p> <p>2. Scenarios. Another of primary goal of R.08-02-007 was to construct a standardized set of 33% RPS scenarios that the utilities would use in developing their LTPPs. The GPI played an active role in the process of developing the standard scenarios. We participated in workshops, worked directly with staff and contractors, and provided pleadings. Our specific Contributions are as follows:</p> <p>The GPI urged that the Commission limit the number of standard scenarios that would be considered in the LTPPs. We recommended 3 – 5. Four standard scenarios were developed.</p> <p>The staff proposal included scenarios based on new nuclear, and IGCC development in California. The GPI recommended against including these scenarios. They were not included.</p> <p>The GPI urged that the transmission-constrained scenario should include bioenergy technologies, as well as PV. This is a case where our contribution enhanced the record, even though it was not fully incorporated. We expect to carry this issue into the 2012 LTPPs.</p>	<p>8/21/09, pgs. 6 – 9.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on RPS Planning Standards</i>, 7/09/10, pg. 8.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on RPS Planning Standards</i>, 7/09/10, pgs. 1 – 4.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on LAWG Results</i>, 12/28/08, pgs. 1-3.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on RPS Planning Standards</i>, 7/09/10, pgs. 4 – 7.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 6/30/08, entire document.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 8/22/08, pgs. 1 – 2.</p> <p>UCS/GPI <i>Comments on Straw Proposal</i>, 8/21/09, pgs. 12 – 13.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Homework on Inputs and Metrics</i>, 11/21/08, entire document.</p>	
---	--	--

<p>The GPI introduced the concept of a discounted core to be used in the development of the 33% RPS scenarios, and argued for the use of more realistic assumptions for the likely success rates of RPS projects-under-development.</p> <p>3. Perspectives on methodology. The development of the standardized planning assumptions involved an enormous amount of analytical effort on the part of staff, contractors, and parties. The GPI played an active role in the overall process of developing the standardized planning assumptions. We participated in workshops, worked directly with staff and contractors, and provided pleadings. Our specific Contributions are as follows:</p> <p>The GPI cautioned that the level of detail that was being planned for the LTPP analytical effort was not supported by the quality of the underlying data, and that the comparisons being drawn between renewable and fossil-based scenarios were not being made on a comparable basis. In the end, the effort was scaled back significantly in the standardized planning assumptions.</p> <p>The GPI critiqued the methodology that was being developed and applied to the construction of the environmental scenario. This is a case where our contribution enhanced the record, even though it was not fully incorporated.</p> <p>In order to incorporate the state's long-term goals for greenhouse gases into the LTPP process, the GPI urged that the 10-year planning horizon for the LTPPs be extended at least ten more years, at least for purposes of assessing the long-term ghg emissions implications of investments that would be made over the next decade. The standardized planning assumptions incorporated this extended time perspective.</p>	<p>GPI's <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 8/15/08, pgs. 8 – 10.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on RPS Planning Standards</i>, 7/09/10, pgs. 9 – 10.</p> <p><i>AC and ALJ Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>, 12/03/10, pg 30.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 8/15/08, pgs. 1 – 3.</p> <p>UCS/GPI <i>Comments on Straw Proposal</i>, 8/21/09, entire document.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on RPS Planning Standards</i>, 7/09/10, entire document.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Opening Brief</i>, 9/16/11, pg. 14.</p> <p><i>AC and ALJ Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>, 12/03/10, pg 28 – 30.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on LAWG Results</i>, 12/28/08, entire document.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Comments on RPS Planning Standards</i>, 7/09/10, pgs. 4 – 7.</p> <p><i>AC and ALJ Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>, 12/03/10, pg 32 – 33.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 6/30/08, pgs. 7 – 8.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>System Plans</p> <p>The development and approval of the IOU system plans was conducted in R.10-05-006. The process began with the issuance of the Dec. 3, 2010 <i>Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>, which included the <i>Standardized Planning Assumptions for System Resource Plans</i>, and extended through the adoption of the Decision, D.12-04-046.</p> <p>We divide our discussion of Substantial Contributions during this phase of the process (Dec. 2010 – April 2012) into two categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis and Settlement • Greenhouse-gas product procurement <p>1. Analysis and Settlement. Once the standardized planning assumptions document was issued, the IOUs and CAISO performed the scenario simulations, and issued their testimonies. The GPI played an active role in the overall monitoring and guiding of the analysis. We participated in workshops, hearings and provided pleadings. Our specific Contributions are as follows:</p> <p>The GPI pointed out that the approach that was being taken in the renewables integration analysis was deficient due to the fact that only currently-available technology and operations was being considered. This meant that the results would tend to overestimate the future need for new fossil generation for purposes of integrating renewables into the grid. The Decision acknowledges this bias in accepting the Settlement proposed by the Joint Parties.</p> <p>As the preliminary results of the integration analysis came in, and it became increasingly apparent that the analysis was seriously behind schedule, many of the parties, including GPI, came together to propose a Settlement for the</p>	<p>Decision D.12-04-046, <i>Decision on System Track I and Rules Track III of the Long-Term Procurement Plan Proceeding and Approving Settlement</i>, 4/19/12, Closed R.10-05-006. Our primary Substantial Contribution to the Decision was as sponsor to the Settlement, whose adoption was the centerpiece of the Decision.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Pre-Workshop Comments</i>, 8/15/08, pg. 7. GPI's <i>Homework—33%</i>, 12/02/08, pg. 4. UCS/GPI <i>Comments on Straw Proposal</i>, 8/21/09, pg. 9. GPI's <i>Comments on Integration Models</i>, 9/19/10, entire document. GPI's <i>Post-Workshop Comments on Integration Models</i>, 11/22/10, entire document. GPI's <i>Opening Brief</i>, 9/16/11, pg. 15. <i>AC and ALJ Joint Scoping Memo and Ruling</i>, 12/03/10, pg 27 – 28.</p> <p>Multi-Party <i>Motion and Proposed Settlement</i>, 8/03/11, entire document. GPI's <i>Opening Brief</i>, 9/16/11, pgs. 15 – 16, and pgs. 1 – 16 generally.</p>	
---	---	--

<p>System Track 1 phase of the 2010 LTTPs. The Settlement was adopted in D.12-04-046.</p> <p>2. Greenhouse-gas product procurement. The GPI participated in one issue that was considered in Rules Track 3 of the 2010 LTTP Proceeding, R.10-05-006, the issue of IOU procurement of greenhouse-gas products (allowances, offsets) in the soon-to-be-created market for these products. We participated in hearings and provided pleadings. Our specific Contributions are as follows:</p> <p>The GPI urged that the process of approving the IOUs' plans be made more open and transparent. During the Hearings, the ALJ admonished PG&E for over-redacting their ghg-product procurement plan.</p> <p>The GPI recommended that the Commission proceed cautiously in setting rules for the nascent ghg-product market, and not permit arbitrage, hedging, or speculation. The Decision follows our advice, and declines to authorize the use of derivatives or other financial devices, at least until the market becomes established.</p>	<p>GPI's <i>Comments on PD</i>, 3/12/12, pg. 1. GPI's <i>Reply Comments on PD</i>, 3/19/12, pg. 1. D.12-04-046, 4/19/12, pgs. 5 – 12. See in particular pg. 9, which quotes an entire paragraph from the GPI's <i>Opening Brief</i>.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Testimony</i>, 8/4/11, pg. 3. GPI's <i>Opening Brief</i>, 9/16/11, pg. 21. GPI's <i>Reply Brief</i>, 10/03/11, pgs. 1 – 4.</p> <p>GPI's <i>Opening Brief</i>, 9/16/11, pgs. 16 – 20. GPI's <i>Reply Brief</i>, 10/03/11, pgs. 7 – 8. GPI's <i>Comments on PD</i>, 3/12/12, pgs. 1 – 4. GPI's <i>Reply Comments on PD</i>, 3/19/12, entire document. D.12-04-046, 4/19/12, pgs. 40 – 59.</p>	

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

10

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: SDG&E, PG&E, SCE, DRA, TURN, UCS, NRDC, Greenlining Institute, IEP, L. Jan Reid, Communities for a Better Environment, Sierra Club, CEERT, Pacific Environment, Vote Solar Initiative, CalWEA.		

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:

This proceeding covered a wide variety of topics related to utility power procurement. The Green Power Institute has focused its participation on our primary area of interest, the renewable-energy sector and the role of renewables in long-term power procurement.

The GPI coordinated its efforts in this proceeding with other parties in order to avoid duplication of effort, and added significantly to the outcome of the Commission's deliberations. In particular, we joined with UCS and NRDC in reviewing and commenting on the LTPP Staff Proposal during the summer of 2009, and we joined with the settling parties during the summer of 2011 in developing the Settlement agreement that was adopted in the Decision. Some amount of duplication has occurred in this proceeding on all sides of contentious issues, but Green Power avoided duplication to the extent possible, and tried to minimize it where it was unavoidable.

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

11

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

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

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

12

a. 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

The GPI is providing, in Attachment 2, a listing of all of the pleadings we provided in the two Proceedings covered by this Claim, R.08-02-007 and R.10-05-006, and a detailed breakdown of GPI staff time spent for work performed that was directly related to our substantial contributions to Decision D.12-04-046. Note that, per instructions of the ALJs and staff, a number of the pleadings were served to the service list but not filed at the docket office. These served-only pleadings, many of which were highly technical in nature, received the same level of diligence and attention on our part as pleadings that were formally filed.

The hours claimed herein in support of Decision D.12-04-046 are reasonable given the scope of the Proceeding, and the strong participation by the GPI. Dr. Morris acted in this Proceeding as both witness and participating party. Attorney Tam Hunt provided legal and technical services during the Hearing Phase of the effort. We were also assisted by the efforts of three capable Associates, Logan Winston, Vennessia Whiddon, and Valerie Morris. GPI staff maintained detailed contemporaneous time records indicating the number of hours devoted to this case. In preparing Attachment 2, Dr. Morris reviewed all of the recorded hours devoted to this proceeding, and included only those that were reasonable and contributory to the underlying tasks. As a result, the GPI submits that all of the

hours included in the attachment are reasonable, and should be compensated in full.

Dr. Morris is a renewable energy analyst and consultant with more than twenty-five years of diversified experience and accomplishments in the energy and environmental fields. He is a nationally recognized expert on biomass and renewable energy, climate change and greenhouse-gas emissions analysis, integrated resources planning, and analysis of the environmental impacts of electric power generation. Dr. Morris holds a BA in Natural Science from the University of Pennsylvania, an MSc in Biochemistry from the University of Toronto, and a PhD in Energy and Resources from the University of California, Berkeley.

Dr. Morris has been actively involved in electric utility restructuring in California throughout the past two decades. He served as editor and facilitator for the Renewables Working Group to the California Public Utilities Commission in 1996 during the original restructuring effort, consultant to the CEC Renewables Program Committee, consultant to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research on renewable energy policy during the energy crisis years, and has provided expert testimony in a variety of regulatory and legislative proceedings, as well as in civil litigation.

Mr. Hunt is a renewable energy law and policy expert with substantial experience in California, in local energy planning and in state energy-policy development. He has worked with local governments throughout Southern California, in his current role with Community Renewable Solutions LLC and in his previous role as Energy Program Director for the Community Environmental Council, a well-known non-profit organization based in Santa Barbara. Mr. Hunt was the lead author of the Community Environmental Council's A New Energy Direction, a blueprint for Santa Barbara County to wean itself from fossil fuels by 2030. Mr. Hunt also contributes substantially to state policy, in Sacramento at the Legislature and in San Francisco at the California Public Utilities Commission, in various proceedings related to renewable energy, energy efficiency, community-scale energy projects, and climate change policy. Mr. Hunt is also a Lecturer in Climate Change Law and Policy at UC Santa Barbara's Bren School of Environmental Science & Management (a graduate-level program). He received his law degree from the UCLA School of Law in 2001, where he was chief managing director of the Journal for International Law and Foreign Affairs. Mr. Hunt is a regular columnist at Renewable Energy World

Mr. Winston and Ms. Whiddon are highly capable professionals who are in the early stages of their careers. Mr. Winston has a Masters from the University of Michigan, and Ms. Whiddon has a Masters from Towson University. Both are working in the renewable energy field. Mr. Winston worked for Horizon Wind, a developer active in California, for 3 years, and is currently working for a solar developer. Ms. Whiddon worked for 5 years for Washington Counsel / Ernst and Young, a Washington, D.C. based consulting and lobbying firm. Ms. Morris was a student in environmental science at the Univ. of Rochester when she was an Associate with the GPI. She has now become an RN.

b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.

The GPI made Significant Contributions to Decision D.12-04-046 by providing a series of Commission filings on the various topics that were under consideration in the two Proceedings covered by this Claim, and by participating in working groups, workshops, settlement discussions, and Hearings. A good deal of the work that we did was highly technical in nature, including developing and applying sophisticated models to the various matters that were being studied during the four years covered by this Claim. Attachment 2 provides a detailed breakdown of the hours that were expended in making our Contributions. The hourly rates and costs claimed are reasonable and consistent with awards to other intervenors with comparable experience and expertise. The Commission should grant the GPI's claim in its entirety.

c. Allocation of Hours by Issue

1. System need determination	6%
2. Environmental risk analysis	11%
3. 33% RPS implementation analysis	17%
4. Inputs, metrics, and scenarios	6%
5. LTPP work plan	10%
6. RPS planning standards	11%
7. RPS integration analysis	10%
8. Testimony, hearings, settlement, briefs	26%
9. Proposed Decision	3%

B. Specific Claim:

13

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
G. Morris	2008	206.5	\$230	D.11-07-025	\$ 47,495			
G. Morris	2009	182.0	\$240	D.11-07-025	\$ 43,680			
G. Morris	2010	140.5	\$240	D.11-07-025	\$ 33,720			
G. Morris	2011	229.0	\$240	D.11-07-025	\$ 54,960			
G. Morris	2012	23.5	\$240	draft Res.ALJ-281	\$ 5,640			
V. Morris	2009	52.5	\$ 33	D.11-09-013	\$ 1,733			
L. Winston	2010	12.5	\$ 70	D.11-09-013	\$ 875			
T. Hunt	2011	40.0	\$300	D.11-10-040	\$ 12,000			
V. Whiddon	2011	11.0	\$ 70	See comment #1	\$ 770			
V. Whiddon	2012	12.5	\$ 70	draft Res.ALJ-281	\$ 875			
Subtotal:					\$201,748	Subtotal:		

14

OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Subtotal:						Subtotal:		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
G. Morris	2012	20	\$120	½ regular	\$ 2,400			
Subtotal:						Subtotal:		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	Postage	See Attachment 2			\$ 119			
Subtotal:					\$ 119	Subtotal:		
TOTAL REQUEST \$:					\$204,367	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.								
**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.								

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Comment #1	Hourly Rate for Vennessia Whiddon in 2011: Vennessia Whiddon is a renewable energy regulatory consultant focused on advancing the development of small-scale and utility-scale renewable energy projects. She has a master's degree from Towson University, and more than five years of experience working for Washington Counsel/Ernst & Young, a Washington, DC, based consulting and lobbying organization, performing a variety of duties in the renewable energy regulatory area. The Commission has previously approved a rate of \$70 per hour for GPI Associate Logan Winston, who has an equivalent level of education and slightly less experience than Ms. Whiddon, and we ask for the same rate of \$70 per hour for Ms. Whiddon.
Attachment #1	Certificate of Service
Attachment #2	List of Pleadings, Daily Time Records, Cost Details, Allocation of Time by Issue / Activity

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

19

#	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?	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Disposition

B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(2)(6))?	
---	--

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Claimant [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to Decision (D.) _____.
2. The requested hourly rates for Claimant’s representatives [as adjusted herein,] are comparable to market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services.
3. The claimed costs and expenses [as adjusted herein,] are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable 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. [for multiple utilities: “Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay Claimant their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional [industry type, for example, electric] revenues for the ^ calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated.”] 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 decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.