

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking Pursuant to Assembly Bill 2514 to Consider the Adoption of Procurement Targets for Viable and Cost- Effective Energy Storage Systems.	R.10-12-007 (Filed December 16, 2010)
--	--

**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF The Utility Reform Network
AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF The Utility Reform Network**

Claimant: The Utility Reform Network	For contribution to D.13-10-040
Claimed: \$24,273.62	Awarded: \$
Assigned Commissioner: Carla Peterman	Assigned ALJ: Colette Kersten and Amy Yip-Kikugawa
I hereby certify that the information I have set forth in Parts I, II, and III of this Claim is true to my best knowledge, information and belief. I further certify that, in conformance with the Rules of Practice and Procedure, this Claim has been served this day upon all required persons (as set forth in the Certificate of Service attached as Attachment 1).	
Signature:	/s/
Date: 12/20/13	Printed Name: Nina Suetake

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

A. Brief Description of Decision:	This decision establishes the policies and mechanisms for procurement of electric energy storage pursuant to Assembly Bill 2514 (Pub. Util.Code § 2836 et seq.). This decision establishes a target of 1,325 megawatts (MW) of energy storage to be procured by Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company by 2020, with installations required no later than the end of 2024, and sets a schedule for procurement of energy storage. The decision directs these utilities to file separate procurement applications containing a proposal for their first energy storage procurement period by March 1, 2014. This decision further establishes a target for community choice aggregators and electric service providers to procure energy storage equal to 1 percent of their annual 2020 peak load by 2020 with installation no later than 2024, consistent with the requirements for the
--	--

	utilities.
--	------------

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)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	April 21, 2011	
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:	-----	
3. Date NOI Filed:	May 23, 2011	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-12-007	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 5, 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)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	P.10-08-016	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	November 22, 2010	
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.13-10-040	
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	October 21, 2013	
15. File date of compensation request:	December 20, 2013	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment

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.)

Contribution	Specific References to Claimant’s Presentations and to Decision	Showing Accepted by CPUC
<p>I. Targets (T)</p> <p>TURN argued that the procurement framework contain flexibility in the procurement targets from year to year to address the availability, cost effectiveness, and viability of energy storage projects in a given year.</p> <p>TURN suggested a modest approach and recommended the Commission raise the amount of such procurement the IOUs may seek to defer, or, in the alternate, that the levels of these off-ramps be reviewed again in future proceedings regarding the storage program based on the data the initial auctions provide.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that being overly prescriptive may have unintended market consequences and that some flexibility in the procurement targets is necessary. The Commission agreed that utilities should be allowed to defer up to 80% of its target MWs to later procurement periods.</p> <p>Commission also modified the solicitation schedule and agreed that the program and targets could be adjusted based on the initial solicitation.</p>	<p>Comments of The Utility Reform Network on the Assigned Commissioner’s Ruling Proposing Storage Procurement Targets and Mechanisms (henceforth, “TURN Opening Comments”), filed July 3, pp. 1-2.</p> <p>D.13-10-040, pp. 25-26, 42-43.</p>	
<p>2. Targets (T)</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments, p. 3.</p>	

<p>TURN specifically argued that utilities should be able to exceeds its procurement target in one year and allow the excess quantities to offset its procurement targets for following years.</p> <p>TURN also argued that if one or more proposals appear to offer a <i>very</i> cost-competitive solution, the IOUs should be allowed to exceed their procurement targets in a given year.</p> <p>TURN also argued that the Commission should clarify the proposal to explicitly require the IOUs to carry over any quantities not purchased in one auction to future auctions.</p> <p>The Commission agreed, stating that the requirements allow for the banking of MW to allow for over-procurement in a target year and that the over-procurement may be used to reduce the target in the following procurement year.</p>	<p>D. 13-10-040, p. 26.</p>	
<p>3. Targets (T)</p> <p>TURN argued that the framework contain sufficient flexibility to allow utilities to procure different quantities from the various use-case buckets (transmission, distribution, and customer-sited) in order to minimize customer costs and identify and procure the “best” storage resources.</p> <p>The Commission agreed, stating, “We agree with SCE</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments, pp. 3-4.</p> <p>D.13-10-040, p. 39.</p>	

<p>and other parties that there should be flexibility among all three points of interconnection to maximize and balance both developer and ratepayer value. We are persuaded by arguments that overly prescriptive targets, without any necessary adjustments, would ultimately drive up ratepayer costs and hamper the development of necessary market experience that would eventually drive other needed adjustments.” The Commission adjusted the program to allow for up to 80% of the MW to be shifted between transmission and distribution domains.</p>		
<p>4. Cost-Effectiveness (CE)</p> <p>TURN argued, that rather than rely on the EPRI or DNV KEMA models, the Commission look to the commercially binding offers submitted by storage providers in response to utility auctions to determine cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>The Commission agreed, stating, “We agree with parties that any actual finding of cost-effectiveness should only be done in a utility application for approval of storage contracts or rate- based additions, where there is a specific project and actual project inputs. Moreover, based on parties’ comments, we find that the EPRI and DNV KEMA models should not be required by the Commission as the sole methodologies for assessing cost effectiveness at this point.</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments, pp. 5-6.</p> <p>D.13-10-040, p. 63.</p>	

<p>As such, we shall allow the IOUs to propose their own methodology to evaluate the cost and benefits of bids.”</p>		
<p>6. Cost-Effectiveness (CE)</p> <p>TURN argued that a cost cap would not be necessary if the program was adjusted to give IOUs greater flexibility in procurement.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that no cost cap was necessary given the procurement flexibility provided to IOUs in the modified framework.</p>	<p>TURN Opening Comments, p. 6.</p> <p>D.13-10-040, p. 63.</p>	

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<p>a. Was the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA) a party to the proceeding?</p>	Yes	
<p>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</p>	Yes	
<p>c. If so, provide name of other parties: ORA, Consumer Federation of California</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>Due to the logistics of this phase of the proceeding, where Commissioner Petrman requested all parties to answer the same questions regarding storage procurement targets and the sheer numbers of parties in this proceeding, coordinating with all parties to entirely avoid duplication of effort and viewpoints would have been nearly impossible. TURN did, however, engage in discussions with ORA, CLECA, and CESA to understand their positions and coordinate responses where possible. TURN was one of the few ratepayer advocate groups in a rulemaking heavily dominated by utilities and interested industry parties, and, as such, provided input from a ratepayer perspective that may otherwise not have been voiced.</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):

<p>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)</p> <p>Assigning a specific dollar value to TURN’s participation in this proceeding is extremely difficult because this rulemaking was intended to create a general framework for energy storage procurement. This rulemaking established specific targets for utilities but did not make a finding on the cost effectiveness of any particular storage technology or discuss the total costs of the storage targets. Generally, to the extent that the Commission specifically invited any and all parties to respond to the OIR and participate in the discussions and workshops, the Commission may safely conclude that by speaking on behalf of residential ratepayers in a Rulemaking heavily dominated by utilities, storage industry parties, and environmentally focused groups, TURN presented important issues on behalf of residential ratepayers that otherwise may not have been addressed, even if it is difficult to assign a dollar value to those issues.</p> <p>In the past, the Commission has acknowledged that assigning a dollar value to intangible benefits may be difficult, and the Commission should treat this compensation request as it has treated similar past requests with regard to the difficulty of establishing specific monetary benefits associated with TURN’s participation.¹</p>	<p>CPUC Verified</p>
<p>b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.</p> <p><u>TURN Attorneys:</u></p> <p>Matthew Freedman: Mr. Freedman was the original TURN attorney assigned to this proceeding at the outset of Rulemaking 10-12-007, and his hours reflect time spent on the proceeding in 2011 and 2012. Mr. Freedman also provided input and</p>	

¹ See, i.e., D.99-12-005, pp. 6-7 (Compensation Decision in 1995 Storm Phase of PG&E GRC, a. 97-12-020) and D. 00-04-006, pp. 9-10 (Compensation Decision in Edison PBR Midterm Review, A.99-03-020) (recognizing the overall benefit of TURN’s participation where that participation assisted the Commission in developing a record on which to assess the reasonableness of the utility’s operations, and particularly its preparedness and performance in the future); D. 00-05-022 (Compensation Decision in the Emergency Standards Proceeding) (awarding TURN \$92,000 in D. 00-10-014 for our substantial contribution to the earlier decision, despite TURN’s inability to assign a dollar value to the benefit of our participation in order to demonstrate “productivity.” Interestingly, the Commission awarded compensation even though the emergency restoration standards may never come into play in the future, since they come into play only after a “major outage,” which is defined as impacting more than 10% of a utility’s customers. The contingent nature of the future standards did not cause the Commission to hesitate in awarding TURN compensation.).

assistance to Ms. Suetake in this later iteration of the Rulemaking, particularly with regards to overlaps between energy storage procurement framework and targets and the framework for renewable energy procurement.

Nina Suetake: Ms. Suetake was the primary attorney assigned to this proceeding after Commissioner Peterman’s Assigned Commissioner Ruling of June 10, 2013 and was solely responsible for drafting all of TURN’s pleadings. Her hours reflect the tasks required to participate in a Rulemaking with multiple parties, including reading the numerous comments filed by all the parties as well as preparing for and participating in Commission-sponsored workshops.

Thomas Long: Mr. Long’s minimal hours were devoted to shepherding the rulemaking from Mr. Freedman to Ms. Suetake, when Mr. Freedman needed to be relieved of responsibility for the proceeding due to resource constraints.

TURN Consultants

Kevin Woodruff: Given the similarity between and overlap of energy storage procurement and energy procurement in general, TURN retained the services of Woodruff Expert Services to assist with the preparation of comments on both the Ruling and the Proposed Decision. Mr. Woodruff has extensive experience with energy procurement, renewable procurement, LTTP, and resource adequacy, his input was critical in shaping TURN’s position on energy storage and the questions presented in Commisisoner Peterman’s ruling.

c. Allocation of Hours by Issue

TURN has allocated all of our attorney and consultant time by issue area or activity, as evident in our attached timesheets. The following codes related to general activities that are part of nearly all CPUC proceedings, such as tasks associated with general participation and procedural matters, as well as the specific substantive issue and activity areas addressed by TURN in this proceeding.

Code	Description	Allocation of Time
GP	General participation: Time spent on activities necessary to participate in the docket that typically do not vary by the number of issues addressed, such as the initial review of the Scoping Memo and Ruling, reading staff issued papers, review of party comments and reply comments, and reviewing and commenting on the proposed decision.	36.86%
T	Targets: Work in this category addressed the issue of energy storage procurement targets, including target levels, flexibility, off-ramps, and use-cases.	28.10%
CE	Cost-Effectiveness: Work in this category addressed the issue of cost-effectiveness of energy storage technologies, cost-containment, and cost caps.	2.42%

W	Workshop: Work devoted to preparation for and participation in workshops held by the Commission on energy storage issues.	20.24%
PD	Proposed Decision: Work devoted to the preparation of comments on the proposed decision which preceded D.13-10-040 that is not allocable to a specific issue.	3.02%
Comp	Compensation related: Work devoted to preparation of TURN' request for compensation.	9.37%
TOTAL		100.00%

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.

B. Specific Claim:

CLAIMED						CPUCA WARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Matthew Freedman, TURN Attorney	2011	12.75	350	D.12-07-019	4462.5			
Matthew Freedman, TURN Attorney	2012	1.5	375	See comment 1	562.5			
Matthew Freedman, TURN Attorney	2013	1.5	400	See comment 1	600			
Nina Suetake, TURN Attorney	2013	33.5	320	See comment 1	10720			
Tom Long, TURN Attorney	2013	1	555	See comment 1	555			
Kevin Woodruff, Woodruff Expert Services	2013	25.5	240	D.12-11-050	6120			

<i>Subtotal:</i> \$ 23,020						<i>Subtotal:</i> \$		
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 \$
NA								
<i>Subtotal:</i> \$						<i>Subtotal:</i> \$		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
Nina Suetake	2013	7.75	160	1/2 2013 hourly rate; see comment 1	1240			
<i>Subtotal:</i> \$1,240						<i>Subtotal:</i> \$		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1	Copies	Copies of pleadings for this proceeding			4.4			
2	Phone	Telecommunications related to this proceeding			0.86			
3	Postage	For mailing pleadings			8.36			
<i>Subtotal:</i> \$13.62						<i>Subtotal:</i> \$		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$24,273.62						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 are compensated at 1/2 of preparer's normal hourly rate.								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ²		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation		
Nina Suetake		December 14, 2004		234769		No		
Thomas Long		December 11, 2004		124776		No		
Matthew Freedman		March 29, 2001		214812		No		

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
-------------------------	---------------------

²This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	Daily Time Records for TURN Attorneys and Experts
Attachment 3	Expense Detail
Attachment 4	Time Allocation by Issue
Comment 1	<p><u>Hourly Rates for TURN Attorneys</u></p> <p>TURN seeks hourly rates for its staff attorneys at levels that the Commission has previously adopted for each individual's work in a given year, or at an increased level for 2012 consistent with ALJ-281 and for 2013 consistent with ALJ-287. The following describes the basis for the requested rates that have not been previously awarded as of the date of this Request for Compensation.</p> <p><u>Matthew Freedman</u></p> <p>For Mr. Freedman's work in 2012, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$375, an increase of 7.2% from the previously awarded rate of \$350 for 2011 (D.12-07-019). The increase is consistent with the general 2.2% cost-of-living increase provided for in Resolution ALJ-281, plus the first of two 5% step increases available with his move in 2011 to the 13+ years experience tier. TURN has a pending request for compensation for Mr. Freedman's work in 2012 at this hourly rate in A.11-06-007.</p> <p>For Mr. Freedman's work in 2013, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$400, an increase of 7% from the requested hourly rate for his work in 2012. This 7% increase is consistent with the general 2% cost-of-living increase provided for in Resolution ALJ-287, plus the second of two 5% step increases available with his move in 2011 to the 13+ years experience tier.</p> <p><u>Nina Suetake</u></p> <p>For Ms. Suetake's work in 2013, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$320, an increase of 2% from the rate authorized in D.13-08-022 for her work in 2012. This is the general 2% increase provided for in Resolution ALJ-287. TURN has a pending request for compensation for Ms. Suetake's work in 2013 at this hourly rate in A.07-06-031.</p> <p><u>Thomas Long</u></p> <p>For Mr. Long's work in 2013, TURN seeks an hourly rate of \$555, an increase of 2% from the rate authorized in D.13-10-065 for his work in 2012. This is the general 2% cost-of-living increase provided for in Resolution ALJ-287. TURN has two pending requests for compensation for Mr. Long's work in 2013 at this hourly rate, one in A.10-12-005/006 and the other in A.07-06-031.</p>

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

Item	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 non-financial commercial paper as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15, beginning [date], 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.

Attachment 1

Certificate of Service

(Filed electronically as a separate document pursuant to Rule 1.13(b)(iii))¹

(Served electronically as a separate document pursuant to Rule 1.10(c))

Attachment 2

Daily Time Records for TURN Attorneys and Experts

Date	Atty	Case	Task	Description	Time Spent
<u>Attorney: K Woodruff</u>					
6/14/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Began reviewing ACR on storage.	0.25
6/18/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Communicated with client about case; discussed rulemaking with CLECA (B.Barkovich) and Jack Ellis.	0.75
6/20/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Discussed case and preparation of comments with client.	0.50
6/21/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Reviewed history of storage case.	0.25
6/23/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Reviewed ACR and began outlining comments.	0.50
7/1/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Continued preparing comments in response to ACR on procurement targets and processes.	1.00
7/1/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	CE	Continued preparing comments in response to ACR	2.00
7/2/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Continued preparing comments in response to ACR on procurement targets and processes; discussed issues with client and DRA (F.Ghazzagh;S.Thomas).	3.75
7/3/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Completed and edited comments; began reviewing other parties' comments.	4.25
7/11/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Continued reviewing other parties' comments; communicated with client regarding reply comments.	3.00
7/12/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Completed reviewing other parties' comments; recommended comments to client; discussed reply comments with DRA (S.Thomas,F.Ghazzagh).	1.25
7/13/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Prepared reply comments; sent to client.	1.25
7/16/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Commented on client's final draft of comments.	0.25

Date	Atty	Case	Task	Description	Time Spent
7/24/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Reviewed other parties' reply comments.	0.25
8/15/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Participated in TURN-CESA meeting by phone.	1.25
9/3/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Began reviewing Proposed Decision; communicated with client.	1.25
9/4/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Completed reviewing PD; prepared notes for comments and sent to client.	1.00
9/12/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Discussed outline of comments on PD with client.	0.25
9/17/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Began drafting comments on Proposed Decision.	1.25
9/19/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	T	Completed draft comments on PD; sent to client.	1.50
9/23/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Reviewed parties' comments on PD.	0.25
9/30/2013	K Woodruff	R10-12-007	GP	Reviewed parties' comments on PD; communicated with client.	0.50

Total: K Woodruff

25.50

Attorney: Matt

3/9/2011	Matt	R10-12-007	W	Attendance at workshop on storage issues	4.00
4/21/2011	Matt	R10-12-007	GP	Review of comments and OIR, participation in PHC	2.00
5/31/2011	Matt	R10-12-007	GP	Review of scoping memo	0.25
6/28/2011	Matt	R10-12-007	W	Attendance at CPUC workshop	6.00
12/14/2011	Matt	R10-12-007	GP	Review of ALJ ruling, preliminary review of staff proposal	0.50
1/25/2012	Matt	R10-12-007	GP	Review of staff proposal on storage issues	1.50
7/3/2013	Matt	R10-12-007	T	Drafting feedback to Nina/Kevin for comments on storage issues	0.25
8/15/2013	Matt	R10-12-007	T	Meeting with CESA (Janice Lin) re: storage OIR issues and SCE procurement	1.25

Total: Matt

15.75

Date	Atty	Case	Task	Description	Time Spent
<u>Attorney: NS</u>					
6/18/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Read EPRI energy storage cost effectiveness report	1.50
6/18/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Email correspondence w/ Synapse to request background information on energy storage	0.25
6/19/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Read EPRI energy storage cost effectiveness report	2.00
6/19/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Review files in docket (rulings, decisions, party comments)	1.25
6/20/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Call w/ KW re: upcoming comments due	0.50
6/20/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Review files in docket (rulings, decisions, party comments)	4.00
6/21/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Review files in docket (rulings, decisions, party comments)	2.00
6/24/2013	NS	R10-12-007	W	Prep for all party meeting	0.50
6/25/2013	NS	R10-12-007	W	Review KEVA slides for workshop	0.50
6/25/2013	NS	R10-12-007	W	Participate in all party meeting	2.50
6/27/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Review cost effectiveness report	0.75
6/28/2013	NS	R10-12-007	W	Attend cost effectiveness workshop	2.50
7/3/2013	NS	R10-12-007	T	Email correspondence w/ KW re: TURN draft comments on storage	0.25
7/3/2013	NS	R10-12-007	T	Draft/edit comments on Assigned Commissioner Ruling	1.00
7/9/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Read other party comments on ACR	1.50
7/10/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Read other party comments on ACR	4.25
7/10/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Read other party comments on ACR	2.50
7/12/2013	NS	R10-12-007	GP	Conf. call w/ DRA and KW to discuss DRA position in energy storage reply comments	0.75
7/19/2013	NS	R10-12-007	T	Call KW re: TURN position on energy storage ACR reply comments	0.25
7/19/2013	NS	R10-12-007	T	Draft/edit reply comments on energy storage ACR	0.75

Date	Atty	Case	Task	Description	Time Spent
8/15/2013	NS	R10-12-007	W	Meeting w/ CESA re: cost effectiveness of energy storage options	0.75
9/12/2013	NS	R10-12-007	PD	Call w/ KW re: energy storage OIR PD	0.25
9/23/2013	NS	R10-12-007	PD	Draft/edit PD comments	0.75
9/30/2013	NS	R10-12-007	PD	Call w/ KW re: energy storage PD reply comments	0.25
10/15/2013	NS	R10-12-007	PD	Read PD and KW comments on revisions to PD	1.25
11/21/2013	NS	R10-12-007	Comp	Draft comp request	1.25
12/10/2013	NS	R10-12-007	Comp	Draft comp request	1.50
12/19/2013	NS	R10-12-007	Comp	Draft comp request	2.50
12/20/2013	NS	R10-12-007	Comp	Draft comp request	2.50
<u>Total: NS</u>					40.50
<u>Attorney: TL</u>					
6/12/2013	TL	R10-12-007	GP	Review Peterman ACR	0.50
6/13/2013	TL	R10-12-007	GP	Discuss potential consultants for case with Matt	0.25
6/14/2013	TL	R10-12-007	GP	Phone call w/Kevin re serving as consultant	0.25
<u>Total: TL</u>					1.00
<u>Grand Total</u>					82.75

Attachment 3

Expense Detail

Date	Atty	Case	Task	Description	Amount
<u>Activity: \$Copies</u>					
7/3/2013	rap	R10-12-007	\$Copies	Copies of Comments of TURN on assigned Commissioner's ruling proposing storage procurement targets and mechanisms sent to ALJ and Commissioner.	\$1.40
7/19/2013	JG	R10-12-007	\$Copies	Copies of Reply comments of The Utility Reform Network on teh assigned Commissioner's ruling proposing storage procurement targets and mechanisms sent to ALJ and Commissioner.	\$0.90
9/24/2013	JG	R10-12-007	\$Copies	Copies of Motion and Proposed Decision Comments of TURN sent to ALJ and Commissioner	\$2.10
Total: \$Copies					\$4.40
<u>Activity: \$Phone</u>					
9/15/2013	**	R10-12-007	\$Phone	Sprint Invoice 09/15/2013	\$0.75
9/30/2013	**	R10-12-007	\$Phone	Telepacific Communications phone charges invoice #50260596-0 for statement 9/30/13. One Intra-State/Inter-LATA call 2.8 minutes for total \$0.11.	\$0.11
Total: \$Phone					\$0.86
<u>Activity: \$Postage</u>					
7/3/2013	rap	R10-12-007	\$Postage	Postage for Comments of TURN on assigned Commissioner's ruling proposing storage procurement targets and mechanisms sent to ALJ and Commissioner.	\$2.24
7/19/2013	JG	R10-12-007	\$Postage	Postage of Reply comments of The Utility Reform Network on teh assigned Commissioner's ruling proposing storage procurement targets and mechanisms sent to ALJ and Commissioner.	\$2.76
9/24/2013	JG	R10-12-007	\$Postage	Postage of Motion and Proposed Decision Comments of TURN sent to ALJ and Commissioner	\$3.36
Total: \$Postage					\$8.36
Grand Total					\$13.62

Attachment 4

Time Allocation By Issue

TURN HOURS ALLOCATED BY ISSUE						
	Attorney/Consultant					
Issue Category	Matthew Freedman	Thomas Long	Nina Suetake	Kevin Woodruff	Total Hours per issue	%
GP	4.25	1.00	21.25	4.00	30.50	36.86%
T	1.50	0.00	2.25	19.50	23.25	28.10%
CE	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	2.00	2.42%
W	10.00	0.00	6.75	0.00	16.75	20.24%
PD	0.00	0.00	2.50	0.00	2.50	3.02%
Comp	0.00	0.00	7.75	0.00	7.75	9.37%
Totals per person	15.75	1.00	40.50	25.50	82.75	100.00%