

**FORM B: BLANK INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM**

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Integrate and Refine Procurement Policies and Consider Long-Term Procurement Plans	Rulemaking 12-03-014 (Filed March 22, 2012)
--	--

**INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA**

Claimant: Sierra Club California ("Sierra Club or Club")	For contribution to Decisions D.13-02-015, D.14-02-040, and D.14-03-004
Claimed: \$ 432,447.50	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 1).	
Signature:	s/ William Rostov
Date: 05/13/14	Printed Name: William Rostov

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

<b>A. Brief Description of Decision:</b>	<p>The Track 1 Decision (D.13-02-015) authorizes Southern California Edison (SCE) to procure local capacity resources in the LA Basin. It establishes a minimum procurement target of 1400 MW, and a maximum of 1800 MW. The decision requires SCE to procure 150 MW of preferred resources, 50 MW of energy storage resources, and at least 1000 MW of conventional gas-fired resources. The decision limited the procurement of gas-fired resources to 1,200 MW and authorized up to 600 of additional preferred and energy storage resources.</p> <p>Following the Track 1 proceedings, the Track 4 Decision (D.14-03-004) also addressed local capacity requirements in Southern California. It authorizes SCE and San Diego Gas &amp; Electric (SDG&amp;E) to procure energy resources by 2022</p>
--	---

	<p>due to local capacity needs resulting from the closure of the San Onofre Nuclear Generation Station (SONGS). SCE is authorized to procure 500-700 MW, including at least 400 MW of preferred resources, and SDG&amp;E is authorized to procure 500-800 MW, including at least 200 MW of preferred resources. Both SCE and SDG&amp;E have the option to procure preferred resources for the entire amount authorized.</p> <p>In parallel, the Track 3 Decision (D.14-02-040) reaffirmed the Commission’s commitment to California’s greenhouse gas goals and the loading order and addressed transparency issues. The decision made change to some procurement rules. For example, it shields departing load from any responsibility for investor owned utilities’ (IOUs’) stranded costs, adds new definitions for “incremental capacity,” “upgraded plants,” and “repowered plants.”</p>
--	--

**B. Claimant must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812:**

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	April 18, 2012	
2. Other Specified Date for NOI:		
3. Date NOI Filed:	May 18, 2012	
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
<b>Showing of customer or customer-related status (§ 1802(b)):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-12-007	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 5, 2011, pp. 8-9	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.13-10-068, p. 2; D.13-12-027, p. 1	
8. Has the Claimant demonstrated customer or customer-related status?		
<b>Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§ 1802(g)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	R.10-12-007	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	July 5, 2011, pp. 8-9	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	D.13-10-068, p. 3; D.13-12-027, p. 2	
12. Has the Claimant demonstrated significant financial hardship?		

Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.14-03-004	
14. Date of Issuance of Final Order or Decision:	March 14, 2014	
15. File date of compensation request:	May 13, 2014	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
	Sierra Club		Sierra Club California (“Sierra Club” or “Club”) is a grassroots environmental organization interested in implementing measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase reliance on renewable energy sources. The Club’s interest in this proceeding is not related to any business interest. The Club receives funding for environmental advocacy from many sources, including philanthropic donations, member contributions and other sources. The Club has entered into agreements with certain residential rooftop solar installers that will likely result in a small amount of additional funding. However, the Club’s involvement in the present proceeding is completely independent and unrelated to those small amounts of funding.

**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><b>Track 1</b></p> <p>1. <u>CAISO studies overinflate the LCR need.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that the CAISO’s OTC studies overstated need. In particular, CAISO’s preferred approach, the Trajectory scenario, significantly overstated need, because the studies made unreasonable policy assumptions about preferred resources.</p> <p>Sierra Club argued that a better approach would be accounting</p>	<p>“CAISO’s high LCR need proposal suffers from multiple flaws. First, CAISO uses unrealistic input assumptions to justify a higher than necessary LCR need. CAISO then asserts that uncommitted energy efficiency and CHP as well as incremental demand response should not be considered for local reliability purposes. CAISO zeros out all three of these categories. CAISO’s policy decision to count these resources as zero for LCR need, but then still argue that</p>	

<p>for overlooked preferred resources including those in the environmental sensitivity scenario.</p> <p>Although the Commission used CAISO’s trajectory study in the final decision, it refused to adopt CAISO’s policy position of zero for certain preferred resources, and adjusted the need number downward for these resources. Although the Commission did not adopt Sierra Club’s position of zero need, Sierra Club’s made a substantial contribution.</p>	<p>these resources are important for the system undermines CAISO’s credibility.” Opening Brief of Sierra Club California on Track 1 Issues (“Track 1 Op. Br.”), pp. 6-7. <i>See also</i> Track 1 Op. Br., p. 1, Summary of Recommendations, Nos. 1-4; Reply Brief of Sierra Club California on Track 1 Issues, pp. 2-4.</p> <p>Sierra Club and other groups “all contend that the ISO local capacity methodology should not have excluded significant amounts of uncommitted energy efficiency, CHP, demand response and energy storage. D.13-02-015, p. 29.</p> <p>“CAISO presents the Commission with only two options from which to determine LCR need: the CAISO recommendation and the sensitivity study. CAISO aggressively advocates for its LCR study, but as discussed above, of the two options the sensitivity study more realistically recognizes that preferred resources play a significant role in reducing LCR need. Thus, the sensitivity study is the better starting point--albeit still overly conservative--for the LCR need analysis.” Track 1 Op. Br, p. 20.</p> <p>“We agree with the ISO, SCE and others that the Trajectory scenario is appropriate for determining LCR needs. However, we have determined herein that it is appropriate to reduce the ISO forecasts to account for the likelihood that 828 MW of uncommitted energy efficiency and CHP will exist, and that at least 200 MW of locally-dispatchable demand response will exist. D.13-02-015, p. 65.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, p. 118.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, Findings of Fact #16, p. 121.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>D.13-02-015, Finding of Fact #28, p. 123.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, Finding of Fact #31, p. 123-24.</p>	
<p><u>2. Adherence to the Loading Order</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that the Loading Order required that any LCR need should account for the preferred resources not counted by CAISO, and should not allow an over procurement of conventional gas-fired generation. In addition, any LCR need identified in Track 1 should be met with preferred resources, in compliance with the Loading Order.</p> <p>In the final decision, the Commission included additional preferred resources that were not modeled in CAISO’s studies. In addition, while it did allow procurement of conventional resources, it authorized, for the first time, required procurement of 150 of preferred resources and the potential additional procurement 600 MW.</p>	<p>“Sierra Club contends that the ISO’s models ‘turn the Loading Order upside down by creating a framework that favors conventional generation over preferred resources.’” D.13-02-015, p. 76; see (Track 1 Op. Br, p 5 [“CAISO’s recommendations endorse the procurement of natural gas plants to meet this need . . . .”].)</p> <p>“If a LCR need is found, the LCR need should be met by scrupulous compliance with the loading order and California’s other clean energy policies. There is no dispute that the loading order is the ultimate energy policy for the state.” Track 1 Op. Br, p. 26; see also pp. 26-28, 13-16.</p> <p>“By assuming higher levels for these resources than the ISO, we are promoting the policies of the Loading Order, and reducing the anticipated LCR need.” D.13-02-015, p. 78.</p> <p>“At least 150 MW of capacity must be procured through preferred resources consistent with the Loading Order in the Energy Action Plan, or energy storage resources. SCE is also authorized to procure up to an additional 600 MW of capacity from preferred resources and/or energy storage resources.” D.13-02-015, p. 2.</p>	
<p><u>3. Demand response used to reduce LCR need</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that CAISO’s failure to include demand response in the modeling was unreasonable.</p>	<p>“The PD recognizes that, contrary to ISO assumptions, energy efficiency and distributed generation will affect LCR need in the LA Basin, but does not apply the same logic to its discussion of demand response. The PD should reflect the fact that demand response is</p>	

<p>Sierra Club asserted that it was reasonable to count reductions from existing demand response programs, and to expect that future programs would reduce LCR demand.</p> <p>The Commission found that even though the ISO did not study the impact of demand response on local capacity requirements, demand response will still likely be an important resource moving forward. The Commission included an assumption of 200 MW of demand response, which was lower than what Sierra Club advocated, but it set the important precedent of including demand response in LCR need calculations rather than adopting CAISO's proposal of zero.</p>	<p>currently in operation in the LA Basin, is expected to grow, and will affect LCR need in the area.” Sierra Club Comments on Proposed Decision Authorizing Procurement for Local Capacity Requirements, p. 7</p> <p>“CAISO’s sensitivity analysis also fails to consider estimates of future demand response resources in the LA Basin.” Track 1 Op. Br, 21, <i>see also</i> pp. 10-11, 20-22.</p> <p>“We agree with parties who contend that demand response resources are likely to be able to provide capabilities which should reduce LCR needs recommended by the ISO...it is reasonable to assume that some amount of demand response resources will be located in the LA basin, be locally dispatchable, and available to meet LCR needs by 2020.” D.13-02-015, p. 55.</p> <p>Justification for addition of 200 MW of dispatchable demand: “[s]ince there appears to be at least 100 MW of demand response in the most effective locations now in the LA Basin (and 549 MW of total demand response resources now in that area), by 2020 it is likely that the actual amount available to reduce LCR needs in the LA Basin will be significantly higher.” D.13-02-015, p. 56.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, p. 65, 66</p> <p>D. 13-02-015, Findings of Fact #17-18, p. 121.</p> <p>D. 13-02-015, p. 128, Conclusion of Law #7.</p>	
<p>4. <u>Using energy efficiency assumption in CAISO’s environmental scenario as a basis for reducing local capacity need determination.</u></p>	<p>“CAISO’s critique of the state agencies’ proposed assumptions used in the sensitivity analysis should be dismissed as unreasonable.” Track 1 Op. Br, p. 14.</p> <p>Commission agrees that uncommitted</p>	

<p>Sierra Club argued that the assumptions used in the sensitivity analysis were appropriate and based on reliable estimates from state agencies. The Commission agreed that the sensitivity analysis provided a reasonable estimate of uncommitted energy efficiency.</p>	<p>energy efficiency estimate in the sensitivity analysis should reduce LCR need. D.13-02-015, p. 51. D.13-02-015, Finding of Fact #29, p. 123.</p>	
<p>5. <u>Uncommitted energy efficiency used to reduce LCR need</u></p> <p>Sierra Club challenged CAISO’s assertion that uncommitted energy efficiency was not reliable and that it should not be included in the trajectory scenario.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that uncommitted energy efficiency can reasonably be included in energy efficiency estimates.</p> <p>The Commission included 100% of uncommitted energy efficiency.</p>	<p>“Uncommitted EE should be included in planning exercises, and should be analyzed as a potential strategy for decreasing LCR need...the California Energy Commission [CEC] defines uncommitted EE as EE programs that are ‘reasonably expected to occur.’” Opening Brief of Sierra Club California on Track I Issues, p. 15.</p> <p>“We have no doubt that the California Public Utilities Commission, CEC and federal programs and standards incorporated into uncommitted energy efficiency amounts will occur, as these are already in place. We find that amounts of uncommitted energy efficiency in programs and standards already approved by this Commission and other agencies, but not yet in the demand forecast used by the ISO, should result in adjustments to demand forecasts for the purpose of authorizing LCR procurement levels.” D.13-02-015, pp. 48-49.</p> <p>Commission includes uncommitted energy efficiency as a resource that can reduce need. D.13-02-015, p. 65.</p> <p>D. 13-02-015, Findings of Fact #14-16. p. 121.</p> <p>D. 13-02-015, Conclusion of Law #6, p. 127.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Combined heat and power (CHP) used to reduce LCR</u></p>	<p>Sierra Club cites a report commissioned by the California Energy Commission</p>	

<p><u>need</u></p> <p>Sierra Club challenged CAISO’s rationale for excluding uncommitted CHP from its LCR analysis.</p> <p>The Commission included 100% of the uncommitted CHP in the sensitivity study. This inclusion, along with the uncommitted energy efficiency estimated, lowered LCR need by approximately 800 MW. As a result, the Commission found that the ISO procurement recommendations were higher than necessary.</p>	<p>that details projected CHP growth of 1.5 GW in California through 2020. Sierra Club also argued that CAISO’s witness, Mr. Sparks, was overly conservative and ignored state policy goals when he dismissed CHP growth. Track 1 Op. Br, p. 15.</p> <p>“[I]t is reasonable to assume that some amount of uncommitted CHP will come to fruition in the LA basin local area before 2021...As with uncommitted energy efficiency, we are convinced that the ISO should have included some projection of uncommitted CHP into its models.” D.13-02-015, p. 59.</p> <p>Commission inclusion of all uncommitted CHP. D.13-02-015, p. 65-66.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, Findings of Fact #19-21, p. 122.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, Conclusion of Law #6 p. 127.</p>	
<p>7. <u>50 MW energy storage requirement remaining in the final decision</u></p> <p>Sierra Club supported the Commission’s inclusion of a first of a kind energy storage procurement of 50 MW. The Commission kept the 50 MW energy storage requirement even after receiving dissenting opening and reply comments from parties.</p>	<p>“The ‘modest’ 50 MW energy storage procurement is an essential start to integrating energy storage into the California electric system.” Reply Comments of Sierra Club California on Proposed Decision Authorizing Procurement for Local Capacity Requirements, p. 4; <i>see also</i> Opening Comments on PD, p. 5 and fn. 15.</p> <p>D.13-02-015, p. 62.</p> <p>The Commission also edited Conclusion of Law #9 (formerly Conclusion of Law #7) to explicitly mention energy storage, as recommended by Sierra Club: “Up to 600 MW of capacity may be from preferred resources or energy storage <b>resources</b> (in addition to resources already authorized or required to be obtained via Commission decisions in energy efficiency, demand response, RPS, energy storage and other relevant docket), subject to the maximum</p>	



	<p>procurement level.” D.13-02-015, p. 128 (emphasis added); cf. Opening Comments on PD, pp. 4-5 and fn. 15.</p>	
<p>8. <u>Highlighting the consequences of over-procurement</u></p> <p>While CAISO and other parties argued that under-procurement was a greater threat to California than over-procurement, Sierra Club explained the serious consequences that over-procurement would have on our energy system, our environment, and public health.</p> <p>The Commission agreed with many of those concerns and included them in the Findings of Fact of the final decision.</p>	<p>Track 1 Op. Br, p. 12; Reply Brief, pp. 13-15.</p> <p>“Over-procurement entails risks of excessive costs and unnecessary environmental degradation. It is not possible to quantify whether the risks of over- or under-procurement are greater.” D.13-02-015, Finding of Fact #7, p. 120.</p> <p>“A maximum LCR procurement level will protect ratepayers from excessive costs resulting from potential over-procurement.” D.13-02-015, Finding of Fact #32, p. 124.</p>	
<p>9. <u>Development of factual record during cross-examination</u></p> <p>The Sierra Club cross-examined 7 witnesses during evidentiary hearings. These witnesses represented PG&amp;E, CAISO, and SCE. Facts elucidated during these cross-examinations contributed to the record and were cited in D.13-02-015.</p>	<p>The following excerpts from the decision cite cross-examination by William Rostov, representing the Sierra Club:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ffi “The Trajectory scenario forecasts a need for 2370 MW in the LA basin local area, which Sparks rounds up to 2400 MW.” D.13-02-015, p. 21.</li> <li>ffi “Sparks testified that it is necessary to begin the procurement process for 2021 local capacity needs in 2013 ‘to ensure we don’t forgo the best options, and also to make sure that the options that are available are actually feasible.’” D.13-02-015, p. 22.</li> <li>ffi “ISO witness Millar agrees that if reliability needs are met through natural gas generation,</li> </ul>	

	<p>but more distributed generation occurs than the ISO forecasts, this would increase ratepayer costs (although he contends ‘that is a consequence of having to move forward in the face of uncertainty.’)” D.13-02-015, pp. 37-38.</p> <p>ffi “However, [Millar] testified that ‘we don’t know’ if energy storage can meet ISO technical characteristics in the next ten years.” D.13-02-015, p. 61.</p> <p>ffi “The ISO does not assume any particular technology would be required to fill the local capacity needs, according to ISO witness Sparks: ‘As long as the resources are in the location where they are needed in these local areas, and they have characteristics of gas-fired generation, I don’t believe the ISO has a preference on exactly what type of resources.’” D.13-02-015, pp. 73-74.</p> <p>ffi “Referring to distributed generation, Sparks suggested that further study would be needed ‘to the extent that some of these nonflexible resources are very large, and these large magnitudes are meeting local needs...we would probably need to study all seasons and all load levels to ensure the system can continue...to reliably operate.’” D.13-02-015, p. 74.</p> <p>ffi “SCE estimates that it would take anywhere from one to two years after today’s decision before SCE can submit an application to the Commission with final LCR procurement contracts for Commission</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>approval, after procurement solicitations, bilateral negotiations and studies for preferred resources.” D.13-02-015, p. 92.</p>	
<p><b>Track 4</b></p> <p>1. <u>CAISO’s study overestimates LCR need.</u></p> <p>The Sierra Club argued that record demonstrated that the LCR need should be zero or significantly lower than the result of CAISO’s model, due to overly conservative assumptions about preferred resources, energy storage, transmission, and the demand forecast. Sierra Club also argued that SCE’s preferred resources scenario, when revised to include the Mesa Loop-In, showed that there was no need in the SONGS area.</p> <p>Although the Commission based its procurement authorization on CAISO’s studies, the decision does consider adjustments to the study results.</p>	<p>“Although the modeling using these assumptions cannot be rerun, the Commission can make changes to the need analysis on the back-end, similar to the approach in Track 1 where certain resources were subtracted from the need projected by the modeling.” Post-Hearing Opening Brief of Sierra Club California in Track 4 (“Track 4, Op. Br.”) p. 4; see also pp. 3-17.</p> <p>“In its Track 1 decision, the Commission increased estimates for EE and CHP resources in response to overly conservative CAISO estimates, and should do the same for DR and PV in this track.” Reply Brief of Sierra Club California in Track 4, p. 10; see also pp. 9-12.</p> <p>“In this decision, we evaluate potential modifications to the ISO’s study results. The ISO agrees that its study results do not include a number of supply and demand considerations that would reduce the total LCR need.” D.14-03-004, p. 28.</p> <p>In discussing preferred resources, energy storage and transmission, solutions, the Commission stated that “at least some of which are reasonably likely to be procured in the SONGS study area by 2022 outside of this procurement proceeding . . . . We find that it is unreasonable to assume that <u>none</u> of these resources will be procured and able to meet local reliability needs in the SONGS service area by 2022. D.14-03-004, p. 70.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, p. 79.</p>	

<p>2. <u>Promoting use of preferred resources to meet any identified need in the SONGS area.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that if any need were identified in the SONGS area, it could be met by preferred resources. Sierra Club asked for an RFO focused on preferred resources only, to ensure that preferred resources are procured. Sierra Club noted that the procurement authorization proposed by SCE could unfairly benefit conventional resources.</p> <p>By providing all-source RFOs for SCE and SDG&amp;E, the Commission acknowledged the importance of preferred resources being able to fairly compete to meet need in the SONGS area. The decision contained a procurement authorization that allowed utilities to procure 100% preferred resources to meet need, and required that SCE and SDG&amp;E procure at least 400 MW and 200 MW of preferred resources, respectively.</p>	<p>“The unexpected retirement of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (“SONGS”) has prompted calls for building new gas-fired power plants as replacement generation. New gas plants are extremely costly, would exacerbate the region’s air pollution and corresponding impacts to public health, and would undermine California’s climate targets by replacing a carbon-free energy source with carbon-intensive generation. . . . Because eliminating fossil fuel generation is an important component of improving the notoriously poor air quality in the Los Angeles Basin, the State, when considering potential replacements for SONGS, should first examine the best available information on the need for new generation and then identify clean energy solutions to meet that need.” Track 4, Op. Br., pp. 1-2; see also pp. 26-27.</p> <p>Sierra Club and other parties “urge that any procurement authorized by the Commission should include preferred resources only.” D.14-03-004, p. 87.</p> <p>“If the SDG&amp;E request is granted as is, SDG&amp;E can potentially fill its “supposed” LCR need with about 900 MW of natural gas in total. The Commission should not sanction such a result, which is inconsistent with the Track 1 decision. Although SCE has put forward the laudable Living Pilot to procure preferred resources, SCE is also requesting to design its Track 4 authorization in a manner that would make natural gas plants more competitive. This is contrary to the Commission holding in the last LTPP that requires maximum use of preferred resources to comply with the loading order.” Reply Brief of Sierra Club California in Track 4, p. 20; see all pp.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>18-20.</p> <p>In testimony given during Sierra Club cross-examination, SCE witness Cushnie states that a procurement authorization of 500-700 MW would allow gas fired resources to compete with some MW available for preferred resources, while a smaller procurement authorization would advantage preferred resources. Reporter's Transcript, Vol. 13, p. 1969, ln. 8 – 1970, ln. 4.</p> <p>“Parties including Sierra Club . . . share a concern that if the Commission adopts SCE's procurement proposals, only gas-fired resources will win, regardless of SCE's intent to pursue preferred resources solutions. These parties recommend that the Commission, if it authorizes any additional Track 4 LCR procurement, require the utilities to first seek to satisfy that additional need with preferred resources. D.14-03-004, p. 109.</p> <p>“Assuming SCE pursues a least-cost/best-fit approach to the increased discretionary portion of procurement authority<sup>192</sup> (the additional 500 – 700 MW), it is likely that SCE would procure mostly gas-fired resources if such resources are less costly than preferred resources. From a ratepayer perspective, this may be beneficial; however, the Loading Order calls for prioritization of cost-effective preferred resources, in some cases even if they are more expensive than other resources.</p> <p>We will modify SCE's proposal to ensure that SCE procures a higher percentage of authorized resources from preferred resources and energy storage. For SCE (and SDG&amp;E as delineated below), we will not require any specific incremental procurement from gas-fired resources. This means that all incremental procurement as a result of</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>this decision may be from preferred resources.” D.14-03-004, p. 93</p> <p>D.14-03-004, pp. 2, 92-93, 112.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, Conclusion of Law #3, p. 135.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, Conclusions of Law #42, 44, p. 140</p>	
<p>3. <u>Demand response resources should reduce LCR Need.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that 1,000 MW of second contingency demand response should have been included in CAISO’s modeling and that alternatively at least the demand response resources identified by SCE witness Silsbee should reduce LCR need.</p> <p>The Commission rejected Sierra’s Club’s second contingency argument, but found that the DR resources identified by SCE do serve as a “directional indicator” to suggest that the full amount of need identified in the ISO studies was too high.</p>	<p>“Even if the Commission decides not to factor the entire 997 MW of DR . . . into the final decision, some portion of those resources greater than the first contingency resources modeled by CAISO should be included, as exemplified in SCE’s need analysis. SCE witness Silsbee stated that SCE, like CAISO, found the second contingency concept to be challenging; unlike CAISO, however, SCE chose to model some demand response resources when assessing need.” Track 4 Op. Br., p. 10; see pp. 8-11.</p> <p>“We will not modify the ISO’s LCR analysis based on ‘second contingency’ demand resources. However, the expectation of over hundreds of MWs of ‘second contingency’ demand response resources identified by the revised Scoping Memo cannot be disregarded. SCE’s model assumed that some of this demand response would be available to meet LCR needs.” D.14-03-004, p. 57.</p> <p>“We do find that there is a reasonable likelihood that more demand response resources will be available for such purposes in the future. While we cannot quantify the LCR effect of such potential demand response resources, we conclude that it is reasonable to consider this potential as a directional indicator. In other words, this gives us more confidence that it is not necessary at this time to authorize the utilities to</p>	

	<p>procure all of the resources indicated to be necessary in the ISO’s study.” D.14-03-004, p. 58.</p>	
<p>4. <u>Energy storage resources should reduce LCR Need.</u>                  Sierra Club argued that the energy storage required under the recent energy storage decision should be a factor in reducing LCR need.                   The Commission did not directly discount the procurement, but it did recognize that the energy storage decision makes it more likely that the procurement authorization should be less than the total need identified in the ISO studies.</p>	<p>“The Decision in Track 4 Should Account for the Commission’s Energy Storage Mandates.” Track 4, Op. Br, pp 11-14; see also Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on ALJ Gamson’s Questions from the September 4, 2013 Prehearing Conference, pp. 8-10.                   “While we cannot quantify the LCR effect of potential energy storage resources, we conclude that it is reasonable to consider this potential as a directional indicator. In other words, this gives us more confidence that it is not necessary at this time to authorize the utilities to procure all of the resources indicated to be necessary in the ISO’s study.” D.14-03-004, p. 61                  D.14-03-004, Finding of Fact #50, p. 129.                   D.14-03-004, Conclusion of Law #21, p. 137.</p>	
<p>5. <u>New demand forecast lowers LCR need</u>                   The CEC released an updated demand forecast during Track 4, which showed a decrease in projected future energy demand. Sierra Club argued that, based on this forecast, the Commission should decrease LCR need in the SONGS area.                   The Commission found that the updated demand forecast was another “directional indicator” showing that the need identified in the ISO studies is likely too high.</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on ALJ Gamson’s Questions from the September 4, 2013 Prehearing Conference, p. 7.                   Track 4 Op. Br., p. 15-16.                   “We find based on the record that updates to the demand forecast are reasonably likely to lower LCR needs. Without quantifying the LCR effect of such potential demand response resources, we conclude that it is reasonable to consider this potential as a directional indicator. In other words, these factors give us more confidence that it is not necessary at this time to authorize the utilities to procure all of the resources indicated to be necessary</p>	

	<p>in the ISO’s study.” D.14-03-004, p. 36; see also pp. 34-36.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Energy efficiency assumptions in SDG&amp;E territory should be adjusted.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued, as did other parties, that since the entire SDG&amp;E service area is also the San Diego local capacity area, the Commission should have required the use of the mid-case energy efficiency estimate.</p>	<p>“Finally, the Commission should have required use of the mid case estimate of energy efficiency for the SDG&amp;E service territory, since the San Diego local area is the entire SDG&amp;E territory. While SDG&amp;E used the mid case estimate in its need analysis, CAISO used the Commission’s assumptions. Adjusting the Commission’s assumption would add an additional 152 MW of energy efficiency resources.” Track 4, Op. Br, p. 8.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, p. 63. (Commission agrees that the mid-level energy efficiency estimate should have been used in modeling for the San Diego area.)</p>	
<p>7. <u>Distributed generation assumptions</u></p> <p>Sierra Club, like CEJA, argued that distributed generation resources were not fully accounted for in the modeling assumptions, and that including all pertinent DG programs would reduce need.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that solar PV will increase, but it could not determine its effect on LCR need.</p>	<p>“Distributed generation (DG) resources can and should play a significant role in meeting need created by the SONGS retirement, but the Track 4 studies neglect to consider programs that provide a total of 522.8 MW to 1540.4 MW of DG to the system.” Track 4 Op. Br., p. 14-15.</p> <p>“It is likely that Commission programs and the marketplace will increase the amount of solar PV in the future...” D.14-03-004, Finding of Fact #55, p. 129.</p>	
<p>8. <u>Load shedding reduces LCR need</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argues that load shedding as a short-term solution would prevent over-procurement of conventional generation while allowing time for development of preferred resources, energy storage, and transmission solutions. It also states that load shedding should be an option for</p>	<p>Other parties “and Sierra Club all question the decision of the ISO, SDG&amp;E and SCE not to consider the use of an SPS to mitigate the SONGS contingency in the absence of more complete information about the costs, benefits risks and affordability of relying on the SPS.” D.14-03-004, p. 39 (citing inter alia Exhibit SC-1 (Powers), pp. 1-11.)</p> <p>“CAISO’s testimony focused on load shedding as a long-term planning tool</p>	



<p>utilities, in contrast to other parties who believe that load-shedding is not an acceptable strategy under NERC and WECC guidelines.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that load shedding can be an appropriate option in the short term and reduces the LCR need based on this finding.</p>	<p>and argued strenuously that it should not be considered. However, CAISO recognized that load shedding could be a short-term bridge.” Track 4 Op. Br., p. 22; see also Exhibit SC-1 (Powers), p. 2.</p> <p>“Sierra Club supports DRA’s recommendation that load shedding be used a bridge will allow the preferred resources and transmission to develop.” Track 4 Op. Br, p. 25-26.</p> <p>“The crux of the issue before us regarding load shedding is whether we should at this time authorize additional procurement to achieve the level of reliability the ISO recommends: Sufficient resources to mitigate a specific, but unlikely, N-1-1 contingency in the SDG&amp;E territory.” D.14-03-004, p. 44.</p> <p>“[W]e see the likelihood that the procurement of preferred resources as authorized herein (and as acquired through other means) will develop sufficiently over time to mitigate the need for further resources, so that the SPS in the SDG&amp;E territory can be lifted and reliability at an N-1-1 contingency level can be maintained. In addition and/or alternatively, transmission solutions such as the Mesa Loop-In may mitigate the need for further resources.” D.14-03-004, p. 46.</p> <p>“[W]e conclude that it is reasonable to subtract a conservative estimate of 588 MW from the ISO’s forecasted LCR need because our policy decision entails a certainty that resources will not be procured at this time to fully avoid the remote possibility of load-shedding in San Diego as a result of the identified N-1-1 contingency.” D.14-03-004, pp. 46-47.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, Findings of Fact #21-26, 29-30, pp. 125-26.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>D.14-03-004, Conclusions of Law #10-12, p. 136.</p>	
<p>9. <u>Transmission solutions will reduce LCR need.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that the Commission should consider the Mesa Loop-In and other transmission solutions in its calculation and alternatively that the decision should be delayed until CAISO finished its transmission studies. At first, CAISO itself also recommended waiting for the outcomes of those studies. While the Commission did not delay the decision, it did find that the likelihood of future transmission solutions makes a lower procurement authorization possible.</p>	<p>“SCE’s preferred resources scenario, which is most consistent with the loading order, and the construction of the Mesa Loop-In provide the basis for denying any new procurement for SCE... Additionally, if the Commission makes a procurement decision on the current record, it should include the reductions from the Mesa Loop-In.” Track 4 Op. Br., p. 19.</p> <p>“CAISO still stands by its position that the 2013/2014 Transmission studies will illuminate the procurement picture... The Commission should not authorize new resources when there is time to make a more informed judgment in the subsequent iteration of the LTPP or in a continuation of this track next year.” Track 4 Op. Br., p. 18; <i>see also</i> Track 4 Op. Br., pp. 25-26.</p> <p>Prepared Opening Testimony of Bill Powers on behalf of Sierra Club California (Exhibit SC-1), pp. 13, 16.</p> <p>“We find that there is a reasonable possibility that at least one of the transmission solutions examined by SCE and SDG&amp;E will be operational by 2022. The least complex of these projects is the Mesa-Loop-In project, which is therefore the most likely to meet this timeframe.” D.14-03-004, pp. 52-53.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, Findings of Fact #39-40, p. 127.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, Finding of Fact #44, p. 128.</p> <p>D.14-03-004, Conclusion of Law #17, p. 137.</p>	
<p>10. <u>Reactive power is not an</u></p>	<p>“For example, although all of the</p>	

<p><u>issue.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club presented testimony and documented other evidence that showed that reactive power was not an issue that needed to be addressed.</p>	<p>reactive power issues have not been consistently modeled, the evidence in the record shows that there will be sufficient voltage support to replace SONGS.” Track 4 Op. Br., p. 18.</p> <p>Exhibit SC-1 (Powers), pp. 12-16</p> <p>“The record in the proceeding shows that there are sufficient resources to provide VAR support in the SONGS study area without further action at this time.” D.14-03-004, p. 33 and fn. 41.</p> <p>During Sierra Club cross, SCE witness Chinn testifies that sufficient reactive power exists. Reporter’s Transcript, Vol. 13, pp. 2048, line 19 – 2050, line 12.</p>	
<p><u>11. The Commission relies on CAISO for determination of Category C vs. Category D.</u></p> <p>Sierra Club provided testimony that the N-1-1 contingency was the functional equivalent of Category D event which would require less procurement authorization. The Commission rejected this, but clarified that the Commission would rely on CAISO transmissions studies for making Category C and Category D determinations.</p>	<p>“On cross examination, witness Powers claims the overlapping outage of SWPL and Sunrise is a ‘functional’ Category D because SDG&amp;E could ‘convert it from a Category C to a Category D’ using the WECC process followed by SDG&amp;E in evaluating the performance criteria of the Sunrise route alternatives.” D.14-03-004, p. 47.</p> <p>Commission will modify certain input assumptions from CAISO, but will rely on the CAISO transmission studies that determine the category contingencies. D.14-03-004, p. 48.</p>	
<p><b>Track 3</b></p> <p><u>1. Maximum limit on gas-fired generation</u></p> <p>Sierra Club argued that the Commission should set a maximum limit on procurement of fossil fuels to encourage compliance with the Loading Order. The Commission stated its support</p>	<p>Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on Track III Rules Issues, p. 1.</p> <p>Comments of Sierra Club California on Track 3 Rules, p. 1.</p> <p>"Parties such as Sierra Club call for maximum procurement levels for fossil-fuel resources or minimum procurement levels for preferred resources. We are committed to goals related to GHG</p>	

<p>of the Loading Order and its expectation that utilities would procure preferred resources wherever possible.</p>	<p>reduction and to the Loading Order prioritization of preferred resources (energy efficiency, demand response and renewable resources) over fossil-fuel resources. There are a number of proceedings which seek to implement statutes, policies and goals in these important areas...We reiterate this exhortation to the utilities and continue to expect every reasonable effort to meet or exceed environmental goals, consistent with reliability and cost." D.14-02-040, p. 11-12.</p>	
<p>2. <u>Departed load should be accounted for in bundled plans</u>                  Sierra Club asserted that IOUs should forecast and plan for a reasonable amount of departing load in their bundled plans. The Commission agreed.</p>	<p>"The bundled plans should plan and account for a certain amount of departing load. This is consistent with the Track II decision of the 2010 LTPP that held IOUs should adopt realistic assumptions related to community choice aggregation and direct access customers." Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on Track III Rules Issues, p. 5.</p> <p>California Environmental Justice Alliance's and Sierra Club California's Comments on the Track III Proposed Decision, p. 3.</p> <p>"Sierra Club recommends that the bundled plans should plan and account for a certain amount of departing load." D.14-02-040, p. 15.</p> <p>"We agree with the concept expressed by most parties that the IOUs should plan for reasonable amounts of departing load in their bundled plans and then only procure for the assumed amounts of retained bundled load." D.14-02-040, p. 16.</p>	
<p>3. <u>Repower valuation should not be changed</u>                  Sierra Club argued that the Commission should recognize the role that upgrades play in the system, particularly to the</p>	<p>"Repowers of fossil fuel plants should not be valued differently... [E]nergy storage should be valued for the additional benefits that it can provide to the system that are not typically valued in the current RFO process, and that are</p>	

<p>extent they serve as a short term bridge that allows more preferred resources to be procured. It did not see a need for any changes in the valuation of fossil fuel plant repowers. Sierra Club argued that adding energy storage to a facility should be valued based on the benefits that storage offers to the system.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that there was no need for changes in the valuation of repowers, but deferred any changes to upgrades. It acknowledged the benefits of energy storage but found that there was too little information to make a decision about valuation at this time.</p>	<p>environmentally and operationally superior to the performance of natural gas plants.” Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on Track III Rules Issues, p. 12 (April 26, 2013).</p> <p>“As the responses indicate, this is a complex issue. At this time, we find it to be unnecessary or premature to decide on any new or different valuation for repowers or upgrades in long-term RFOs. In particular, as the energy storage industry develops further, it may be appropriate to develop new valuation rules for such technologies. But we have too little knowledge or information about this fledgling industry to come to any conclusions at this time.” D.14-02-040, p. 33.</p>	
<p>4. <u>Procurement rules should promote greater transparency</u></p> <p>Sierra Club advocated for greater transparency in the procurement rules, including improving the QCR process.</p>	<p>“Sierra Club believes agencies with regulatory obligations with respect to IOUs, such as CAISO and the Energy Commission, as well as the public, should have access to significant information about mid-term and other procurement contracts. D.14-02-040, p. 20.</p> <p>The Commission “intend[s] to promote greater reporting of the information that the Commission regularly collects from the utilities, either as aggregate or in specific when advisable. . . . [I]n this decision we articulate a plan to reform certain data requesting guidelines, with an eye towards aggregating data via the quarterly compliance reports (QCRs) and reporting out that data in ways that are consistent and usable, while protecting market sensitive information.” D.14-02-040, p. 24.</p> <p>“Sierra Club argues that creating mechanisms that reduce the ability of the Commission and the public to review action approved by the</p>	

	<p>Commission reduces the Commission’s ability to provide effective oversight.” D.14-02-040, p. 39.</p> <p>“CEJA and the Sierra Club agree with the PD’s proposed Conclusion of Law that ‘[i]t is in the public interest to promote greater reporting of the information that the Commission regularly collects from the utilities regarding procurement activities ... to the extent that confidentiality is not compromised.” This finding reflects comments made by Sierra Club, CEJA and other stakeholders emphasizing the need for increased information sharing with the public about forward procurement activities while using existing mechanisms to protect confidential information.” California Environmental Justice Alliance’s And Sierra Club California’s Comments On The Track III Proposed Decision, pp. 4-5.</p> <p>Sierra Club and other parties support a public process to improve the utilities QCR process. California Environmental Justice Alliance’s And Sierra Club California’s Reply Comments On The Track III Proposed Decision, p. 3; see also California Environmental Justice Alliance’s And Sierra Club California’s Comments On The Track III Proposed Decision, pp. 6-8.</p> <p>“We adopt a public process for QCR revisions. . . . Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, the utilities shall jointly file a Report in R.13-12-010 with recommended modifications. Energy Division staff will then conduct workshops with stakeholders.” D.14-02-040, p. 65.</p>	
--	---	--

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

	Claimant	CPUC Verified
a. Was the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA) a party to the proceeding? <sup>1</sup>	Yes	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: <b>California Environmental Justice Alliance (“CEJA”), Natural Resources Defense Council and other Environmental Intervenors, and TURN.</b>		
<p>d. Describe how you coordinated with ORA and other parties to avoid duplication or how your participation supplemented, complemented, or contributed to that of another party:</p> <p>During the proceeding, the Club coordinated most closely with CEJA. Both the Club and CEJA were very active participants in the proceeding and often shared similar positions. We conferred on most if not all issues during the proceeding. Typically, our briefs presented different approaches/perspectives on the same goals which resulted in a fuller presentation of the issues and stronger decisions in large, complicated case; we coordinated to ensure that our work was complementary. Where it was possible to coordinate, in terms of timing and mutuality of position, Sierra Club and CEJA filed joint documents, as in Track 3. In addition, given the multitude of parties, two similar but unique voices from the environmental community provided an important balance to other interests in the proceeding. Sierra Club also coordinated with NRDC on energy efficiency issues. When our positions were the same, Sierra Club would often cite to NRDC’s testimony, comments, or brief on these issues. During Track 4, Sierra Club participated in multi-party coordination calls with environmental and ratepayer advocates. Also, during the course of the two-year proceeding, the Club met with a cross section of the parties either in formal meetings or after workshops and hearings.</p> <p>The Club coordinated throughout the proceeding with ORA. In Track 1 and Track 3, the coordinated with ORA’s attorney primarily by phone but also discussed case matters at the hearings and pre-hearing conferences. Based on the relationship developed during Track 1, Sierra Club coordinated much more closely with ORA in track 4. In addition to phone coordination on the main substantive issues, Sierra Club, ORA and CEJA served multiple joint data requests on SCE and SDG&amp;E and filed a joint motion on reactive power. It is important to note that Sierra Club’s and ORA’s position were divergent at times during the proceeding.</p>		

<sup>1</sup> The Division of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Office of Ratepayer Advocates effective September 26, 2013, pursuant to Senate Bill No. 96 (Budget Act of 2013: public resources), which was approved by the Governor on September 26, 2013.

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

#	Claimant	CPUC	Comment
I	Sierra Club		Attachment 2 lists the merits documents filed in Track 1, 3 and 4.

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

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

<b>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)</b>	<b>CPUC Verified</b>
<p>The Club's main objective in the proceeding was to advocate for a transition to clean energy grid and strict adherence to the loading order with the ultimate long-term goal of transforming California's energy sector into a zero emissions sector. Although we are still far away from that ultimate goal, the more short-term approach has been to advocate for no new procurement of fossil-fuel generation while promoting use of preferred resources and energy storage to fill LCR need. This took the form of advocating for better counting of preferred and energy storage resources as well as transmission resources. Although Sierra Club did not fully achieve its ultimate goals of no new fossil fuel generation, the authorization of need in the LTPP took a dramatic turn in the 2012 LTPP, where for the first time the Commission authorized the procurement of preferred resources and energy storage resources along with conventional fossil-fuel generation. In addition, the Commission set a maximum limit on the amount of conventional generation that could be procured.</p> <p>The SONGS shutdown necessitated that Track 4 follow on the heels of Track 1. Track 4 maintained the same approach to creating procurement buckets and assuring that additional preferred and storage resources would be procured as a result of Track 4, an additional 400 MW for SCE and 200 MW for SDG&amp;E. Although the ultimate procurement authorizations in both Tracks were much higher than Sierra Club had advocated, Sierra Club participation contributed to both the Track 1 and 4 decisions reducing the LCR need amount that resulted from CAISO's study. In Track 4, in addition to arguing about the merits of preferred and energy storage resources for meeting LCR need, Sierra Club also presented testimony about load shedding and transmission which also served to reduce need. Through the decisions in Track 1 and Track 4 that the Commission has begun to steer procurement towards a cleaner energy system.</p> <p>Similarly, in Track 3, Sierra Club advocated and contributed to procurement policies that emphasized and supported the loading order and the reduction of fossil fuel generation. Additionally, Sierra Club contributed to the outcome regarding the allocation of costs of departing load and some transparency issues.</p> <p>The Club's participation in this proceeding will result in benefits to ratepayers that exceed the cost of participation. Although these benefits are not quantifiable, the</p>	



Commission's establish need authorization below the results of CAISO models directly reduces the costs to ratepayers. Moreover, the Club's fee request is miniscule in comparison to the tens of billions of dollars in procurement that this type of proceeding often authorizes. Additionally, the Club's advocacy on behalf of aggressive implementation of the State's clean energy and environmental goals will benefit the ratepayers over the long-term because California's environment will reap the public benefits intended by these laws.

**b. Reasonableness of Hours Claimed.**

This was a complex, two-year proceeding that addressed a large number of issues in four tracks that involved two sets of contested hearings and several workshops and pre-hearing conferences. Sierra Club was an active participant throughout the proceeding on both substantive issues as well procedural issues.<sup>2</sup>

Sierra Club leanly staffed the proceeding primarily with one attorney, William Rostov and one research policy and analyst, Adenike Adeyeye. Building on his participation in the 2010 LTPP, William Rostov was Sierra Club's lead attorney who developed and shaped strategy, drafted Sierra Club's papers, cross-examined witnesses, participated in hearings, workshops and pre-hearing conferences. Adenike Adeyeye, a 2011 of the master program at the Yale School of Forestry researched programs that could affect LCR need and the factual positions of other parties, assisted in preparing cross-examination provide valuable insight, ensured the accuracy of comments, briefs and testimony and with Mr. Rostov's direction drafted initial sections of briefs and comments. Due to her excellent research and writing skills, Ms. Adeyeye's work product was at level significantly higher than her level of experience would predict. Her contributions, in addition, to Mr. Rostov's effort allowed Sierra Club to have quite extensive briefs and comments that thoroughly covered the topics on which Sierra Club advocated.

Sierra Club focused on its major objectives and tailored its comments, briefs and cross-examination to those issues. In addition, the Club focused on legal, policy, and factual issues that related to its area of expertise, California's clean energy and environmental laws. In Track 1, the Club did not present testimony but rather focused on the cross-examination of the CAISO and SCE witnesses. This was particularly important because the LTPP has entered uncharted territory where for the first time, the Commission was evaluating CAISO's local capacity modeling over ten year period rather than its typical use of one-year. Moreover, CAISO testimony presented novel policy issues about how to count preferred resources. In Track 4, Sierra Club built on the expertise it developed in litigating similar issues in Track 1 and provided expert testimony on load shedding, reactive power, other transmission issues, and preferred resources assumptions. Sierra Club's expert, Bill Powers, worked for a rate that is seventy-five dollars less than his highest Commission approved rate.

Mr. Rostov reviewed all of Sierra Club's hours and in the exercise of billing judgment reduced the claim by hundreds of hours for tasks that he deemed excessive, redundant, or for tasks for which Sierra Club does not seek an award. For example, Sierra Club eliminated all billing for Ms. Adeyeye's attendance at the Track 1 hearings to prevent double counting. In the Track 3 hours Sierra Club

<sup>2</sup> See Attachment 2 for a list of merits documents that Sierra Club filed in Tracks 1, 3 and 4.

eliminated all time related to its argument that the Bagley-Keene Act/Procurement Review Group arguments which is currently subject to motion for rehearing.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, the Club did not request compensation for Robert Freehling, a Sierra Club expert, who spent some time working on all three of the Tracks. Sierra Club did not claim the time of an associate attorney who worked on issues at the end of the proceeding, including the comments on the Track 3 and 4 proposed decisions. Sierra Club is also not requesting compensation for any its time in Track 2.<sup>4</sup> As described above, Sierra Club coordinated with ORA and CEJA on multiple data requests and a joint motion in Track 4 which further reduced Sierra Club's compensation request.

**c. Allocation of Hours by Issue**

For ease of reference, Sierra Club allocated issues by Track. Sierra Club has one general category not related to an individual Track that involves general work at the beginning of the proceeding including comments on the initial scope and the first prehearing conference, Category A.

For Track 1, Sierra Club allocates the time into five categories: 1: CAISO OTC Study Has Too High of a Need Number; 2: Preferred Resources Should be Adequately Counted; 3: The Commission Should Adhere to the Loading Order; 4. Hearings, Meetings, and Coordination. 5. Developing the Case, Initial Review of Testimony, Discovery, Drafting Cross, Misc. Motion Practice and Procedural Issues

For Track 4, Sierra Club allocates the time into five categories: 1: There Is No Need/Alternatively Use Preferred Resources; 2: Preferred Resources Assumptions; 3: Load Shedding SPS, Reactive Power, and Transmission Issues, 4. Hearings, Meetings, Coordination, and Joint Discovery with CEJA and ORA 5. Developing the Case, Initial Review of Testimony, Discovery, Misc. Motion Practice and Procedural Issues

For Track 3, Sierra Club allocates the time into four categories: 1: Affirmation of California's Greenhouse Gas Policies and Loading Order; 2: Departing Load; 3: Transparency Issues; 4: Coordination.

Allocation Percentages		
Category A	\$9,216.00	2.19%
(Track 1) Category 1	\$51,593.00	12.26%
(Track 1) Category 2	\$35,764.00	8.50%
(Track 1) Category 3	\$25,449.50	6.05%
(Track 1) Category 4	\$27,963.50	6.64%
(Track 1) Category 5	\$24,604.00	5.85%

<sup>3</sup> Sierra Club reserves the right to submit this time, if Sierra Club prevails on its motion for rehearing.

<sup>4</sup> Sierra Club may claim some of this Track 2 time in 2014 LTPP compensation request, because Track 2 was not resolved in this proceeding.

(Track 3) Category 1	\$11,822.50	2.81%		
(Track 3) Category 2	\$1,396.00	0.33%		
(Track 3) Category 3	\$11,245.00	2.67%		
(Track 3) Category 4	\$2,378.00	0.56%		
(Track 4) Category 1	\$50,040.00	11.89%		
(Track 4) Category 2	\$61,398.50	14.59%		
(Track 4) Category 3	\$61,428.50	14.59%		
(Track 4) Category 4	\$40,140.50	9.54%		
(Track 4) Category 5	\$6,463.00	1.54%		
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$420,902.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>		

**B. Specific Claim:**

CLAIMED						CPUCA WARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
William Rostov	2012	332.3	360	D.13-12-027	\$119,628.00			
William Rostov	2013	459.2	390	See Comment 1	\$179,088.00			
William Rostov	2014	72	410	See Comment 2	\$29,520.00			
Adenike Adeyeye	2012	153.2	130	See Comment 3	\$19,916.00			
Adenike Adeyeye	2013	320.2	135	See Comment 3	\$43,227.00			
Adenike Adeyeye	2014	34.2	140	See Comment 4	\$4,788.00			
Bill Powers	2013	164.9	150	See Comment 5	\$24,735.00			
<b>Subtotal: \$ 420,902.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$</b>		
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 \$
<b>Subtotal: \$</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$</b>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate	Total \$
William	2014	38.8	205	See	\$7,954.00			

Rostov				Comment 6			
Adenike Adeyeye	2013	8.2	67.5	See Comment 6	\$553.5		
Adenike Adeyeye	2014	43.4	70	See Comment 6	\$3,038.00		
<b>Subtotal: \$ 11,545.50</b>					<b>Subtotal: \$</b>		
<b>COSTS</b>							
<b>#</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Detail</b>		<b>Amount</b>	<b>Amount</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$ 432,447.50</b>					<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$</b>		
<p>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 ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate.</p>							
<b>Attorney</b>		<b>Date Admitted to CA BAR<sup>5</sup></b>		<b>Member Number</b>		<b>Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation</b>	
William Rostov		December, 1996		184528		No	

**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	Rostov's 2013 rate includes a requested 5% step increase pursuant to D.08-04-110 and a 2% COLA pursuant to Resolution ALJ-287. (360 x 5% rounded to nearest 5\$ = 380, 380 x 2% rounded to nearest 5\$ = 390). This would be Rostov's first 5% step increase.
Comment 2	Rostov's 2014 rate includes a requested 5% step increase pursuant to D.08-04-110. (390 x 5% rounded to nearest 5\$ = 410). This would be Rostov's second 5% step increase. The COLA for 2014 has not yet been established. Sierra Club requests that the COLA be incorporated into rate after it has been established.
Comment 3	Adenike Adeyeye works as a Research and Policy Analyst in Earthjustice's California Regional Office, a non-profit public interest law firm dedicated to protecting the magnificent places, natural resources, and wildlife of this earth, and to defending the right of all people to a healthy environment. Earthjustice receives no compensation for its representation and will only receive compensation for its services based on the award of intervenor compensation.  Adeyeye holds a BA in Environmental Studies from Yale University in 2007 and a Masters in Environmental Management from the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies in

<sup>5</sup> This information may be obtained at: <http://www.calbar.ca.gov/>.

	2011 (attachment 8). She has worked on PUC proceedings including the 2012 Long Term Procurement Planning and Energy Storage proceedings since March 2012. She falls within the 0-6 year range for experts. Sierra Club requests the minimum in the range for both 2012 and 2013.
Comment 4	Adeyeye's 2014 rate includes a requested 5% step increase pursuant to D.08-04-110. (135 x 5% rounded to nearest 5\$ = 140). The 2014 rate chart has not been released, if the minimum rate increases. Sierra Club requests that the 5% step increase be applied to that rate. In addition, Sierra Club that the COLA for 2014 also be applied to this rate.
Comment 5	Mr. Powers charges Sierra Club \$150 per hour for his work on Track 4. Pursuant to D.08.04.010 (pp.6-7) Sierra Club uses this rate. This rate is seventy-five dollars less than Mr. Powers' 2010, Commission approved rate of \$225 in D.11-03-025.
Comment 6	Mr. Rostov's and Ms. Adeyeye's compensation preparation rates are based on half of their rates.
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service
Attachment 2	List of Merits documents filed on behalf of Sierra Club in Track 1, 3, 4
Attachment 3	Timesheets of William Rostov and Adenike Adeyeye (Track 1)
Attachment 4	Timesheets of William Rostov and Adenike Adeyeye (Track 3)
Attachment 5	Timesheets of William Rostov, Adenike Adeyeye and Bill Powers (Track 4)
Attachment 6	Summary of Sierra Club California Hours
Attachment 7	Timesheets of William Rostov and Adenike Adeyeye (Compensation Claim Preparation)
Attachment 8	Adenike Adeyeye Resume

**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)

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Disposition

--	--	--

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

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Disposition

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Claimant [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to 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 Pub. Util. 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 compound 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 75<sup>th</sup> day after the filing of Claimant’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.

Revised December 2013

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 by Customer**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of the foregoing **INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM** by (check as appropriate):

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

to the following persons appearing on the official Service List:

**Proceeding: R1203014 - CPUC - OIR TO INTEGR**  
**Last changed: April 30, 2014**

### Parties

ADAM GUSMAN  
CORPORATE COUNSEL  
GLACIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, VI 00000  
FOR: GLACIAL ENERGY OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

ANDREW WANG  
SOLARRESERVE, LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: SOLARRESERVE

ELIZABETH KELLY  
LEGAL DIRECTOR  
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: MARIN CLEAN ENERGY

JEAN MERRIGAN  
WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: WOMEN'S ENERGY MATTERS

KATHY TRELEVEN  
LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION

KENNETH SAHM WHITE  
CLEAN COALITION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: CLEAN COALITION

LISA BOND  
ATTORNEY  
RICHARDS WATSON GERSHON  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: CITY OF REDONDO BEACH

MARCUS V. DA CUNHA  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: MARCUS V. DA CUNHA



Revised December 2013

MARK HUFFMAN  
LAW DEPT  
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
NETWORK  
FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PAUL ACKERMAN  
CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY, INC.  
P.C.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: CONSTELLATION NEWENERGY, INC.  
DISTRICT

SIERRA MARTINEZ  
LEGAL DIR - CALIFORNIA ENERGY PROJECT  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
COUNCIL  
FOR: NATIONAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

GENERAL MANAGER  
PLUMAS SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC COOP. (908)  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: PLUMAS SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC CORP

ABRAHAM SILVERMAN  
ASSIST. GEN. COUNSEL - REGULATORY  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
400  
211 CARNEGIE CENTER DRIVE  
PRINCETON, NJ 08540  
FOR: NRG ENERGY, INC.

KYLE W. DANISH  
VAN NESS FELDMAN, P.C.  
1050 THOMAS JEFFERSON ST., N. W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007-3877  
SUITE 600  
FOR: COALITION FOR EMISSION REDUCTION  
POLICY  
LLC

ALRINE WILLIAMS  
LEGAL COUNSEL  
LIBERTY POWER HOLDINGS LLC (1371)

MATTHEW FREEDMAN  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM

SCOTT BLAISING  
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: KINGS RIVER CONSERVATION  
(KRCD)

TAM HUNT  
ATTORNEY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
FOR: COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL

ANDREW O. KAPLAN, ESQ.  
BROWN RUDNICK LLP  
ONE FINANCIAL CENTER  
BOSTON, MA 02111  
FOR: BEACON POWER, LLC

RICK C. NOGER  
PRAXAIR PLAINFIELD, INC.  
2711 CENTERVILLE ROAD, SUITE  
WILMINGTON, DE 19808  
FOR: PRAXAIR PLAINFIELD, INC.

ALRINE WILLIAMS  
LEGAL COUNSEL  
LIBERTY POWER DELAWARE LLC  
1901 W. CYPRESS CREEK ROAD,  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33309  
FOR: LIBERTY POWER DELAWARE

TRACY PHILLIPS  
VP OF MARKETING  
TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC.

SB\_GT&S\_0091654

1901 W. CYPRESS CREEK ROAD, SUITE 600  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33309  
FOR: LIBERTY POWER HOLDINGS LLC

JASON ARMENTA  
CALPINE POWERAMERICA-CA, LLC  
717 TEXAS AVENUE, SUITE 1000  
HOUSTON, TX 77002  
FOR: CALPINE POWERAMERICA-CA, LLC

KARA MORGAN  
TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC  
555 SEVENTEENTH STREET, SUITE 2400  
DENVER, CO 80202  
FOR: TRANSWEST EXPRESS, LLC  
ASSOCIATION

PAUL SHEPARD  
WILDFLOWER ENERGY  
333 S. GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 1570  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071  
FOR: WILDFLOWER ENERGY

J. DOUGLAS DIVINE  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER  
EAGLE CREST ENERGY COMPANY  
350  
3000 OCEAN PARK BLVD., STE. 1020  
SANTA MONICA, CA 90405  
FOR: EAGLE CREST ENERGY COMPANY

DANIEL W. DOUGLASS  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
21700 OXNARD STREET, SUITE 1030  
COMPANY  
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91367  
AVE  
FOR: CONEDISON SOLUTIONS, INC./WESTERN  
POWER TRADING FORUM (WPTF)  
EDISON COMPANY

HAL ROMANOWITZ  
CEO  
COMPANY  
ALTON ENERGY, INC.  
4039 ALTON WAY  
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025  
COMPANY  
FOR: ALTON ENERGY, INC.

1422 E. 71ST., STE J  
TULSA, OK 74136  
FOR: TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC.

KEVIN BOUDREAUX  
ENERCAL USA LLC  
7660 WOODWAY DRIVE, STE. 471A  
HOUSTON, TX 77063  
FOR: ENERCAL USA, LLC

BRIAN FICKETT  
VALLEY ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION  
800 E. HWY 372  
PAHRUMP, NV 89048  
FOR: VALLEY ELECTRIC

MICHAEL MAZUR  
PRINCIPAL  
3 PHASES RENEWABLES, LLC  
2100 SEPULVEDA BLVD, SUITE 37  
MANHATTAN BEACH, CA 90266  
FOR: 3 PHASES RENEWABLES, LLC

INGER GOODMAN  
COMMERCE ENERGY INC  
1 CENTERPOINTE DRIVE, SUITE  
LA PALMA, CA 90623-2520  
FOR: COMMERCE ENERGY, INC.

CAROL A. SCHMID-FRAZEE  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
PO BOX 800 2244 WALNUT GROVE  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

AIMEE SMITH  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
101 ASH STREET, HQ-12  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
FOR: SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC

DANIEL KING  
SEMPRA U.S. GAS & POWER, LLC  
SOLUTIONS, LLC  
101 ASH STREET, HQ-15B  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
FOR: SEMBRA U.S. GAS & POWER, LLC  
SOLUTIONS LLC

DONALD C. LIDDELL, PC  
COUNSEL  
FOUNDATION  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
2928 2ND AVENUE  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92103  
FOUNDATION  
FOR: STARWOOD POWER-MIDWAY, LLC /  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY STORAGE ALLIANCE  
(CESA) / CAMCO INTERNATIONAL GROUP, INC  
./ TAS ENERGY

CLIFFORD D. EVANS, JR.  
VP  
CALPEAK POWER, LLC  
7365 MISSION GORGE ROAD, STE. C  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92120  
AMERICA (US),  
FOR: CALPEAK POWER LLC

SARAH TOMEC  
SR. ADVISOR, REGULATORY AFFAIRS WEST  
(1365)  
CAPITAL POWER CORPORATION  
STE. 520  
9255 TOWNE CENTRE DRIVE, STE. 900  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121  
FOR: CAPITAL POWER CORPORATION

GLORIA BRITTON  
REGULATORY AFFAIRS MGR.  
ANZA ELECTRIC CO-OPERATIVE, INC (909)  
& ENERGY  
PO BOX 39109 / 58470 HIGHWAY 371  
ANZA, CA 92539-1909  
FOR: ANZA ELECTRIC CO-OPERATIVE, INC.  
TELEPHONE &

ANDREA MORRISON  
DIRECTOR - GOV'T. AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
AFFAIRS  
DIRECT ENERGY SERVICES, LLC (1341)

GREG BASS  
NOBLE AMERICAS ENERGY  
401 WEST A STREET, STE. 500  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101  
FOR: NOBLE AMERICAS ENERGY

DAVID A. PEPPER, ESQ.  
PROTECT OUR COMMUNITIES  
4452 PARK BOULEVARD, STE. 209  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92116  
FOR: PROTECT OUR COMMUNITIES

MARCIE MILNER  
SHELL ENERGY (1374)  
4445 EASTGATE MALL, SUITE 100  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121  
FOR: SHELL ENERGY NORTH  
L.P. (SHELL ENERGY)

THOMAS R. DARTON  
PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.  
8910 UNIVERSITY CENTER LANE,  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122  
FOR: PILOT POWER GROUP, INC.

KRISTINE MICHAELS  
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA TELEPHONE  
27515 ENTERPRISE CIRCLE WEST  
TEMECULA, CA 92590  
FOR: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
ENERGY

MONA TIERNEY-LLOYD  
DIR., WESTERN REGULATORY  
ENERNOC, INC.

Revised December 2013

415 DIXON STREET  
ARROYO GRANDE, CA 93420  
FOR: DIRECT ENERGY, LLC/DIRECT ENERGY  
SERVICES

DAVID ORTH  
SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY POWER AUTHORITY  
ADMIN OFF @KINGS RIVER CONSERV DISTRICT  
SUITE 1850  
4886 EAST JENSEN AVENUE  
FRESNO, CA 93725  
COALITION  
FOR: SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY POWER AUTHORITY

WILLEM FADRHOUC  
STEM, INC.  
100 ROLLINS RD.  
MILLBRAE, CA 94030  
FOR: STEM, INC.  
  
INC.

SUE MARA  
PRINCIPAL  
CARDOZO  
RTO ADVISORS, LLC  
164 SPRINGDALE WAY  
94080  
REDWOOD CITY, CA 94062  
UTILITY  
FOR: ALLIANCE FOR RETAIL ENERGY MARKETS  
(AREM) /DIRECT ACCESS CUSTOMER  
COALITION (DACC)

DIANA L. LEE  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
FRANCISCO  
LEGAL DIVISION  
ROOM 4107  
PLACE  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
FRANCISCO  
FOR: ORA

ETHAN RAVAGE  
WEST COAST LEAD - US  
RELATIONS  
INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS TRADING ASSN.  
COMPANY (39)  
456 MONTGOMERY ST., 18TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

PO BOX 378  
CAYUCOS, CA 93430  
FOR: ENERNOC, INC.

EVELYN KAHL  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET,  
  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94015  
FOR: ENERGY PRODUCERS & USERS

DAVID MACMILLAN  
PRESIDENT  
MEGAWATT STORAGE FARMS, INC.  
3931 JEFFERSON AVE.  
WOODSIDE, CA 94062  
FOR: MEGAWATT STORAGE FARMS,

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

THERESA L. MUELLER  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
  
CITY HALL, ROOM 234  
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT  
  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682  
FOR: CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN

BRIAN CHERRY  
DIRECTOR - REGULATORY  
  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
  
77 BEALE STREET ROOM 1087  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

SB\_GT&S\_0091657

FOR: INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS TRADING  
COMPANY  
ASSOCIATION (IETA)

ERICA BRAND  
PROJECT DIR.  
THE NATURE CONSERVANCY  
1850  
201 MISSION STREET, 4TH FL.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
CONSUMERS  
FOR: THE NATURE CONSERVANCY

DEBORAH N. BEHLES  
ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND JUSTICE CLINIC  
& LAMPREY  
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW  
536 MISSION STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2968  
PRODUCERS  
FOR: THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL  
JUSTICE ALLIANCE (CEJA)

JACK STODDARD  
MANATT PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
ONE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 30TH FL.  
LAMPREY LLP  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: PANOCHE ENERGY CENTER, LLC  
ASSOCIATION

MICHAEL B. DAY  
ATTORNEY  
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY & LAMPREY,  
505 SANSOME ST., STE. 900  
STE. 1120  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: ABENGOA SOLAR, INC./CALENERGY  
POWER  
GENERATION

WILLIAM KISSINGER  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEM LLP  
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER, 28TH FL.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: COMPETITIVE POWER VENTURES/POWER  
DEVELOPMENT, INC.

MARTIN A. MATTES  
ATTORNEY

FOR: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
NORA SHERIFF  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY ST., STE.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
FOR: CALIFORNIA LARGE ENERGY  
ASSOCIATION (CLECA)

BRIAN T. CRAGG  
GOODIN, MACBRIDE, SQUERI, DAY  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: INDEPENDENT ENERGY  
ASSOCIATION (IEPA)

JEANNE B. ARMSTRONG  
ATTORNEY  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY &  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES

SETH D. HILTON  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER,  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: AES SOUTHLAND/ZEPHYR  
TRANSMISSION

WILLIAM V. ROSTOV  
EARTHJUSTICE  
50 CALIFORNIA ST., STE. 500  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111  
FOR: SIERRA CLUB CALIFORNIA

LISA A. COTTLE  
ATTORNEY AT LAW

NOSSAMAN, LLP  
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, 34TH FL.  
FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-4799  
FOR: NOSSAMAN, LLP

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

SARA STECK MYERS  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
122 - 28TH AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121  
FOR: CENTER FOR ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND  
RENEWABLE TECHNOLOGIES (CEERT)

JOHN L. GEESMAN  
ATTORNEY  
DICKSON GEESMAN LLP  
1999 HARRISON STREET, STE. 2000  
OAKLAND, CA 94612  
ENERGY  
FOR: ALLIANCE FOR NUCLEAR  
THE EARTH  
RESPONSIBILITY (A4NR)

MARGIE GARDNER  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
CAL. ENERGY EFFICIENCY INDUSTRY COUNCIL  
CALIFORNIA  
436 14TH STREET, SUITE 1020  
OAKLAND, CA 94612  
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENERGY EFFICIENCY  
CALIFORNIA  
INDUSTRY COUNCIL (CEEIC)

GREGG MORRIS  
DIRECTOR  
GREEN POWER INSTITUTE  
2039 SHATTUCK AVENUE, STE 402  
BERKELEY, CA 94704  
FOR: GREEN POWER INSTITUTE  
SCIENTISTS

NANCY RADER  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

WINSTON & STRAWN LLP  
101 CALIFORNIA STREET, 39TH  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5802  
FOR: GENON ENERGY, INC.

JEFFREY P. GRAY  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP  
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-6533  
FOR: CALPINE CORPORATION

JENNIFER CHAMBERLIN  
LS POWER DEVELOPMENT, LLC  
5000 HOPYARD ROAD, SUITE 480  
PLEASANTON, CA 94588  
FOR: LS POWER

LAURENCE G. CHASET  
KEYES FOX & WIEDMAN, LLP  
436 14TH STREET, STE. 1305  
OAKLAND, CA 94612  
FOR: INTERSTATE RENEWABLE  
COUNCIL, INC. / FRIENDS OF

PATRICK VANBEEK  
DIR - CUSTOMER SUPPORT  
COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF  
7677 OAKPORT STREET, STE. 525  
OAKLAND, CA 94621  
FOR: COMMERCIAL ENERGY OF

LAURA WISLAND  
SENIOR ENERGY ANALYST  
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS  
2397 SHATTUCK AVE., STE. 203  
BERKELEY, CA 94704  
FOR: UNION OF CONCERNED

R. THOMAS BEACH  
CROSSBORDER ENERGY

Revised December 2013

CALIFORNIA WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION  
2560 NINTH STREET, SUITE 213A  
BERKELEY, CA 94710  
COGENERATION COUNCIL  
FOR: CALIFORNIA WIND ENERGY ASSOCIATION

2560 9TH ST., SUITE 213A  
BERKELEY, CA 94710-2557  
FOR: THE CALIFORNIA

BRAD BORDINE  
DISTRIBUTED ENERGY CONSUMER ADVOCATES  
516 WHITEWOOD DRIVE  
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903  
FOR: DISTRIBUTED ENERGY CONSUMER  
ADVOCATES

JAN REID  
COAST ECONOMICS CONSULTING  
3185 GROSS ROAD  
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95062  
FOR: L. JAN REID

DAVID KATES  
DAVID MARK & COMPANY  
3510 UNOCAL PLACE, SUITE 200  
OPERATOR CORP  
SANTA ROSA, CA 95403  
FOR: THE NEVADA HYDRO COMPANY  
SYSTEM

JUDITH B. SANDERS  
SR. COUNSEL  
CALIF. INDEPENDENT SYSTEM  
250 OUTCROPPING WAY  
FOLSOM, CA 95630  
FOR: CALIFORNIA INDEPENDENT  
OPERATOR CORPORATION

MARGARET MILLER  
BROOKFIELD RENEWABLE ENERGY GROUP  
513 SAN MARCO PLACE  
EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762  
FOR: BROOKFIELD RENEWABLE ENERGY GROUP  
ENERGY  
LLC

STEPHEN T. GREENLEAF  
V.P. & COMPLIANCE DIRECTOR  
J.P. MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A.  
2864 ABERDEEN LANE  
EL DORADO HILLS, CA 95762  
FOR: J.P. MORGAN VENTURES  
CORPORATION (JPMVEC) / BE CA

DOUGLAS E. DAVIE  
V.P.  
WELLHEAD ELECTRIC COMPANY, INC.  
650 BERECUT DRIVE, STE. C  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95811  
FOR: WELLHEAD ELECTRIC COMPANY  
FUND

LAUREN NAVARRO  
ATTORNEY  
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND  
1107 9TH ST., STE. 1070  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
FOR: ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE

RONALD LIEBERT  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP  
L.L.P.  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, STE. 400  
400  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816  
FOR: THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE  
WIND ENERGY,

CHRISTOPHER T. ELLISON  
ATTORNEY  
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS,  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905  
FOR: PATHFINDER RENEWABLE  
LLC

SB\_GT&S\_0091660

KAREN MILLS  
CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION  
2300 RIVER PLAZA DRIVE  
CORP.  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833  
FOR: CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

DANIEL SILVERIA  
GEN MGR  
SURPRISE VALLEY ELECTRIC  
  
516 US HIGHWAY 395 E  
ALTURAS, CA 96101-4228  
FOR: SURPRISE VALLEY ELECTRIC  
CORPORATION

DONALD BROOKHYSER  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
121 S.W. SALMON ST., STE. 1100  
1400  
PORTLAND, OR 97204  
FOR: COGENERATION ASSOCIATION OF  
CALIFORNIA

GIFFORD JUNG  
POWEREX CORPORATION  
666 BURRARD STREET, SUITE  
  
VANCOUVER, BC V5R 4Y2  
CANADA  
FOR: POWEREX CORPORATION

## Information Only

AHMAD FARUQUI  
THE BRATTLE GROUP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BARBARA R. BARKOVICH  
BARKOVICH & YAP, INC.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

BRAD MEIKLE  
SOVEREIGN ENERGY, LLC  
COMPANY  
EMAIL ONL Y  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CASE COORDINATION  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CATHIE ALLEN  
REGULATORY MGR.  
PACIFICORP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, OR 00000

CEDRIC O. CHRISTENSEN  
DIR - OPER & DEVELOPMENT  
STRATEGEN CONSULTING LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DANIEL PATRY  
RECURRENT ENERGY  
CORPORATION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVID HICKS  
DIAMOND GENERATING  
  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVID MARCUS  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVID WEIDBERG  
JOHNSON CONTROLS  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000



DIANE FELLMAN  
DIR - GOVERNMENTAL & REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
NRG ENERGY, INC.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ERIN GRIZARD  
BLOOM ENERGY  
COMPANY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JAMIE L. MAULDIN  
ADAMS BROADWELL JOSEPH & CARDOZO, PC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JEREMY WAEN  
REGULATORY ANALYST  
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JIMMY NELSON, PH.D  
KENDALL SCIENCE FELLOW IN ELECTRICITY  
UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JOHN W. LESLIE, ESQ.  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KATY ROSENBERG  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LYNN HAUG  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.  
EMAIL ONLY  
COUNCIL  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MATT KLOPFENSTEIN

DYANA MARIE DELFIN-POLK  
POLICY MANAGER  
CLEAN COALITION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

GEORGE ZAHARIUDAKIS  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JENNIFER CHAMBERLIN  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JERRY BROWN  
WORLD BUSINESS ACADEMY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JODY S. LONDON  
JODY LONDON CONSULTING  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JULIEN DUMOULIN-SMITH  
UBS INVESTMENT RESEARCH  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, NY 00000

KELSEY SOUTHERLAND  
DIR OF GOV'T RELATIONS  
TAS ENERGY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, TX 00000

MARIA STAMAS  
LEGAL FELLOW, ENERGY PROGRAM  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MATTHEW BARMACK

GONZALEZ QUINTANA & HUNTER LLC  
ANALYST  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DIRECTOR, MARKET & REGULATORY  
CALPINE CORPORATION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MELISSA P. MARTIN  
SENIOR REGULATORY COUNSEL  
STATESIDE ASSOCIATES  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, VA 00000

MICHAEL EVANS  
SHELL  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MIKE CADE  
ALCANTAR & KAHL, LLP  
COMPANY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, OR 00000

MIYUKI IWAHASHI  
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

OLIVIA PARA  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

PUNEET PASRICH  
COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CO 00000

RACHEL MCMAHON  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000  
CORPORATION

RANDY KELLER  
DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT  
CALENERGY OPERATING  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ROBERT GEX  
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
REGULATION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ROBIN SMUTNY-JONES  
DIR. - CALIFORNIA POLICY &  
IBERDROLA RENEWABLES, LLC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, OR 00000

SCOTT DAYER  
REGION SALES MGR. - GE POWER & WATER  
AFFAIRS  
GE PACKAGED POWER, INC.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SEAN P. BEATTY  
DIRECTOR - WEST REGULATORY  
NRG WEST  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

SHALINI SWAROOP  
REGULATORY COUNSEL  
MARIN CLEAN ENERGY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

STEPHANIE WANG  
DIRECTOR  
CLEAN COALITION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

STEVE ZURETTI  
MANAGER, CALIFORNIA  
COMPANY  
SOLAR ENERGY INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

TAM HUNT  
CLEAN COALITION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

WILLIAM J. KEESE  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALICE GONG  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

ERIC HSIEH  
A 123 SYSTEMS INC.  
155 FLANDERS RD  
WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581-1032

RACHEL WILSON  
SYNAPSE ENERGY ECONOMIS, INC.  
INC.  
485 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., 2ND FLOOR  
FL.  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02129

ROBERT FAGAN  
PRINCIPAL ASSOCIATE  
INC.  
SYNAPSE ENERGY ECONOMICS  
STE. 2  
485 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., 2ND FLOOR  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

ALEXANDER DABERKO  
CALPEAK POWER, LLC

SUJATA PAGEDAR  
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

VIDHYA PRABHAKARAN  
ATTORNEY  
DAVIS WRIGHT & TREMAINE, LLP  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

AES SOUTHLAND  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

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

KAREN TERRANOVA  
ALCANTAR & KAHL  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000-0000

MIKE BERLINSKI  
BEACON POWER, LLC  
65 MIDDLESEX ROAD  
TYNGSBORO, MA 01879

PATRICK LUCKOW  
SYNAPSE ENERGY ECONOMICS,  
485 MASSACHUSETTS AVE., 2ND  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

THOMAS J. VITOLO  
SYNAPSE ENERGY ECONOMICS,  
485 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE,  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

ADAM FAIRBANKS  
DIR - REGULATORY AND RETAIL

STRUCTURING

591 PUTNAM AVENUE  
GREENWICH, CT 06830  
410

RICHARD J. HUDSON, JR.  
DIR. - REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS  
CONEDISON SOLUTIONS, INC.  
100 SUMMIT LAKE DR., STE. 410  
FL.  
VALHALLA, NY 10595

S.DAVID FREEMAN  
C/O FRIENDS OF THE EARTH  
1100 15TH STREET, NW, 11TH FLOOR  
STE. 600  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

KIM L. JOHNSON  
EVP AND AGENT  
RIVERBANK PUMPED STORAGE, LLC  
STE. 119  
2000 S. OCEAN BLVD., STE. 703  
DELRAY BEACH, FL 33483  
FOR: RIVERBANK PUMPED STORAGE, LLC

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

ERIN SZALKOWSKI  
CORPORATE COUNSEL  
INC.  
CLEAN LINE ENERGY PARTNERS, LLC  
SUITE 490  
1001 MCKINNEY STREET, SUITE 700  
HOUSTON, TX 77002  
FOR: CENTENNIAL WEST CLEAN LINE LLC

CAROLINE SCHNEIDER  
PROLOGIS  
4545 AIRPORT WAY  
DENVER, CO 80239

CAITLIN COLLINS LIOTIRIS  
ENERGY STRATEGIES, LLC  
215 SOUTH STATE STREET, STE 200

CONEDISON SOLUTIONS, INC.  
100 SUMMIT LAKE DRIVE, STE.  
VALHALLA, NY 10595

KENDRA ULRICH  
NUCLEAR CAMPAIGNER  
FRIENDS OF THE EARTH  
1100 15TH STREET, NW, 11TH  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

YANIRA M. GOMEZ  
LIBERTY POWER CORP.  
1901 W. CYPRESS CREEK RD.,  
FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33309

SHAWN NICHOLS  
SUMMIT POWER GROUP  
1324 CLARKSON CLAYTON CENTER,  
BALLWIN, MO 63011-2145

CHRIS HENDRIX  
TEXAS RETAIL ENERGY  
2001 SE 10TH STREET  
BENTONVILLE, AR 72716

CHARLES PURSHOUSE  
CAMCO INTERNATIONAL GROUP,  
390 INTERLOCKEN CRESCENT,  
BROOMFIELD, CO 80021

DREW TORBIN  
V.P.- RENEWABLE ENERGY  
PROLOGIS  
4545 AIRPORT WAY  
DENVER, CO 80239

GIANCARLO ESTRADA  
KIS MAYES LAW FIRM  
ONE EAST CAMELBACK ROAD, STE.

550  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

HEIDI BETHEL  
DIR. - POLICY & BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT  
ORMAT TECHNOLOGIES INC.  
6225 NEIL ROAD  
200  
RENO, NV 89511  
FOR: ORMAT TECHNOLOGIES

RON KNECHT  
1009 SPENCER ST  
COMPANY  
CARSON, NY 89703-5422

SARAH FRIEDMAN  
SIERRA CLUB  
714 W. OLYMPIC BLVD., STE. 1000  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90015

TOUSSAINT.S BAILEY  
RICHARDS WATSON GERSHON  
ASSOCIATION  
355 S. GRAND AVENUE, 40TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071

MICHAEL W. WEBB  
CITY ATTORNEY  
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
415 DIAMOND STREET  
REDONDO BEACH, CA 90277

MARILYN LYON  
SOUTH BAY CITIES COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
SOUTH BAY ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CTR.  
107-356  
20285 S. WESTERN AVE., STE. 100  
TORRANCE, CA 90501

CAROL SCHMID-FRAZEE  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
COMPANY  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
AVE.  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91765

PHOENIX, AZ 85012

JOE GRECO  
SR. V.P.  
TERRA-GEN POWER LLC  
9590 PROTOTYPE COURT, SUITE  
RENO, NV 89521-5916

STEVEN HRUBY  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS  
555 W. FIFTH ST., GT14D6  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

FRED MOBASHERI  
CONSULTANT  
ELECTRIC POWER GROUP, LLC  
2958 HOMEWOOD ROAD  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90049

DARIUSH SHIRMOHAMMADI  
CALIFORNIA WIND ENERGY  
10208 CIELO DRIVE  
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90210

ADAM GREEN  
SOLARRESERVE  
2425 OLYMPIC BLVD., STE. 500E  
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404

GREGORY KLATT  
DOUGLASS & LIDDELL  
411 E. HUNTINGTON DR., STE.  
ARCADIA, CA 91006  
FOR: TIGER NATURAL GAS, INC.

AMANDA KLOPF  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
PO BOX 800/2244 WALNUT GROVE  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

CASE ADMINISTRATION  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVENUE, RM. 321  
COMPANY  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770  
BOX 800

MELISSA A. HOVSEPIAN  
SENIOR ATTORNEY  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
2244 WALNUT GROVE AVE. / PO  
ROSEMEAD, CA 91770

NGUYEN QUAN  
MGR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
GOLDEN STATE WATER CO. - ELECTRIC OP.  
630 EAST FOOTHILL BOULEVARD  
SAN DIMAS, CA 91773

JONATHAN WORD  
ALTON ENERGY  
4039 ALTON WAY  
ESCONDIDO, CA 92025

TY TOSDAL  
TOSDAL LAW FIRM  
ANALYSIS  
777 S. HIGHWAY 101, SUITE 215  
SOLANA BEACH, CA 92075  
FOR: SAN DIEGO ENERGY DISTRICT  
FOUNDATION

SHAWN BAILEY  
DIRECTOR - PLANNING &  
SEMPRA US GAS AND POWER  
101 ASH STREET  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-3017

CENTRAL FILES  
SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP31-E  
COMPANY  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
CP32D

CHRISTOPHER SUMMERS  
REGULATORY CASE ADMIN.  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT,  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123

DESPINA NIEHAUS  
REGULATORY CASE MGR.  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY  
COMPANY  
8330 CENTURY PARK COURT, CP32D  
CP21D  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1530

THOMAS C. SAILE  
ENERGY CONTRACTS ORIGINATOR  
SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC  
8315 CENTURY PARK COURT,  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1548

CATHERINE SULLIVAN  
E22BGREEN  
27479 VIA RAMONA  
SAN JUAN CAPISTRANO, CA 92675

CRAIG POSPISIL  
EDISON MISSION ENERGY  
3 MACARTHUR PLACE, STE. 100  
SANTA ANA, CA 92707

JEFF HIRSCH  
JAMES J. HIRSCH & ASSOCIATES  
12185 PRESILLA ROAD  
STE. 135  
SANTA ROSA VALLEY, CA 93012-9243

RINALDO BRUTUCO  
WORLD BUSINESS ACADEMY  
2020 ALAMEDA PADRE SERRA,  
SANTA BARBARA, CA 93103

Revised December 2013

RON DICKERSON  
CALIFORNIA CONSUMERS ALLIANCE  
PO BOX 3751  
CLOVIS, CA 93613

ALBERT NELSON  
APPLIED SUPERCONDUCTOR, INC.  
ECONOMICS, INC.  
251 PARK ROAD, SUITE 600  
BULINGAME, CA 94010

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
CITY HALL, ROOM 234  
FRANCISCO  
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLET PLACE  
PLACE, RM. 234  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

MARCEL HAWIGER  
THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK  
785 MARKET ST., STE. 1400  
935  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

JIM BAAK  
DIR - POLICY FOR UTILITY-SCALE SOLAR  
THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE  
101 MONTGOMERY ST., STE. 2600  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

CARA GOLDENBERG  
DIAN GRUENEICH CONSULTING, LLC  
COMPANY  
201 MISSION STREET, SUITE 1200  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

FRED WELLINGTON  
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.  
1 MARKET ST., SPEAR ST. TOWER, STE 1200  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

FUND

KIMBERLY C. JONES  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE STREET, MC B9A, ROOM 904  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

RANDY SHILLING  
4886 EAST JENSEN AVENUE  
FRESNO, CA 93725

NICOLAI SCHLAG  
ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL  
101 MONTGOMERY ST., STE 1600  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94101

JEANNE M. SOLE  
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682

BREWSTER BIRDSALL, P.E.  
ASPEN ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP  
235 MONTGOMERY STREET, STE.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104

BARNEY SPECKMAN  
VP - GRID MANAGEMENT  
NEXANT  
101 SECOND STREET, 11TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

CHRISTOPHER SMITH  
PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC  
77 BEALE STREET, B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

JAMES FINE  
SR. ECONOMIST  
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND  
123 MISSION ST., 28TH FL.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105  
FOR: ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE

MATHEW VESPA  
SR. ATTORNEY  
SIERRA CLUB  
85 SECOND STREET, 2ND FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

SB\_GT&S\_0091668

MATTHEW GONZALES  
SENIOR CASE MANAGER  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
77 BEALE ST., RM. 918, B9A  
SUITE 1850  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

WADE A. GREENACRE  
REGULATORY CASE COORDINATOR  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
COMPANY  
77 BEALE ST., MC B9A  
B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

DAVID A. ZIZMOR  
GRADUATE FELLOW  
ENVIRONMENTAL LAW & JUSTICE CLINIC  
CLINIC  
536 MISSION STREET  
OF LAW  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2968

STEVEN MOSS  
SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY POWER  
2325 THIRD STREET, STE. 344  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94107

DEVIN MCDONELL  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN  
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

PAUL R. CORT  
EARTHJUSTICE  
50 CALIFORNIA ST., STE. 500  
500  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

SARAH BARKER-BALL  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
3 EMBARCADERO CENTER  
LAMPREY LLP  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

WILL MITCHELL

MICHAEL ALCANTAR  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ALCANTAR & KAHL LLP  
33 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET,  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

TOM JARMAN  
ENERGY  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
77 BEALE STREET, RM. 909, MC  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-1814

JAMES J. CORBELLI  
STAFF ATTORNEY  
ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND JUSTICE  
GOLDEN GATE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL  
536 MISSION STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2968

ADENIKE ADEYEYE  
EARTHJUSTICE  
50 CALIFORNIA ST., STE. 500  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

MONICA A. SCHWEBS  
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP  
THREE EMBARCADERO CENTER  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

ROSICELI VILLARREAL  
EARTHJUSTICE  
50 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

SUZY HONG  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
GOODIN MACBRIDE SQUERI DAY &  
505 SANSOME STREET, SUITE 900  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

MICHAEL S. HINDUS



COMPETITIVE POWER VENTURES, INC.  
PITTMAN LLP  
505 SANSOME STREET, STE. 475  
FLR.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

IRENE K. MOOSEN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
53 SANTA YNEZ AVE.  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94112

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

DONNA BARRY  
ENERGY PROCEEDINGS  
MYERS  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 770000, MC B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120-7442

ED LUCHA  
CASE COORDINATOR  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
PO BOX 770000, MAIL CODE B9A  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177

BETH VAUGHN  
CALIFORNIA COGENERATION COUNCIL  
AFFAIRS  
4391 N. MARSH ELDER COURT  
CONCORD, CA 94521

ROBERT ANDERSON  
OLIVINE, INC  
2010 CROW CANYON PLACE, STE. 100  
SN RAMON, CA 94583

ANTHONY HARRISON  
CAL. ENERGY EFFICIENCY INDUSTRY COUNCIL  
PROGRAM  
436 14TH ST., SUITE 1020  
ENGINEERS HEALTH  
OAKLAND, CA 94612

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW  
4 EMBARCADERO CENTER, 22ND  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-5998

STEVEN MOSS  
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND  
2325 THIRD STREET, STE. 344  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94114

CHARLES R. MIDDLEKAUFF  
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC  
PO BOX 7442, MC-B30A-2475  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94120

MEGAN M. MYERS  
LAW OFFICES OF SARA STECK  
122 - 28TH AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94121

ANDY SCHWARTZ  
SOLARCITY  
3055 CLEARVIEW WAY  
SAN MATEO, CA 94402

AVIS KOWALEWSKI  
VP - GOV'T & REGULATORY  
CALPINE CORPORATION  
4160 DUBLIN BLVD, SUITE 100  
DUBLIN, CA 94568

GREGORY BLUE  
PRINCIPAL  
GTB CONSULTING  
3161 WALNUT BLVD  
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596

ELENA KRIEGER, PH.D  
DIR - RENEWABLE ENERGY  
PHYSICIANS, SCIENTISTS &  
436 14TH ST., STE. 808

ENGINEERS

SHANA LAZEROW  
ATTORNEY  
COMMUNITIES FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT  
1904 FRANKLIN STREET, STE 600  
OAKLAND, CA 94612  
FOR: CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE  
ALLIANCE

TIM LINDL  
.  
INTERSTATE RENEWABLE ENERGY COUNCIL, INC  
436 14TH ST., STE. 1305  
OAKLAND, CA 94612

ERIC G. GIMON  
TECHNICAL CONSULTANT  
THE VOTE SOLAR INITIATIVE  
2727 MARIN AVE.  
BERKELEY, CA 94708

PHILLIP MULLER  
SCD ENERGY SOLUTIONS  
436 NOVA ALBION WAY  
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

RICH QUATTRINI  
DIR. PRODUCT MANAGEMENT  
INC.  
JOHNSON CONTROLS  
100-3  
901 CAMPISI WAY, STE 260  
CAMPBELL, CA 95008-2348

DEVRA WANG  
STAFF SCIENTIST  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL  
141  
111 SUTTER STREET, 20TH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 95104

JEFFREY SHIELDS  
GEN MGR.  
SOUTH SAN JOAQUIN IRRIGATION DISTRICT  
PO BOX 747  
RIPON, CA 95366-0747

OAKLAND, CA 94612  
FOR: PHYSICIANS, SCIENTISTS &  
FOR HEALTHY ENERGY

THADEUS B. CULLEY  
KEYES, FOX & WIEDMAN LLP  
436 14TH STREET, STE. 1305  
OAKLAND, CA 94612  
FOR: FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

LINDA AGERTER  
LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION  
51 PARKSIDE DRIVE  
BERKELEY, CA 94705

CARLOS LAMAS-BABBINI  
CEN-CA PROGRAM MGR.  
COMVERGE, INC.  
58 MT. TALLAC CT.  
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903

JENNIFER A. CHAMBERLIN  
JOHNSON CONTROLS, INC.  
901 CAMPISI WAY, SUITE 260  
CAMPBELL, CA 95008-2348

PUSHKAR G. WAGLE  
FLYNN RESOURCE CONSULTANTS,  
2900 GORDON AVENUE, SUITE  
SANTA CLARA, CA 95051

C. SUSIE BERLIN  
LAW OFFICES OF SUSIE BERLIN  
1346 THE ALAMEDA, STE. 7, NO.  
SAN JOSE, CA 95126

JAMES CALDWELL  
1650 E NAPA STREET  
SONOMA, CA 95476

DOUGLAS M. GRANDY, P.E.  
CALIFORNIA ONSITE GENERATION  
1220 MACAULAY CIRCLE  
CARMICHAEL, CA 95608

MARTIN HOMECE  
PO BOX 4471  
DAVIS, CA 95617

DELPHINE HOU  
CALIF. INDEPENDENT SYSTEMS OPERATOR  
AFFAIRS - CA  
250 OUTCROPPING WAY  
FOLSOM, CA 95630

JACQUELINE M. DEROSA  
DIRECTOR OF REGULATORY  
CUSTOMIZED ENERGY SOLUTIONS  
101 PARKSHORE DRIVE SUITE 100  
FOLSOM, CA 95630

PAUL D. MAXWELL  
OPERATOR CORP.  
NAVIGANT CONSULTING, INC.  
35 IRON POINT CIRCLE, STE. 225  
FOLSOM, CA 95630

CAL. INDEPENDENT SYSTEM  
250 OUTCROPPING WAY  
FOLSOM, CA 95630

SHUCHENG LIU  
CALIFORNIA ISO  
250 OUTCROPPING WAY  
FOLSOM, CA 95630-8773

BRIAN THEAKER  
NRG ENERGY  
3161 KEN DEREK LANE  
PLACERVILLE, CA 95667

DANIEL KIM  
WESTLANDS SOLAR PARK  
PO BOX 582844  
ELK GROVE, CA 95757

ALLISON C. SMITH  
ATTORNEY  
STOEL RIVES LLP  
500 CAPITOL MALL, SUITE 1600  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

DAVID MILLER, PHD  
CTR. FOR ENERGY EFFECIENCY & RENEWABLE  
1100 ELEVENTH ST., STE. 311  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

JENNIFER WEBERSKI  
ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND  
49 TERRA BELLA DRIVE  
WALNUT CREEK, CA 95814

KEVIN WOODRUFF  
WOODRUFF EXPERT SERVICES  
SMITH  
1100 K STREET, SUITE 204  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
FOR: THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK

NICOLE WRIGHT  
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN &  
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

STEVEN J. KEENE  
BRAUN BLAISING MCLAUGHLIN P.C.  
915 L STREET, SUITE 1270  
ASSOCIATION  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

STEVEN KELLY  
POLICY DIRECTOR  
INDEPENDENT ENERGY PRODUCERS  
1215 K STREET, STE. 900  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

SAMANTHA G. POTTENGER  
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER AND HARRIS L.L.P.  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816

CHASE B. KAPPEL  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS LLP  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
LLP  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905  
400

GREGGORY L. WHEATLAND  
ATTORNEY  
ELLISON SCHNEIDER & HARRIS L.L.P.  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905

SHANNON EDDY  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR  
LARGE SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION  
2501 PORTOLA WAY  
205  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95818

JACK ELLIS  
1425 ALPINE WAY / PO BOX 6600  
LAKE TRAHOE, CA 96145-6600

VIRINDER SINGH  
DIR. - REG. & LEGISLATIVE. AFFAIRS  
TRADING ASSN.  
EDF RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC.  
5700  
517 SW 4TH AVE., STE. 300  
PORTLAND, OR 97212  
FOR: EDF RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC.

DANIEL JURIJEW  
SR. MGR - REGULATORY AFFAIRS WEST  
CAPITAL POWER CORPORATION  
1200 - 10423 101 ST. NW  
EDMONTON, AB T5H 0E9  
CANADA

ANDREW BROWN  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ELLISON & SCHNEIDER  
2600 CAPITOL AVE, SUITE 400  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905

DOUGLAS K. KERNER  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
ELLISON, SCHNEIDER & HARRIS,  
2600 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95816-5905

RACHEL GOLD  
LARGE-SCALE SOLAR ASSOCIATION  
2501 PORTOLA WAY  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95818

ANN TROWBRIDGE  
ATTORNEY  
DAY CARTER & MURPHY LLP  
3620 AMERICAN RIVER DR., STE.  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95864

DONALD SCHOENBECK  
RCS INC.  
3426 SE CRYSTAL SPRINGS BLVD.  
PORTLAND, OR 97202

ROBIN FRASER  
INTERNATIONAL EMISSIONS  
100 KING STREET WEST, SUITE  
TORONTO, ON M5X 1C7  
CANADA  
FOR: IETA

PETER CAVAN  
PULSE ENERGY  
576 SEYMOUR ST., STE. 600  
VANCOUVER, BC V6B 3K1  
CANADA

## State Service

BRIAN STEVENS  
CPUC - ENERGY  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CHRIS UNGSON  
CPUC  
EMAIL ONLY  
COMMISSION  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DAVID PECK  
ORA  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ELIZABETH DORMAN  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
EMAIL ONLY  
OVERSIGHT  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JORDAN PARRILLO  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING AND POLICY BRANCH  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LEGAL DIVISION  
CPUC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LILY CHOW  
REGULATORY ANALYST  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

MICHAELA FLAGG  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION

CARLOS VELASQUEZ  
CPUC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

CLAIRE EUSTACE  
PROJECT COORDINATOR - ORA  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

DONALD J. BROOKS  
CPUC - ENERGY DIV.  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

JOANNA GUEMAN  
REGULATORY ANALYST  
CPUC - PROCUREMENT ADEQUACY &  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

KEITH D. WHITE  
CPUC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LEWIS BICHKOFF  
CPUC  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

LINDA KELLY  
CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

VALERIE KAO  
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES

ORA  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

WILLIAM DIETRICH  
SR. ANALYST - ENERGY DIV.  
COMMISSION  
CPUC  
BRANCH  
EMAIL ONLY  
EMAIL ONLY, CA 00000

ALAN WECKER  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY  
ROOM 4102  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ALEXANDER COLE  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND PERMITTING B  
PERMITTING B  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ALOKE GUPTA  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ARTHUR J. O'DONNELL  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND PERMITTING B  
BRANCH  
ROOM 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHLOE LUKINS  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY  
ROOM 4102  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

CHRIS UNGSON  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
OVERSIGHT BRANC  
ROOM 4104  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAMON A. FRANZ  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID M. GAMSON  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGES  
ENFORCEMENT BRANCH  
ROOM 5019  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

DAVID SIAO  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
UTILITY & PAYPHONE  
ROOM 455  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

ED CHARKOWICZ  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

EDWARD F. RANDOLPH  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES

COMMISSION  
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

IRYNA KWASNY  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
LEGAL DIVISION  
ROOM 4107  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214  
FOR: ORA

KARIN M. HIETA  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH  
ENFORCEMENT BRANCH  
ROOM 4102  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MARCELO POIRIER  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
EXECUTIVE DIVISION  
ROOM 5025  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MEGHA LAKHCHAURA  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC  
PERMITTING B  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MICHEL PETER FLORIO  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
EXECUTIVE DIVISION  
AREA  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NEAL REARDON  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

ENERGY DIVISION  
ROOM 4004  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

JULIE A. FITCH  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
EXECUTIVE DIVISION  
ROOM 5214  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

KE HAO OUYANG  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
UTILITY & PAYPHONE  
AREA 2-E  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MATT MILEY  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
LEGAL DIVISION  
ROOM 5135  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MERIDETH STERKEL  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

MICHELE KITO  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
DEMAND SIDE ANALYSIS BRANCH  
AREA 4-A  
505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214

NIKA ROGERS  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES

COMMISSION INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND PERMITTING B BRANCH AREA 4-A 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214	ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY ROOM 4101 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
PATRICK L. YOUNG CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION COMMISSION INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING AND PERMITTING B BRANCH AREA 4-A 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214	PETER SPENCER CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY ROOM 4104 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
RACHEL MCMAHON CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION COMMISSION DEMAND SIDE PROGRAMS BRANCH CUSTOMER PROGRAM AREA 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214	RADU CIUPAGEA CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES ELECTRICITY PRICING AND ROOM 4104 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
SEAN A. SIMON CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION COMMISSION PROCUREMENT STRATEGY AND OVERSIGHT BRANC AREA 4-A 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214	SEPIDEH KHOSROWJAH CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES EXECUTIVE DIVISION ROOM 5201 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
STEPHEN ST. MARIE CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION COMMISSION EXECUTIVE DIVISION CUSTOMER PROGRAM ROOM 5203 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214	XIAN "CINDY" LI CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES ELECTRICITY PRICING AND ROOM 4104 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214
YAKOV LASKO CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION ELECTRICITY PLANNING & POLICY BRANCH ROOM 4101 505 VAN NESS AVENUE SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3214	CONSTANCE LENI CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION MS-20 1516 NINTH STREET SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
MARC S. PRYOR CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION	MICHAEL JASKE CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION



Revised December 2013

1516 NINTH STREET  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

REBECCA TSAI-WEI LEE  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
COMMISSION  
ORA - ADMINISTRATIVE BRANCH  
COMPLIANCE BRAN  
770 L Street, Suite 1250  
115  
Sacramento, CA 95814

1516 9TH STREET, MS-21  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814

KEVIN S. NAKAMURA  
CALIF PUBLIC UTILITIES  
UTILITY AUDIT, FINANCE &  
180 Promenade Circle, Suite  
Sacramento, CA 95834

Executed this 13th day of May, 2014, at San Francisco,  
California.

s/Rosiceli Villarreal

Rosiceli Villarreal  
Earthjustice  
50 California Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, CA 94111

# ATTACHMENT 2

## **List of Substantive Documents Filed by Sierra Club California in Tracks 1, 3 & 4 in the 2012 Long Term Procurement Planning Proceeding**

### **Track 1**

1. “Comments of Sierra Club California on the Preliminary Scoping Memo” (April 6, 2012)
2. “Opening Brief of Sierra Club California on Track I Issues” (September 24, 2012)
3. “Reply Brief of Sierra Club California on Track I Issues” (October 12, 2012)
4. “Reply Comments of Sierra Club California on the Joint LTPP /Storage Workshop, Held September 7, 2012” (October 23, 2012)
5. “Comments of Sierra Club California on Proposed Decision Authorizing Procurement for Local Capacity Requirements” (January 14, 2013)
6. “Reply Comments of Sierra Club California on Proposed Decision Authorizing Procurement for Local Capacity Requirements” (January 22, 2013)

### **Track 3**

1. “Comments of Sierra Club California on Track 3 Rules” (November 2, 2012)
2. “Reply Comments of Sierra Club and California Environmental Justice Alliance on Track 3 Rules” (November 30, 2012)
3. “Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on Track III Rules Issues” (April 26, 2013)
4. “California Environmental Justice Alliance’s and Sierra Club California’s Comments on the Track III Proposed Decision” (February 18, 2014)
5. “California Environmental Justice Alliance’s and Sierra Club California’s Reply Comments on the Track III Proposed Decision” (February 24, 2014)

### **Track 4**

1. “Opening Comments of Sierra Club California on ALJ Gamson’s Questions from the September 4, 2013 Prehearing Conference” (September 30, 2013)
2. “Prepared Opening Testimony of Bill Powers on behalf of Sierra Club California” (September 30, 2013)

3. “Prepared Rebuttal Testimony of Bill Powers on behalf of Sierra Club California” (October 14, 2013)
4. “Post-Hearing Opening Brief of Sierra Club California in Track 4” (November 25, 2013)
5. “Reply Brief of Sierra Club California in Track 4” (December 16, 2013)
6. “Sierra Club California’s Comments on the Proposed Decision Authorizing Long-Term Procurement for Local Capacity Requirements Due to the Permanent Retirement of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station” (March 3, 2014)
7. “Sierra Club California’s Reply Comments on the Proposed Decision Authorizing Long-Term Procurement for Local Capacity Requirements due to the Permanent Retirement of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station” (March 10, 2014)

# ATTACHMENT 3

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
3/26/2012	2012 LTTP: Find new OIR and review; OCW P. Cort re: new LTTP; email to clients re: same	1.00						1.00
3/27/2012	CW Matt Vespa re: new LTTP	0.30						0.30
4/4/2012	CW Robert Freehling re: Comments on OIR	0.50						0.50
4/4/2012	Second CW Robert Freehling re: Comments on OIR	0.50						0.50
4/4/2012	Draft comment on OIR; review emails for R. Freehling	4.50						4.50
4/5/2012	Draft comment on OIR	6.50						6.50
4/5/2012	CW Robert Freehling re: CHP	0.10						0.10
4/6/2012	CW R. Freehling re: comments	0.10						0.10
4/6/2012	Revise comment on OIR; email to clients	1.50						1.50
4/6/2012	Review emails from clients and revise comment accordingly; line edit.	1.00						1.00
4/6/2012	Skim filed comments	1.00						1.00
4/18/2012	Prepare for Prehearing Conf.	0.80						0.80
4/18/2012	Arrive early for Prehearing Conf.; brief meeting with A. Adeyeye	0.50						0.50
4/18/2012	Prehearing conference	4.00						4.00
4/18/2012	Lunch meeting with D. Behles, S. Lazerow and A. Adeyeye	1.00						1.00
4/27/2012	Talk with A. Adeyeye and R. Freehling						1.40	1.40
5/3/2012	R Sparks testimony in Carlsbad proceeding		0.30					0.30
5/3/2012	Workshop on CAISO LCR studies		2.00					2.00
5/3/2012	Lunch with CEJA attorneys and Nike					1.30		1.30
5/3/2012	Workshop on CAISO LCR studies; post workshop discussions		3.30					3.30
5/4/2012	Develop case strategy and plan	1.00						1.00
5/4/2012	Web research re: state agency documents on OTC		1.00					1.00
5/7/2012	CW D. Behles re: discovery form					0.20		0.20
5/7/2012	DR discovery requests to CAISO; review CAISO workshop presentation and my notes		5.30					5.30
5/8/2012	R CAISO Transmission Study; draft and revise data requests		4.50					4.50
5/8/2012	Legal research: review CAISO statutory authority, review of CAISO comments to water board		0.30					0.30
5/9/2012	Draft discovery requests to CAISO; review transmission plan		2.00					2.00
5/9/2012	TCW Sarah Thomas, DRA re: experts and other case issues					0.30		0.30
5/9/2012	Revise discovery request and serve on CAISO		0.40					0.40
5/11/2012	Email with Sarah Thomas re: potential meeting and forward discovery					0.10		0.10
5/18/2012	Email with DRA re: scheduling meeting for next week					0.10		0.10
5/18/2012	R CAISO Discovery answers to DRA		0.20					0.20

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
5/18/2012	R Scoping Memo						0.30	0.30
5/21/2012	R DRA testimony in SDG&E PPA Case						0.50	0.50
5/23/2012	Skim LCR testimony from CAISO		0.20					0.20
5/25/2012	VM for Judith Sanders re: discovery requests; Follow up email; brief email exchange with her		0.40					0.40
6/19/2012	R scoping memo; CAISO discovery responses; CAISO testimony and supplemental testimony						2.90	2.90
6/20/2012	VM D. Behles re: CAISO supplemental testimony					0.10		0.10
6/20/2012	Review CAISO responses to Vote Solar data request; OCW A. Adeyeye re: responses; review ISO new response to CEJA and response to CPUC staff						0.80	0.80
6/21/2012	TCW Matt Vespa re: LTTP strategy						0.20	0.20
6/25/2012	Read parties Track 1 testimony						2.50	2.50
6/26/2012	Read the filed testimony						5.00	5.00
6/28/2012	TCW D. Behles re: testimony and strategy						0.60	0.60
6/29/2012	Talk with A. Adeyeye about opening testimony in track 1 of LTTP						0.50	0.50
6/29/2012	Review testimony; develop strategy for cross and reply						1.50	1.50
7/3/2012	R Allianc for Nuclear Responsibility filings, and IEP motion						0.30	0.30
7/5/2012	TCW Kelly Foley re: testimony; prehearing conf. and SONGS					0.40		0.40
7/5/2012	R CEJA data requests to SCE						0.20	0.20
7/6/2012	Email with Sierra Martinez and D. Behles re: EE and prehearing conf.					0.20		0.20
7/9/2012	Attend pre hearing conf. in room early					0.30		0.30
7/9/2012	Pre hearing conf.					2.00		2.00
7/16/2012	R CAISO response to DRA and CEJA discovery; email R. Freehling re: same						0.30	0.30
7/17/2012	R ALJ order and Commissioner ruling re: motion to strike WEM testimony						0.10	0.10
7/17/2012	Talk with A. Adeyeye about the LTTP prehearing conference						0.50	0.50
7/17/2012	Rereview SCE testimony						0.50	0.50
7/19/2012	Finish rereading SCE testimony; Data request to SCE; email from A. Adeyeye re: questions; review CEJA data requests						1.00	1.00
7/20/2012	R data requests; develop cross						1.00	1.00
7/23/2012	Review various parties reply testimony						2.00	2.00
7/24/2012	VM for D. Behles re: coordination and subsequent email					0.20		0.20
7/24/2012	TCW Robert Freehling re: cross for CAISO and SCE						1.20	1.20
7/24/2012	R reply testimony						0.60	0.60
7/24/2012	R CAISO reply testimony						0.30	0.30
7/25/2012	Review testimony; develop brief and cross strategy						1.10	1.10
7/25/2012	Draft notes for post hearing brief		0.40					0.40

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
7/25/2012	Review testimony; develop brief and cross strategy		0.10	0.10	0.10		0.20	0.50
7/25/2012	OCW-A.Adeyeye re: cross strategy						1.20	1.20
7/25/2012	Draft cross for SCE						0.50	0.50
7/26/2012	Draft cross for CAISO and SCE						1.50	1.50
7/26/2012	Draft cross for CAISO and SCE						1.00	1.00
7/27/2012	Prepare cross; review testimony						6.00	6.00
7/27/2012	OCW-A.Adeyeye re: cross and briefing strategy		0.10	0.10	0.10			0.30
7/31/2012	TCW-Deborah Behles; Shana Foley and A.Adeyeye re: cross examination strategy					0.70		0.70
7/31/2012	TCW-Deborah Behles and A.Adeyeye re: load forecast; OCW-A.Adeyeye re: strategy					0.20		0.20
7/31/2012	TCW-Kelly Foley re: cross strategy					0.20		0.20
7/31/2012	TCW-Sierra Martinez re: cross energy efficiency			0.30		0.30		0.60
7/31/2012	Draft Cross						3.70	3.70
8/1/2012	Preparing cross						4.50	4.50
8/1/2012	OCW-Paul Cort re: questions for CAISO		0.20					0.20
8/1/2012	TCW-S.Martinez NRDC re: energy efficiency from CEC					0.30		0.30
8/1/2012	R-CEC Energy Efficiency Demand forecast; email to Robert Freehling; VM Sierra Martinez; VM for Kelly Foley re: briefing			0.30				0.30
8/1/2012	Talk with A.Adeyeye about Solar in LTPP			0.10				0.10
8/2/2012	Complete drafts of crosses						1.50	1.50
8/2/2012	Draft estimates of cross times					0.20		0.20
8/2/2012	OCW-A.Adeyeye re: cross; Draft intro/outline of brief		0.20	0.10	0.10			0.40
8/2/2012	Email w/D.Behles re: proposing briefing schedule					0.10		0.10
8/2/2012	Review testimony and ISO discovery responses						2.00	2.00
8/3/2012	Review changes to A.Adeyeye; revise cross; multiple email with D.Behles re: cross and briefing schedule; review multiple filings and emails in proceeding; preparing for hearings					5.00		5.00
8/3/2012	Email Robert Freehling draft cross and VM to him						0.20	0.20
8/3/2012	Reviewing CEC demand forecasts			0.30				0.30
8/5/2012	Review SDG&E and PG&E testimony						0.40	0.40
8/6/2012	Review and revise crosses						2.50	2.50
8/6/2012	Email w to Robert Freehling re: demand forecasts; and reviewing crosses. Email to Judith Sanders re: cross documents; research on energy commission website re: links			0.20		0.20		0.40
8/6/2012	Oppositions to ISO's motion to strike						0.20	0.20
8/7/2012	Revise crosses						1.50	1.50



Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
8/7/2012	Review and revise crosses						0.60	0.60
8/7/2012	Track 1 hearings including lunch break					6.00		6.00
8/8/2012	Track 1 hearings including lunch break					7.00		7.00
8/9/2012	Review and revise Cushnie cross				0.30			0.30
8/9/2012	Track 1 hearings including lunch break					7.20		7.20
8/10/2012	Track 1 hearings					5.50		5.50
8/10/2012	lunch with over envois					0.60		0.60
8/10/2012	revise cross during break						0.40	0.40
8/11/2012	Email from D. Behles and K. Foley re: demand forecast					0.20		0.20
8/12/2012	Review and revise SCE crosses					1.00		1.00
8/13/2012	Arrive at hearings early; discussions with other parties					0.30		0.30
8/13/2012	LTPP Hearings including Lunch					6.50		6.50
8/13/2012	Review transcript; revise crosses for next day					1.50		1.50
8/14/2012	Arrive at hearings early; discussions with other parties					0.20		0.20
8/14/2012	Review transcript;					0.50		0.50
8/14/2012	Mtg. with D. Behles re: cross prior to hearings					0.20		0.20
8/14/2012	LTPP Hearings including Lunch					6.80		6.80
8/15/2012	Review transcripts and related exhibits		1.50	1.00	1.00			3.50
8/16/2012	TCW-D. Behles re: Sparks Cross and briefing schedule					0.20		0.20
8/16/2012	Email with K. Foley re: Sept. 17 workshop					0.10		0.10
8/16/2012	Review transcript from yesterday and today; outline argument; OCW-A. Adeyeye		1.00	1.00	1.00			3.00
8/30/2012	Talk with A. Adeyeye about Track 1 Brief		0.20	0.20	0.10			0.50
8/31/2012	Review Sept 17 workshop notice; email with Kelly Foley					0.30		0.30
8/31/2012	R common outline and A. Adeyeye notes; outline approach		0.20	0.20	0.10			0.50
8/31/2012	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: brief strategy and division of labor					0.50		0.50
9/4/2012	CAISO LCR Study with no San Onofre		0.40					0.40
9/5/2012	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: need questions		0.20					0.20
9/5/2012	Revise intro to brief		0.20	0.10	0.20			0.50
9/6/2012	Review A. Adeyeye's initial draft of sections			0.40				0.40
9/6/2012	Revise intro to brief and organize argument		0.50	0.50	0.50			1.50
9/7/2012	LTPP/Energy Storage Workshop at PUC including lunch					6.50		6.50
9/10/2012	Draft Brief		2.00					2.00
9/11/2012	Draft brief; review record		5.00					5.00
9/12/2012	Draft section I.A & B		1.50	1.50				3.00
9/12/2012	R.A. Adeyeye section on need; R Millar transcript; OCW-A. Adeyeye		0.70					0.70
9/13/2012	Draft brief; revise intro; section II			1.00				1.00
9/13/2012	Draft Section II			3.00				3.00
9/13/2012	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: need questions			0.40				0.40

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
9/13/2012	Review Millar testimony; notes for brief;		1.00					1.00
9/13/2012	TCW A. Adeyeye and D. Behles re: need and briefing strategy					0.50		0.50
9/14/2012	TCW D. Behles re: EE numbers			0.10				0.10
9/14/2012	Review A. Adeyeye's draft sections and my sections		0.20	0.20	0.10			0.50
9/14/2012	OCW A. Adeyeye re: brief					0.10		0.10
9/14/2012	TCW D. Behles re: loading order				0.10			0.10
9/14/2012	Draft brief; multiple office conf w. A. Adeyeye and emails; incorporate A. Adeyeye sections into brief		0.50	0.50	3.00			4.00
9/15/2012	Draft Brief sections II and III; revise section III			1.00	4.50			5.50
9/15/2012	Review ALJ order on Sept 7 workshop; email to Vote Solar and CEJA					0.20		0.20
9/16/2012	Draft and revise sections II and III. Email to A. Adeyeye re: brief status and projects			1.00	1.50			2.50
9/19/2012	Revise brief; review transcript; work on IV and V; OCW A. Adeyeye re: next steps on brief			2.00	2.00			4.00
9/20/2012	OCW A. Adeyeye re: facts for brief			0.10				0.10
9/20/2012	Draft brief section IV				2.00			2.00
9/20/2012	Draft Section IV				4.20			4.20
9/20/2012	Revise draft and finish drafting section IV				3.00			3.00
9/21/2012	Finish drafting section IV and revise draft; OCW A. Adeyeye re: draft; OCW J. Baird re: draft		2.00	2.00	2.00	0.30		6.30
9/21/2012	email to clients re: draft					0.20		0.20
9/22/2012	Edit brief; check cites		1.40	1.40	1.00			3.80
9/23/2012	Edit brief; draft recommendations and conclusion; check cites		2.00	2.00	1.50			5.50
9/24/2012	R and RV brief; cite check; incorporate P. Cort comments; multi OCW A. Adeyeye re: cites and brief review.		2.50	2.50	2.50			7.50
9/25/2012	Review opening briefs		1.00	1.00	1.00			3.00
9/27/2012	OCW A. Adeyeye re: opening briefs and reply strategy		0.10	0.10	0.10			0.30
9/27/2012	Review briefs and outline argument		0.40	0.40				0.80
9/27/2012	TCW Deborah Behles, Shana Foley and two law students and A. Adeyeye re: reply brief, PG&E's motion and comments on workshop					0.70		0.70
9/27/2012	Post phone call mtg. with A. Adeyeye					0.10		0.10
9/27/2012	Review DRA and CAC briefs		0.20	0.20	0.10			0.50
9/27/2012	Review opening briefs		0.50	0.50	0.40			1.40
9/28/2012	Review briefs; review notes from A. Adeyeye; discuss outline and strategy with A. Adeyeye; email to Matt Vespa re: strategy discussion		0.80	0.80	0.60			2.20
9/28/2012	Review briefs		0.80	0.80	0.60			2.20
9/30/2012	R A. Adeyeye's draft sections			0.20				0.20

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
10/1/2012	TCW Kelly Foley re: Track 1 arguments					0.60		0.60
10/1/2012	OCW A. Adeyeye re: her draft			0.10				0.10
10/2/2012	OCW A. Adeyeye re: her draft and reply schedule			0.10				0.10
10/2/2012	Review A. Adeyeye sections began drafting other sections of Reply and intro; review opening briefs		2.00	1.00				3.00
10/3/2012	TCW D. Behles re: case strategy					0.10		0.10
10/3/2012	Review A. Adeyeye draft			0.50				0.50
10/3/2012	OCW A. Adeyeye re: reply brief			0.10				0.10
10/4/2012	TCW D. Behles re: opening comments on LTPP/Storage workshop					0.20		0.20
10/4/2012	Review CEJA response to ALJ questions on LTPP/Storage workshop re: potential collaboration			0.70				0.70
10/4/2012	DR reply Track 1		1.00					1.00
10/4/2012	TCW M. Vespa re: CEJA draft comments and strategy		0.10	0.10				0.20
10/4/2012	DR reply Track 1		2.10					2.10
10/4/2012	Review email ALJ Gamson re: scheduling; revise calendar; email Matt Vespa re: same						0.20	0.20
10/5/2012	Draft Track 1 reply		5.50					5.50
10/6/2012	Draft Track 1 reply		3.00					3.00
10/8/2012	Draft Track 1 reply		3.00					3.00
10/9/2012	Draft Track 1 reply			1.50				1.50
10/10/2012	Draft Track 1 reply			3.00				3.00
10/11/2012	Draft Track 1 reply and revise		1.50	2.00				3.50
10/12/2012	Review and revise Track 1 reply brief		2.50	2.00				4.50
10/19/2012	Draft reply brief on Sept. 7 workshop topics				3.50			3.50
10/19/2012	TCW Matt Vespa re: reply brief				0.30			0.30
10/22/2012	Draft reply brief on Sept. 7 workshop topics				5.00			5.00
10/23/2012	Revise reply brief on Sept. 7 workshop topics; review cites				1.50			1.50
10/23/2012	review Matt Vespa email; revise reply and incorporate his comments; finalize document; OCW A. Adeyeye re: final review				0.50			0.50
12/24/2012	Email re: PD from commission; review notice; calendar dates; email to D. Behles re: timing						0.20	0.20
12/24/2012	Review Track 1 PD and related cites		0.50	0.50	0.50			1.50
12/26/2012	Go over Track 1 PD again and take notes for comments				0.50			0.50
12/27/2012	Review Track 1 PD and make notes for comments		1.50	1.50	1.50			4.50
12/28/2012	Draft email to client re: decision; formulate comments		1.00	1.50	1.50			4.00
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>#5</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Total Hours for William Rostov, Attorney in 2012</b>		<b>24.30</b>	<b>71.40</b>	<b>42.20</b>	<b>48.50</b>	<b>66.50</b>	<b>53.60</b>	<b>306.50</b>

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
1/7/2013	TCW D. Behles and Shana Foley re: proposed decision		0.50			0.50		1.00
1/8/2013	Draft comments on PD		3.00		3.00			6.00
1/8/2013	TCW CEJA and DRA re: PD issues		0.70			0.70		1.40
1/8/2013	TCW A. Adeyeye and D. Behles re: briefing issues and call with DRA		0.20			0.20		0.40
1/8/2013	OCW A. Adeyeye re: Comments on PD		0.20	0.20				0.40
1/9/2013	Review PD and drafts comments		1.00	0.50	0.50			2.00
1/9/2013	Draft comments on PD		5.00		5.00			10.00
1/10/2013	Draft comment on PD; OCW Nike re: demand response; incorporate DR section into comment		6.00	2.50	3.50			12.00
1/11/2013	Draft comments on PD; email with M. Vespa re: comments; email w/ R. Freehling re: comments; OCW A. Adeyeye re: review and DR; revise comments		4.00	4.00				8.00
1/11/2013	TCW R. Freehling re: comments		0.20	0.20				0.40
1/13/2013	Review cites; edit comments		1.10	0.50	0.60			2.20
1/14/2013	Review comments and make final edits; email and text with J. Baird		0.40	0.20	0.20			0.80
1/15/2013	R-Opening Comments; review SCE filings in energy storage		4.00	2.00	2.00			8.00
1/16/2013	Review rest of comments; draft reply; OCW A. Adeyeye re: comments; review her email re: CEJA evidence		3.00	3.00				6.00
1/16/2013	TCW Matt Vespa re: Comments and exparte strategy		0.20			0.20		0.40
1/16/2013	TCW Deborah Behles re: Comments on PD and her meeting with Tisdale		0.30			0.30		0.60
1/17/2013	R-SCE and CAISO exparte notices; email with Matt Vespa re: SCE notice		0.20		0.20			0.40
1/17/2013	DR reply on PD focusing on energy storage		3.50	3.50				7.00
1/18/2013	DR Reply Comments; VM for Matt Vespa, email to Matt Vespa and Robert Freehling		3.00	2.00	1.00			6.00
1/21/2013	Review and revise reply comments on PD; email new version to clients		1.50	1.00	0.50			3.00
1/22/2013	Incorporate edits from A. Adeyeye and Matt Vespa; review comments; OCW J. Baird re: filing		1.00	0.70	0.30			2.00
1/24/2013	TCW D. Behles re: expartes		0.20			0.20		0.40
1/24/2013	Review reply briefs and expartes		0.50	0.30	0.20			1.00
1/25/2013	Exparte request; fill out forms; email		1.20				1.20	2.40
1/25/2013	Review expartes; file reply comments		0.30	0.20	0.10			0.60
1/29/2013	Review our comments on PD as well as SCE reply and CEJA and DRA exparte notices; prepare outline for mtg. with Matthew Tisdale		0.70	0.40	0.30			1.40
1/29/2013	Scheduling meetings with aides to Commission Ferron and Pederman		0.20				0.20	0.40

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
1/31/2013	Ex parte with Commissioner Florio's chief of staff; prepare for meeting		2.00			1.50		3.50
2/4/2013	Review LTP materials and prepare for meeting with Commission Pederman's office		0.50			0.50		1.00
2/5/2013	Reschedule mtg. with Commissioner Ferron's office		0.20				0.20	0.40
2/5/2013	Prepare for mtg. with Commissioner Pederman's office; pre mtg. with A. Adeyeye; ex parte mtg. with Julie Fitch and Rachel Peterson;		1.60			1.60		3.20
2/5/2013	Revise ex parte notice with Commissioner Florio's office; straighten out filing error		1.00				1.00	2.00
2/7/2013	Review revised decision and our comments; OCW A. Adeyeye re: same		1.00			1.00		2.00
2/7/2013	RV ex parte with Pederman's office		0.30				0.30	0.60
2/8/2013	Review and finalize Pederman ex parte		0.30				0.30	0.60
2/8/2013	Prepare for mtg. with Commissioner Ferron's office; pre mtg. with A. Adeyeye; ex parte mtg. with Sara Kamins;		2.00			1.40		3.40
2/8/2013	Review ex parte notices		0.20				0.20	0.40
2/11/2013	TCW M. Vespa re: revised proposed decision		0.20			0.20		0.40
5/22/2013	Review new scoping memo and ALJ order; Email to clients re: revised scoping memo; calendar dates;	1.20	2.40					3.60
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>#5</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Total Hours for William Rostov, Attorney in 2013</b>		<b>1.20</b>	<b>53.80</b>	<b>21.20</b>	<b>17.40</b>	<b>8.30</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>105.30</b>

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS FOR ROSTOV TIMESHEET

DR	Draft
OCW	Office call with
R	Review
RV	Revise
TCW	Telephone call with

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Adenike Adeyeye								
4/20/2012	Reading scoping memo.						0.80	0.80
4/27/2012	Talk with Will Rostov and Robert Freehling.						1.40	1.40
5/3/2012	TPP workshop at the PUC.		6.50					6.50
6/25/2012	Reading reply testimony emails.						0.30	0.30
6/25/2012	Reading parties' data requests.						1.30	1.30
6/26/2012	Reading opening testimony in Track 1 of LTPP.						2.10	2.10
6/26/2012	Talk with Rostov re: reply testimony in Track 1 of LTPP.						0.20	0.20
6/27/2012	Reading opening testimony in track 1 of LTPP.						0.40	0.40
6/28/2012	Analyzing opening testimony in Track 1 of the LTPP.						3.00	3.00
6/29/2012	Reading opening testimony in track 1 of LTPP.						1.60	1.60
6/29/2012	Reading opening testimony in track 1 of LTPP.						0.90	0.90
6/29/2012	Talking with Rostov about opening testimony in track 1 of LTPP.						0.50	0.50
6/29/2012	Reading LTPP opening testimony.						0.20	0.20
7/9/2012	Attending pre hearing conference at the PUC with Rostov.						2.30	2.30
7/17/2012	Talk with Rostov about the LTPP prehearing conference.						0.50	0.50
7/18/2012	Writing questions for data request and/or cross examination of SCE.			1.00				1.00
7/23/2012	Reading CAISO testimony and supporting documents.		0.30					0.30
7/23/2012	Reading CAISO testimony and supporting documents.		0.60					0.60
7/23/2012	Writing cross examination questions and reviewing CAISO's opening testimony.		1.20					1.20
7/24/2012	Reviewing CAISO opening and reply testimony.		2.00				0.50	2.50
7/24/2012	Reviewing CAISO reply testimony.		0.50					0.50
7/24/2012	Reading SCE reply testimony.						0.30	0.30
7/24/2012	Reading SCE reply testimony.						0.30	0.30
7/25/2012	Talk with Rostov about briefing and cross examination.						1.20	1.20
7/26/2012	Reading SCE testimony.						0.40	0.40
7/26/2012	Reading LTPP parties' reply testimony.						2.30	2.30
7/26/2012	Reading SCE and DRA testimony.						2.90	2.90
7/27/2012	Reading LTPP Track 1 reply testimony.						2.10	2.10
7/27/2012	Talk with W. Rostov about cross examination.						0.30	0.30
7/30/2012	Reading reply testimony and writing cross examination questions.						1.80	1.80
7/30/2012	Reading reply testimony and writing cross examination questions.						1.20	1.20
7/31/2012	Writing cross examination questions.						1.00	1.00
7/31/2012	Reading reply testimony.		0.20	0.20	0.20			0.60

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Adenike Adeyeye								
7/31/2012	Reading reply testimony.		0.50	0.50	0.50			1.50
7/31/2012	Reading reply testimony.		0.40	0.90				1.30
7/31/2012	Call with W. Rostov and D. Behles re: cross examination in Track 1 of LTPP.					0.90		0.90
8/1/2012	Reading CPUC reply testimony and incremental EE documents.			1.00				1.00
8/1/2012	Talk with Rostov about solar in LTPP.			0.10				0.10
8/2/2012	Reviewing and doing research for cross examination testimony in evidentiary hearings.			1.80				1.80
8/2/2012	Researching PV use in SCE territory.			0.80				0.80
8/3/2012	Reviewing and doing research for cross examination testimony in evidentiary hearings.			3.70				3.70
8/3/2012	Review and research for cross examination in evidentiary hearings.			1.40				1.40
8/7/2012	Discussing cross examination before LTPP hearing with Rostov.			0.30				0.30
8/29/2012	Reviewing LTPP hearing transcripts			0.80				0.80
8/30/2012	Reviewing LTPP hearing transcripts and writing notes for the brief.			0.70				0.70
8/30/2012	Reviewing testimony to create an outline for the brief.		0.50	1.00				1.50
8/30/2012	Talk with Rostov about track 1 brief.		0.20	0.20	0.10			0.50
8/30/2012	Reviewing LTPP hearing transcripts		0.40	0.40				0.80
8/30/2012	Reviewing LTPP hearing transcripts and writing notes for the brief.		1.00					1.00
9/4/2012	Research for LTPP post hearing brief.			4.60				4.60
9/5/2012	Working on LTPP post hearing brief.			4.90				4.90
9/5/2012	DCW Rostov re: need questions		0.20	0.00				0.20
9/10/2012	Reviewing LTPP brief.		0.30					0.30
9/10/2012	Working on LTPP Track 1 brief.			1.20				1.20
9/11/2012	Reviewing hearing transcripts.		2.00	2.00				4.00
9/11/2012	Reading through Rostov's draft of LTPP brief, and researching and working on sections of LTPP brief.		0.50	1.00				1.50
9/12/2012	Talk with Rostov about the brief.		0.20					0.20
9/12/2012	Working on LTPP brief.			5.40				5.40
9/13/2012	Working on LTPP brief			6.50				6.50
9/13/2012	Talk with Rostov and Behles re: LTPP track 1.					0.40		0.40
9/13/2012	Talk with Rostov re: LTPP track 1.		0.10	0.10	0.30			0.50
9/14/2012	Working on LTPP brief.			7.70				7.70
9/17/2012	Working on LTPP track 1 brief.		6.50					6.50
9/18/2012	Work on LTPP brief			3.50				3.50
9/20/2012	Working on LTPP track 1 brief.			5.30				5.30
9/20/2012	Talk with Rostov re: brief.			0.10				0.10
9/24/2012	Reviewing draft of brief.		2.00	1.00	1.50			4.50
9/25/2012	Reading LTPP Track 1 opening briefs.		1.50	1.50	0.40			3.40
9/26/2012	Reviewing briefs.		1.00	1.40	0.40			2.80
9/27/2012	Talk with Rostov re: opening briefs.		0.10	0.10	0.10			0.30

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Adenike Adeyeye								
9/27/2012	Reading briefs and creating reply brief outline.		1.50	1.50	0.90			3.90
9/27/2012	Reading briefs.		0.80	0.80	0.60			2.20
9/27/2012	Talk with CEJA and Rostov about reply brief and PGE motion.					0.70		0.70
9/28/2012	Reply brief outlining and writing.			5.10				5.10
10/1/2012	Work on LTPP brief.			1.60				1.60
10/1/2012	Work on reply brief.			1.00				1.00
10/2/2012	Work on LTPP reply brief			3.80				3.80
10/3/2012	Editing reply brief.		2.00	1.00				3.00
10/12/2012	Editing then cite checking reply brief in Track 1.		3.50	3.00				6.50
10/22/2012	Proofreading and adding cites to energy storage/LTPP joint reply comments.			1.00				1.00
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>#5</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2012</b>		<b>0.00</b>	<b>36.50</b>	<b>79.90</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>29.80</b>	<b>153.20</b>

1/7/2013	Talk with Rostov about LTPP track 1 decision.			0.10				0.10
1/7/2013	Reading LTPP decision.			1.00	1.00			2.00
1/8/2013	Talk with Rostov, DRA, and CEJA about LTPP track 1 decision.					0.90		0.90
1/8/2013	Reviewing LTPP track 1 proposed decision.				0.30			0.30
1/8/2013	Reading LTPP track 1 proposed decision.		0.50	0.50	0.40			1.40
1/8/2013	Talk with Rostov re: Comments on PD		0.20	0.20				0.40
1/9/2013	Reviewing LTPP track 1 proposed decision.		0.50	0.50	0.70			1.70
1/9/2013	Reviewing transcripts to find information about demand response in SCE territory.			1.70				1.70
1/9/2013	Outlining demand response section of comments, talking with Rostov about demand response section of comments.			0.70				0.70
1/10/2013	Reviewing draft of comments on proposed decision, beginning draft of demand response section of those comments.			1.20				1.20
1/10/2013	Writing draft of demand response section of those comments.			1.80				1.80
1/11/2013	Review EnerNOC opening and reply briefs.			0.40				0.40
1/11/2013	Reading and editing Track 1 proposed decision comments.			0.50				0.50
1/11/2013	Editing and cite checking comments on track 1 proposed decision.			2.10				2.10
1/11/2013	Revisions to comments on track 1 proposed decision.				1.10			1.10
1/16/2013	Talking with Rostov about LTPP proceeding.			0.10				0.10



Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2012 and 2013 (Track 1)

Date	Description	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Adenike Adeyeye								
1/16/2013	Research on CEJA's position on energy storage in LTPP.			0.60				0.60
1/16/2013	Research on energy storage in LTPP proceeding and on CAISO proceedings that impact storage, writing up notes for Rostov.			1.10				1.10
1/22/2013	Editing and cite checking comments on Track 1 proposed decision.			1.00	0.60			1.60
1/28/2013	Review other parties comments in response to PD and our comments in response to PD in preparation for ex parte meeting.					0.50		0.50
1/31/2013	Ex parte meeting at CPUC with aide to Commissioner Florio.					0.50		0.50
2/5/2013	Ex parte meeting with Commissioner Peterman's staff.					0.50		0.50
2/5/2013	Meeting with Rostov before ex parte meeting.					0.50		0.50
2/5/2013	Editing ex parte notice						0.20	0.20
2/8/2013	Researching DG targets and estimates in LTPP testimony.			0.70				0.70
2/8/2013	Meeting with Rostov before ex parte meeting.					0.50		0.50
2/8/2013	Writing ex parte notice.						0.60	0.60
2/8/2013	Ex parte meeting with aide to Commissioner Ferron.					0.50		0.50
Issue Areas		A	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Total
Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013		0.00	1.20	14.20	4.10	3.90	0.80	24.20

# ATTACHMENT 4

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012, 2013 and 2014 (Track 3)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
10/29/2012	Review scoping memo and orders related to Track 3	0.20		0.20		0.40
10/29/2012	TCW-D.Behles re: Track 3 comments; voicemail for Nat Skinner w/Deborah				0.30	0.30
10/31/2012	TCW-Sierra Martinez, NRDC, re: Track 3 comments				0.20	0.20
10/31/2012	email from Deborah Behles re: Track 3 comments; VM for Deborah Behles re: same; TCW-Deborah Behles re: same				0.20	0.20
11/1/2012	Draft Track 3 comments; email to clients re: same;	4.00				4.00
11/6/2012	Review Track 3 opening comments	0.50		1.00		1.50
11/6/2012	Email with Diana Lee and Deborah Behles re: meeting re: Track 3				0.20	0.20
11/7/2012	Review Track 3 opening comments	0.50		0.20		0.70
11/9/2012	Review CEJA and DRA comments; prepare for meeting with CEJA & DRA	0.30		0.30		0.60
11/9/2012	TCW-DRA (Diana Lee & Jordan?), CEJA (D.Behles) and A.Adeyeye				0.80	0.80
11/9/2012	TCW-Deborah Behles and A.Adeyeye re: potential collaboration				0.20	0.20
11/12/2012	TCW-Sierra Martinez re: Track 3 reply comments				0.50	0.50
11/13/2012	TCW-Deborah Behles re: splitting up Track 3 comments				0.20	0.20
11/13/2012	R-DRA comments and abatement curve reports	1.50				1.50
11/14/2012	Draft Track 3 reply comments			2.00		2.00
11/15/2012	TCW-D.Behles re: Track 3 reply comments			0.20		0.20
11/15/2012	DR Track 3 reply comments			1.50		1.50
11/16/2012	DR Track 3 reply comments in response to PG&E	2.00				2.00
11/19/2012	RV Track 3 reply comments on IE, Transparency and PG&E proposals; review SCE comments and D.Behles email; email to D.Behles re: draft	1.00		1.50		2.50
11/20/2012	VM for D.Behles and email from her re: Track 3 reply comments				0.20	0.20
11/21/2012	TCW-D.Behles re: Track 3 reply comments and Track 2 proposed decision				0.20	0.20
11/21/2012	Review GHG and oversight sections from CEJA; TCW-D.Behles re: comment	0.30				0.30
11/27/2012	Email with D.Behles re: draft Track 3 comments; email clients draft Track 3 comments				0.30	0.30
11/28/2012	Review and revise Track 3 comments; email and TCW-Matt Vespare: comments; email with D.Behles re: comments	0.80		0.70		1.50
11/29/2012	TCW-R.Freehling re: comments	0.20				0.20

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012, 2013 and 2014 (Track 3)

11/29/2012	TCW Robert Freehling re: Track 3 comments	0.60		0.50		1.10
11/29/2012	Revise Track 3 comments; include Paul Cort's and Robert Freehling's comments; email with D. Behles and M. Vespa re: same	1.50		1.00		2.50
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012</b>		<b>13.40</b>		<b>9.10</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>25.80</b>

3/22/2013	TCW D. Behles re: Track 3 questions and intervenor comp				0.50	0.50
4/1/2013	Review Track 3 questions; ours and CEJA's comments, the joint reply comments and DRA's comments	0.30				0.30
4/2/2013	VM for D. Behles re: Track 3 questions.				0.10	0.10
4/2/2013	Review Track 3 questions;	0.20				0.20
4/2/2013	TCW Robert Freehling re: Track 3 questions		1.30			1.30
4/3/2013	TCW D. Behles re: Track 3 comments and Track 4 compensation				0.20	0.20
4/4/2013	Draft Track 3 comments	1.50				1.50
4/5/2013	Draft Track 3 comments	2.00				2.00
4/8/2013	TCW D. Behles re: Track 3 issues				0.70	0.70
4/12/2013	LR re: Track 3 questions; outline answers; email with Deborah Behles	2.00				2.00
4/15/2013	TCW D. Behles re: Track 3 comments				0.50	0.50
4/15/2013	Draft Track 3 comments			5.00		5.00
4/16/2013	Draft Track 3 comments	0.50				0.50
4/17/2013	Draft Track 3 comments; review related decisions	2.00	0.50			2.50
4/19/2013	Finalize draft of Track 3 comments; TCW R. Freehling re: comment; email to clients	3.00	1.00			4.00
4/25/2013	Revise Track 3 comments; email with Matt Vespa and Robert Freehling	2.50				2.50
4/26/2013	Finalize Track 3 comments; incorporate comments; email with Matt Vespa	2.50				2.50
4/26/2013	TCW R. Freehling re: Track 3 comments	0.40	0.50			0.90
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013</b>		<b>16.90</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>27.20</b>

2/5/2014	TCW Jim Corbellie re: Track 3 comments				0.40	0.40
2/7/2014	Review email from D. Behles				0.20	0.20
2/11/2014	Email with Deborah Behles re: Track 3 opening comments insert				0.20	0.20
2/12/2014	Email with J. Corbellie re: Track 3 opening comments				0.10	0.10
2/17/2014	Review conclusions of law and fact	0.30		0.30		0.60
2/17/2014	Review and edit Track 3 brief; email with D. Behles	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.10	0.50
2/18/2014	Final review of brief; email with David Zizmor re: same	0.10	0.10	0.10		0.30

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2012, 2013 and 2014 (Track 3)

2/19/2014	Review Track 3 opening comments and emails from Deborah Behles			2.50		2.50
2/20/2014	Review comments and draft reply			3.50		3.50
2/21/2014	TCW Matt Vespa re: Track 3 reply comments			0.30		0.30
2/21/2014	Draft reply comments; email to CEJA			2.50		2.50
2/21/2014	TCW Diana Lee re: track 3 reply comments			0.50		0.50
2/21/2014	Continue to revise and fill in cites and corrections from others			2.00		2.00
2/24/2014	Proof and finalize Track 3 comments; incorporate comments from D. Behles			0.70		0.70
2/24/2014	OCW Tamara Zakim and A. Adeyeye re: comments on PD and factual needs			0.20		0.20
2/24/2014	TCW D. Behles, Matt Vespa and S. Lazerow re: comments on PD			0.20		0.20
2/24/2014	OCW Tamara Zakim re: comments on PD and legal research			0.30		0.30
2/24/2014	OCW A. Adeyeye re: factual research			0.10		0.10
2/24/2014	Email with clients re: meeting re: comments			0.20		0.20
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2014</b>		<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>13.60</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>15.30</b>

**TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS FOR ROSTOV TIMESHEET**

DR	Draft
OCW	Office call with
R	Review
RV	Revise
TCW	Telephone call with

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013 and 2014 (Track 3)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Adenike Adeyeye							
4/26/2013	Cite checking; Track III rules comments.	1.50	0.20	1.00			2.70
Issue Areas		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Total
Total Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013							2.70

2/19/2014	Edit and cite check; Track 3 PD reply comments			2.20			2.20
Issue Areas		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Total
Total Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2014				2.2			2.20

# ATTACHMENT 5

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
4/26/2013	Review email from ALJ and forward to Matt Vespa re: SONGS Track				0.20	0.20
5/10/2013	Travel to PHC; pre mtg. with S. Lazerow and D. Behles; PHC				2.30	2.30
5/16/2013	Review DRA ex parte notice				0.10	0.10
6/4/2013	Email Matt Vespa re: expert needs and case schedule; review relevant orders				1.00	1.00
6/7/2013	Find articles on San Onofre shut down; email with Matt Vespa re: San Onofre and expert				0.50	0.50
6/10/2013	Email to Bill Powers re: SONGS Track				0.30	0.30
6/12/2013	TCW D. Behles re: LTPP track 4 strategy				0.50	0.50
6/12/2013	TCW Matt Vespa re: experts				0.20	0.20
6/12/2013	Review JEP Motion re: SONGS schedule				0.20	0.20
6/12/2013	Email Bill Powers and schedule				0.20	0.20
6/16/2013	Emails re: expert meeting; Review motions to intervene and motion re: Track 4				0.30	0.30
6/17/2013	Review SCE opposition to JEP motion				0.20	0.20
6/20/2013	TCW CEJA, Clean Coalition, and Sierra Club client				1.00	1.00
6/20/2013	TCW Bill Powers re: CAISO discovery			0.10		0.10
6/20/2013	Email revised discovery requests to DRA and CEJA				0.10	0.10
6/21/2013	TCW DRA, CEJA, NRDC and group experts including Bill Powers				1.80	1.80
6/21/2013	Review email from Diana Lee re: proposed joint motion				0.10	0.10
6/27/2013	TCW D. Behles re: motion on reactive power and response to solar parties motion				0.20	0.20
6/27/2013	Review reactive power motion and make minor edits			0.50		0.50
6/27/2013	Review ALJ ruling on solar parties motion and email with D. Behles re: same				0.10	0.10
6/27/2013	Review joint discovery requests to CAISO				0.40	0.40
7/8/2013	Review email from SCE on its modeling				0.10	0.10
7/10/2013	TCW Jaleh Firooz re: SONGS Modeling			0.50		0.50
7/11/2013	OCW A. Adeyeye re: OTCs and SONGS outage	0.20				0.20
7/15/2013	CEC/CPUC Workshop on SONGS Webcast				2.70	2.70
7/15/2013	CEC/CPUC Workshop on SONGS Webcast				2.40	2.40
7/15/2013	Review papers in response to the joint motion re: reactive power			0.20		0.20
7/15/2013	VM from Bill Powers re: power flow modeling			0.10		0.10
7/24/2013	TCW D. Behles re: SONGS strategy				0.50	0.50
7/25/2013	Review second set of data requests and related emails				0.20	0.20
7/26/2013	Call with clients re: SONGS issue				1.80	1.80
7/30/2013	Email re: data requests; review suggested requests				0.50	0.50



Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
8/1/2013	TCW-Bill Powers re: data requests and case issues			0.30		0.30
8/5/2013	Review Sparks testimony	0.20				0.20
8/6/2013	TCW-D. Behles re: CAISO testimony and strategy				0.40	0.40
8/6/2013	Review Sparks testimony	0.70				0.70
8/7/2013	Review PHC notice; email D. Behles re: same				0.20	0.20
8/7/2013	Review data requests to CAISO				0.30	0.30
8/13/2013	TCW-Deborah Behles, her fellow law student, and A. Adeyeye re: CAISO testimony and potential response				0.50	0.50
8/13/2013	TCW-David Peffer-POC foundation re: potential coordination				0.40	0.40
8/15/2013	Review ISO testimony and data requests		0.50	0.50		1.00
8/15/2013	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: Track 4 approach				0.10	0.10
8/16/2013	Prepare for mtg. with Sierra Club re: LTPP; TCW-M. Vespa and S. Friedman re: LTPP update and SONGS issues				0.60	0.60
8/19/2013	Review CAISO track 4 testimony and data requests responses; review related motions		1.50	1.00		2.50
8/20/2013	TCW-Bill Powers and A. Adeyeye			0.70		0.70
8/20/2013	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: Track 4 testimony and mtg. with Bill Powers			0.30		0.30
8/21/2013	CAISO response to SCE data request	0.20				0.20
8/21/2013	Review potential fifth set of data requests from DRA				0.30	0.30
8/26/2013	Email Bill Power other parties testimony; skim SDG&E testimony and Jaleh Firooz testimony		0.40			0.40
8/28/2013	Review 5th set of data requests; email D. Behlese				0.40	0.40
8/28/2013	TCW-D. Behles re: SCE testimony, PHC and data requests				0.40	0.40
8/29/2013	Email with Bill Powers re: schedule and testimony				0.20	0.20
8/29/2013	Review SCE testimony and all data requests to CAISO	1.00	1.00	1.00		3.00
8/29/2013	TCW-Rendondo Beach attorney and email him relevant documents				0.20	0.20
8/29/2013	TCW-Diana Lee, DRA re: testimony and PHC				0.30	0.30
8/29/2013	TCW with 12 intervenor groups re: SCE testimony and PHC				1.00	1.00
8/30/2013	Review SDG&E and Rendondo Beach testimony; draft data request to SCE	1.00	2.00	1.00		4.00
9/3/2013	Prepare for prehearing conf.				2.00	2.00
9/3/2013	TCW-D. Behles re: prehearing conf				0.20	0.20
9/3/2013	TCW-Bill Power and A. Adeyeye re: testimony		0.60	0.70		1.30
9/4/2013	Review data requests; email with Bill Powers re: same; email with A. Adeyeye re: same	0.40	0.40			0.80

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description		1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov							
9/4/2013	TCW-Bill Powers			0.20	0.20		0.40
9/4/2013	Prepare for prehearing conf.; mtg. with CEJA and mtg. with bigger intervenor group; pre hearing conf.; post conf. discussion	A				3.50	3.50
9/9/2013	Edit response re: schedule;	A				1.50	1.50
9/9/2013	TCW-D. Behles re: scheduling response	A				0.20	0.20
9/10/2013	Review and Revise comment on schedule	A				1.00	1.00
9/10/2013	Review and revise response re: schedule	A				0.50	0.50
9/11/2013	Review emails re: CEERT comments; email CEJA	A				0.50	0.50
9/12/2013	TCW-CEJA re: reply strategy; TCW-DRA and CEJA re: reply strategy					0.70	0.70
9/12/2013	Review SCE emails and data requests; OCW A. Adeyeye re: identifying assumptions that are off			0.30			0.30
9/13/2013	OCW A. Adeyeye re: reply and review her comments on it; email with J. Corbelli	A				0.30	0.30
9/13/2013	Review joint reply with CEJA re: schedule; TCW J. Corbelli re: same	A				1.50	1.50
9/15/2013	TCW-Bill Powers re: testimony		0.40	0.20	0.20		0.80
9/15/2013	Review testimony and data response requests; draft questions for testimony		1.00	1.00	1.00		3.00
9/16/2013	OCW A. Adeyeye re: testimony; review new set of questions from ALJ for testimony; email Bill Powers re: schedule					0.40	0.40
9/16/2013	Review new discovery responses		0.10	0.10	0.10		0.30
9/16/2013	Review ALJ Decision on schedule					0.30	0.30
9/17/2013	Review data requests; develop outline for testimony; review A. Adeyeye SDG&E analysis; OCW her re: same		2.00	2.00			4.00
9/17/2013	TCW Track 4 intervenors re: scheduling order and hearings					0.30	0.30
9/17/2013	TCW Sierra Client s re: proceeding					1.00	1.00
9/17/2013	Email and TCW Diana Lee re: data request to SCE; review data requests to SCE					0.40	0.40
9/17/2013	TCW Diana Lee re: scheduling order and testimony					0.40	0.40
9/18/2013	Review data responses from SCE and SCE workpapers		0.50	0.50			1.00
9/18/2013	TCW R. Freehling re: response to ALJ questions		0.50	0.40			0.90
9/18/2013	Review draft testimony and data response requests; make notes about testimony				2.50		2.50
9/19/2013	Draft response to ALJ questions		1.50	1.50			3.00
9/19/2013	TCW-Bill Powers and A. Adeyeye re: testimony				0.40		0.40
9/20/2013	TCW-Bill Powers re: testimony				0.70		0.70

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
9/20/2013	DR comments on ALJ questions	1.50	1.50			3.00
9/22/2013	Review suggested SDG&E data request from Bill Powers			0.20		0.20
9/22/2013	Review Powers draft testimony, make comments; email with Bill Powers			1.50		1.50
9/23/2013	TCW J. May and A. Adeyeye re: SCE testimony	0.20	0.20			0.40
9/23/2013	Draft comments	1.00				1.00
9/23/2013	Review Powers draft testimony, make comments; email with Bill Powers		0.50	1.50		2.00
9/24/2013	TCW Bill Powers re: testimony			0.50		0.50
9/24/2013	Review Powers draft testimony, review scoping memo and testimony			2.00		2.00
9/24/2013	Draft comments; multi b CW A. Adeyeye re: same	1.00	1.50			2.50
9/25/2013	TCW Matt Vespa re: testimony and data requests				0.20	0.20
9/25/2013	Draft Comments on ALJ questions	1.00	1.50			2.50
9/25/2013	Review data requests from Bill Powers; email with other parties re: same; email with A. Adeyeye re: same; email with DRA				0.80	0.80
9/25/2013	Bill Power testimony; make comments			3.00		3.00
9/26/2013	Revise comments; email clients comments	0.50	0.50			1.00
9/26/2013	TCW Matt Vespa re: Testimony					
9/26/2013	Review Bill Powers revised testimony		0.50	1.50		2.00
9/26/2013	TCW Bill Powers re: Testimony			0.80		0.80
9/27/2013	Revising Comments on ALJ questions; reviewing client comments; OCW A. Adeyeye re: same	0.50	0.50			1.00
9/27/2013	Review Powers testimony; making comments; email and TCW Bill Powers; multi OCW A. Adeyeye re: testimony and revisions		2.00	3.30		5.30
9/28/2013	review testimony; email and phone call with Bill Powers; email client group; email Matt Vespa; OCW A. Adeyeye re: status			2.00	0.50	2.50
9/30/2013	Review and revise comments; email with Bill Powers re: comments; incorporate his edits	0.50	0.50			1.00
9/30/2013	Review Comments on ALJ questions; email with Matt Vespa re: comments; email with Bill Powers; review his edits	0.70				0.70
9/30/2013	Incorporate edits from clients on comments; email with Matt Vespa re: comments; review filing; OCW A. Adeyeye	2.00	2.00			4.00
10/1/2013	Review Comments on ALJ questions	1.00	1.00			2.00
10/2/2013	Review Submitted Testimony; OCW A. Adeyeye re: reply testimony	2.00	2.00	0.50		4.50
10/2/2013	Email with James Corbell re: filed documents and stepping up a meeting				0.30	0.30

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
10/2/2013	TCW Matt Vespare: reply testimony				0.30	0.30
10/3/2013	TCW Carol Schmid Frazee: revise testimony; email with Bill Powers re: corrections; email to A. Adeyeye and Rosie re: filing		1.00			1.00
10/3/2013	Review testimony re: contingencies and other reply issues; email Bill Powers re: reply testimony		1.50	1.50		3.00
10/3/2013	TCW Diana Lee, DRA re: reply testimony				0.30	0.30
10/4/2013	Review errata; email with A. Adeyeye and Rose re: service		0.50			0.50
10/4/2013	TCW Jim Corbelli re: coordination				0.70	0.70
10/11/2013	Draft insert for request for hearing				0.30	0.30
10/11/2013	Revise reply testimony; Review and incorporate section from A. Adeyeye	1.00	3.00			4.00
10/11/2013	Email with James Corbelli and Diana Lee re: request for hearing				0.30	0.30
10/13/2013	Review request for hearing draft; email from Jim Corbelli re: same; email Diana Lee				0.30	0.30
10/13/2013	Review reply testimony; comments for Bill Powers		2.50	2.50		5.00
10/14/2013	Make change to request for hearing; email Diana Lee; email NRDC and EDF re: potentially joining				0.50	0.50
10/14/2013	Review reply testimony; comments for Bill Powers;		1.50	1.50		3.00
10/15/2013	Review rebuttal testimony	1.00	1.00	1.00		3.00
10/18/2013	Review reply testimonies	1.00	1.00	1.00		3.00
10/18/2013	TCW other intervenors re: reply testimony and hearing				0.90	0.90
10/18/2013	Read CAISO motion; VM for Diana Lee re: same				0.10	0.20
10/20/2013	Review email from Diana Lee re: CAISO motion				0.10	0.10
10/20/2013	review email from Bill Powers re: his testimony and related reply testimony			0.10		0.10
10/21/2013	TCW Diana Lee re: CAISO motion and cross examination				0.30	0.30
10/21/2013	OCW A. Adeyeye re: cross examination times					0.20
10/21/2013	TCW CEJA attorneys and A. Adeyeye re: cross examination				0.90	0.90
10/21/2013	TCW Jim Corbelli re: CAISO motion and cross examination				0.30	0.30
10/21/2013	Prepare for prehearing conf.; review CAISO motion and DRA response				3.00	3.00
10/22/2013	Email to Bill Powers re: his cross examination				0.10	0.10
10/22/2013	Prepare for PHC				1.00	1.00
10/22/2013	PHC				2.20	2.20
10/22/2013	Post pre hearing discussions with other parties				0.20	0.20

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
10/22/2013	Email with Sarah Friedman re: Sierra Club's request for public hearing at PHC				0.20	0.20
10/23/2013	TCW-Bill Powers re: reply testimony and cross			0.30		0.30
10/23/2013	Reviewedis of joint motion				0.20	0.20
10/24/2013	Prepare CAISO crossess;	2.00	2.00	1.00		5.00
10/25/2013	Outline SCE Crosses	1.00	1.00			2.00
10/26/2013	Prepare CAISO crossess	2.00	2.00	1.00		5.00
10/27/2013	Prepare SCE cross; email Paul Cort re: rumble cross		0.50	0.50		1.00
10/27/2013	Prepare Anderson and Jontry Crosses	1.00	3.00	1.00		5.00
10/28/2013	Review and revise Sparks Cross	1.00	0.30			1.30
10/28/2013	Evidentiary hearing; work through lunch on Sparks Cross				6.00	6.00
10/28/2013	Prepare Millar Cross	1.00	0.50	0.50		2.00
10/29/2013	Prepare Nelson Cross; Figure out cross for other SCE witnesses	0.50	0.50	0.50		1.50
10/29/2013	Review and revise Millar Cross			0.50		0.50
10/29/2013	Evidentiary hearing; work through lunch on Jontry Cross				7.00	7.00
10/29/2013	Prepare Jontry and Anderson Crosses;		1.50	1.00		2.50
10/30/2013	Prepare Chinn Cross			1.00		1.00
10/30/2013	Dinner meeting with Bill Powers and Nike re: prep for cross			1.50		1.50
10/30/2013	Review and revise Nelson Cross	0.70				0.70
10/30/2013	Prepare Cushnie and Chinn Cross; Review and revise rumble cross	1.00		1.00		2.00
10/30/2013	Evidentiary Hearing; work through lunch on Cushnie Cross				7.00	7.00
10/31/2013	Prepare Silsbee Cross		2.50			2.50
10/31/2013	Arrive early to meet with Bill Powers; Meeting with Bill Powers				0.70	0.70
10/31/2013	OCW-A. Adeyeye after hearing.		0.50			0.50
10/31/2013	Evidentiary Hearings; work through lunch on Silsbee cross				7.00	7.00
11/1/2013	Revise Silsbee Cross		0.50			0.50
11/1/2013	Evidentiary hearings; lunch with NRDC and CEJA;				4.50	4.50
11/1/2013	Email with Bill Powers and Nike re: corrections to Transcript				0.20	0.20
11/5/2013	Call with clients re: case status and strategy				0.70	0.70
11/7/2013	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: drafting opening brief.	0.10	0.10	0.10		0.30
11/11/2013	Review transcripts	1.50	1.50			3.00
11/12/2013	Draft outline and work on overall structure/intro	1.00	1.00			2.00
11/12/2013	TCW Matt Vespa re: briefing issues and key facts				0.40	0.40
11/12/2013	TCW Environmental Intervenor and ORA re: briefing				0.80	0.80
11/13/2013	Review testimony, pur comments; draft intro; OCW-A. Adeyeye re: brief.	1.50	1.50			3.00
11/15/2013	Work on overall structure/intro	1.50	1.50			3.00

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	Total
User: Will Rostov						
11/17/2013	DR need and load shedding sections	2.00		1.80		3.80
11/18/2013	Draft section on load shedding; review record			5.00		5.00
11/18/2013	Draft policy argument	1.00				1.00
11/18/2013	Review load forecast and energy efficiency section; OCW-A. Adeyeye re: revising both		0.40			0.40
11/19/2013	Review and revise A. Adeyeye sections on energy efficiency and energy storage		1.00			1.00
11/19/2013	Draft opening brief intro and load shedding	1.00	1.00	3.00		5.00
11/20/2013	Draft brief	2.00	2.50			4.50
11/21/2013	Draft opening brief		2.00			2.00
11/21/2013	Review A. Adeyeye edits and comments and incorporate them into the brief; read through and revise	0.50	0.50	0.50		1.50
11/22/2013	OCW-Bill Powers re: his testimony			0.10		0.10
11/22/2013	Review emails from Bill Powers re: brief inserts			0.30		0.30
11/22/2013	RV Load shedding section; review record			1.50		1.50
11/22/2013	OCW-Matt Vespa re: brief and exparte				0.20	0.20
11/22/2013	Draft preferred resources and no all source RFO section;		3.00			3.00
11/23/2013	Revise no procurement need section/policy questions; review related record cites	7.00				7.00
11/24/2013	Review draft and edit	0.30	0.20	0.10		0.60
11/24/2013	Revise no procurement need section/policy questions;	1.00				1.00
11/24/2013	Revise load shedding/transmission; review record.			2.50		2.50
11/25/2013	Revise brief; email to Matt Vespa, incorporate his comments; email to clients	2.00	2.00	0.80	0.20	5.00
12/2/2013	Read opening briefs	1.50	1.50			3.00
12/3/2013	Email with Jim Corbelli re: opening briefs and setting up coordination mtg.				0.30	0.30
12/3/2013	Phone call with Matt Vespa and Shana Lazerow re: exparte				0.30	0.30
12/3/2013	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: new CEC forecast numbers for SCE		0.20			0.20
12/3/2013	Review email from A. Adeyeye re: difference in CEC forecast		0.10			0.10
12/4/2013	Read opening briefs	1.00	1.00			2.00
12/4/2013	OCW-Matt Vespa re: reply comments	0.20				0.20
12/4/2013	Review POC testimony, brief and SCE Motion to strike brief				0.60	0.60
12/5/2013	Review opening briefs	0.70	0.70	0.60		2.00
12/5/2013	OCW-Diana Lee DRA				0.50	0.50
12/5/2013	OCW-CEJA attorneys re: reply brief strategy				1.10	1.10
12/6/2013	Draft reply			5.00		5.00
12/6/2013	OCW-A. Adeyeye re: brief and projects	0.10	0.20			0.30
12/9/2013	Draft reply; OCW-A. Adeyeye re: brief.	5.50				5.50

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description		1	2	3	4		Total
User: Will Rostov								
12/10/2013	Draft reply; preferred resources and timing sections;			3.00				3.00
12/10/2013	OCW-A.Adeyeye re: reply brief topics and work		0.10	0.10				0.20
12/10/2013	Draft loading shedding section; review other briefs				2.00			2.00
12/11/2013	Draft Reply		4.00					4.00
12/12/2013	Draft reply; OCW-A.Adeyeye re: load shedding, reply brief.		3.80		0.20			4.00
12/13/2013	OCW-A.Adeyeye re: reply brief draft		0.10	0.20	0.20			0.50
12/13/2013	Draft reply and email to clients			4.70		0.30		5.00
12/13/2013	TCW-Matt Vespa re: reply comments				0.20			0.20
12/13/2013	Email with clients and incorporate their comments	A	0.20	0.30				0.50
12/15/2013	Finish intro and edit brief, check record and fix cites		1.00	1.00	1.00			3.00
12/16/2013	Final review and edits and edits on brief		0.30	0.30	0.10			0.70
12/16/2013	Review and edit brief, draft summary of recommendations and findings of fact and conclusions of law		1.50	1.00	1.00			3.50
12/16/2013	Email and TCW-Matt Vespa re: one section			0.20				0.20
12/16/2013	Revise brief in response to his comment			0.80				0.80
Issue Areas		A	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Total
<b>Total Hours for William Rostov, Attorney in 2013</b>			<b>77.20</b>	<b>87.10</b>	<b>72.20</b>	<b>80.10</b>	<b>10.10</b>	<b>326.70</b>

1/31/2014	Review ex parte with President Peevey; email Matt Vespa re: same						0.20	0.20
2/5/2014	Review TPP; email Matt Vespa re: my thoughts				1.00			1.00
2/5/2014	Email with Matt Vespa re: Transmission plan; email with A.Adeyeye re: same; email S.Martinez re: same.					0.70		0.70
2/7/2014	Email with Matt Vespa re: ex parte strategy; email to larger group of plaintiffs					0.30		0.30
2/10/2014	Call with CEJA and NRDC re: ex parte strategy with Peevey					0.70		0.70
2/11/2014	Review proposed decision; TCW-Matt Vespa re: same		0.70	1.00	0.30			2.00
2/18/2014	TCW-D.Behles re: Track 4 decision and opening comments coordination					0.50		0.50
2/19/2014	Post-call discussion with Matt Vespa, T.Zakim and A.Adeyeye					0.20		0.20
2/19/2014	Email with Sierra Club re: ex partes						0.20	0.20
2/19/2014	TCW-NRDC and CEJA re: Track 4 decision and opening comments					0.80		0.80
2/24/2014	Review proposed decision Track 4; outline comments		0.60	0.20	0.20			1.00
2/25/2014	Draft comments on PD		4.00					4.00
2/25/2014	TCW-Sierra Club clients re: comments on PD		0.80					0.80
2/26/2014	Draft comments on PD		5.00					5.00
2/27/2014	Draft Comments on PD		6.00					6.00

Hours of William Rostov, Attorney in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description		1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Will Rostov								
2/28/2014	Draft Comments on PD				5.00			5.00
2/28/2014	TCW Matt Vespa re: comments on PD					0.20		0.20
2/28/2014	Email clients re: timing of draft					0.10		0.10
3/1/2014	Draft Comments on PD			4.50				4.50
3/2/2014	Review clients edits and update brief		0.20		0.20			0.40
3/2/2014	Email to clients		0.20					0.20
3/2/2014	Draft Comments on PD		1.00		1.00			2.00
3/3/2014	Draft Appendix; Revise brief in response to Matt Vespa, A. Adeyeye and T. Zakim comments; review and revise; edits summary of recommendations		4.00	2.00	2.00			8.00
3/4/2014	Review and skim opening comments		0.30	0.30	0.10			0.70
3/4/2014	TCW D. Behles re: ex partes and reply comments					0.20		0.20
3/5/2014	DR and set up ex parte meeting; TCW and email with Sierra Club clients re: meetings and press strategy					1.00		1.00
3/7/2014	Review draft reply; OCW T. Zakim re: same		1.00					1.00
3/7/2014	TCW Shana Lazerow and Aura Vasquez re: ex parte prep					0.30		0.30
3/7/2014	TCW Jim Corbett, CEJA re: reply comments					0.40		0.40
3/9/2014	Revise reply brief; email T. Zakim re: revisions		3.50					3.50
3/10/2014	Review and revise reply; multi OCW T. Zakim re: same		2.00					2.00
3/10/2014	Review and edit handout for ex partes					0.30		0.30
3/10/2014	TCW D. Behles re: ex partes					0.20		0.20
3/10/2014	Set up ex parte with Commissioner picker; email to group					0.20		0.20
3/10/2014	Pre and post mtg. with CEJA re: ex partes. Ex partes with Commission Peterrman's, Florio's and Picker's Staff; travel back to office					2.50		2.50
3/11/2014	Review and revise ex parte notices						0.60	0.60
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>#5</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Total Hours for William Rostov, Attorney in 2014</b>			<b>29.30</b>	<b>8.00</b>	<b>9.80</b>	<b>8.60</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>56.70</b>

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS FOR ROSTOV TIMESHEET

DR	Draft
OCW	Office call with
R	Review
RV	Revise
TCW	Telephone call with



Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Adenike Adeyeye							
5/29/2013	Reading ALJ scoping memo.					0.50	0.50
5/29/2013	Reading scoping memo.					0.50	0.50
7/11/2013	Talking about researching DTCs and the SONGS outage with Rostov.	0.20					0.20
7/24/2013	Researching DTCs and SONGS.	0.80					0.80
7/24/2013	Researching DTCs and SONGS.	2.60					2.60
7/26/2013	Call with Sierra Club about SONGS outage.	1.80					1.80
7/26/2013	Reading SONGS outage comments.	0.50					0.50
8/6/2013	Reviewing CAISO Track 4 opening testimony.	1.00	0.90				1.90
8/8/2013	TPP Track 4 call with other parties				1.00		1.00
8/13/2013	Reviewing track 4 CAISO opening testimony		0.50				0.50
8/13/2013	Call with Golden Gate Law Clinic about Track 4 CAISO Opening Testimony.				0.50		0.50
8/15/2013	Talk with Rostov about LTPP				0.10		0.10
8/16/2013	Reviewing CAISO testimony and LTPP Scoping Ruling	2.00	2.00	0.50			4.50
8/20/2013	Reviewing track 4 CAISO testimony and assumptions		2.50				2.50
8/20/2013	Call with Powers and Rostov				0.70		0.70
8/20/2013	Talk with Rostov about Track 4 testimony and call with Powers				0.30		0.30
8/23/2013	Background research on energy terms used in CAISO responses to data requests		0.80				0.80
8/23/2013	Reviewing data requests from DRA, CEJA, Sierra Club					2.50	2.50
8/27/2013	Skimming SCE Track 4 opening testimony	0.20	0.30				0.50
8/29/2013	Reviewing SDGE testimony		0.30				0.30
8/29/2013	Reviewing SCE and SDG&E opening testimony	0.60	0.70				1.30
8/29/2013	Reviewing SCE's opening testimony	1.00	0.90				1.90
8/29/2013	Call to discuss prehearing conference with other environmental parties.					1.00	1.00
9/3/2013	Reviewing City of Redondo Beach testimony			0.90			0.90
9/3/2013	Call with Powers and Rostov about Track 4 opening testimony.		0.60	0.70			1.30
9/4/2013	Meeting with environmental groups before prehearing conference.				0.70		0.70
9/4/2013	Track 4 prehearing conference.				2.00		2.00
9/4/2013	Debrief with Rostov at office after PUC Track 4 prehearing conference.				0.20		0.20
9/5/2013	Editing and sending data request for Track 4 to SDG&E		0.30	0.50			0.80
9/9/2013	CEC IEP workshop on reliability in Southern CA without SONGS (re: LTPP Track 4)	1.50	1.00				2.50
9/10/2013	Researched cost to build a new natural gas power plant		0.50				0.50
9/10/2013	Review comments on schedule of Track 4					0.80	0.80

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

9/12/2013	Reviewing data requests from SCE and SDG&E to figure out assumptions in Track 4 studies						1.20
9/13/2013	Researching Track 4 study assumptions		2.00				2.00
9/13/2013	Reading LTPP Track 4 comments about scheduling					0.50	0.50
9/13/2013	Revising reply comments on track 4 schedule					0.60	0.60
9/13/2013	Reading LTPP emails about scheduling					0.20	0.20
9/13/2013	Reading and revising outline of Track 4 opening testimony from expert			1.70			1.70
9/16/2013	Reading Track 4 schedule decision					0.40	0.40
9/16/2013	Reviewing latest ISO data request responses.			0.70			0.70
9/16/2013	Taking notes on expert witness's testimony outline (Track 4); talk with Rostov.			1.20			1.20
9/17/2013	Writing opening comments on Track 4 studies.		2.50				2.50
9/19/2013	Talking with Rostov and Powers about track 4 testimony			0.40			0.40
9/19/2013	Researching questions for track 4 opening testimony.		3.50				3.50
9/19/2013	Reading data request responses from track 4.		0.50				0.50
9/20/2013	Researching impact of distributed generation on load in SDG&E and SCE territory.		4.60				4.60
9/20/2013	Talk with Rostov and Powers about track 4 testimony			0.70			0.70
9/20/2013	Talking with Freehling about impact of distributed generation on load in SDG&E and SCE territory.		0.40				0.40
9/23/2013	Call with May and Rostov re: SCE testimony	0.20	0.20				0.40
9/23/2013	Research on assumptions SDG&E and SCE used in their Track 4 studies.		4.00				4.00
9/23/2013	Reading, revising, and organizing Track 4 testimony.			4.00			4.00
9/24/2013	Reading, revising, and organizing Track 4 testimony.			8.00			8.00
9/26/2013	Reviewing track 4 opening testimony			2.00			2.00
9/26/2013	Revising track 4 comments.	2.50	2.50				5.00
9/27/2013	Reading and making comments on Track 4 testimony.		4.50	4.50			9.00
9/28/2013	Reading and making comments on Track 4 testimony.		3.00	3.00			6.00
9/30/2013	Reading and making comments on Track 4 testimony.			8.50			8.50
10/1/2013	Reviewing parties' opening testimony for track 4	2.00	2.00	0.50			4.50
10/2/2013	Reviewing parties' opening testimony for track 4, talked with Rostov.	2.00	2.00	0.50			4.50
10/3/2013	Reviewing parties' opening comments for track 4	0.50	0.60				1.10

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

10/4/2013	Working on track 4 reply testimony.		3.30				3.30
10/7/2013	Research load shedding in testimony from Track 4			1.80			1.80
10/11/2013	Reading track 4 rebuttal testimony draft.			0.40			0.40
10/11/2013	Editing and cite checking track 4 rebuttal testimony draft.			3.70			3.70
10/14/2013	Reading rebuttal testimony from other parties (Track 4)	1.00	1.00	0.50			2.50
10/14/2013	Editing track 4 reply testimony.		1.20	1.00			2.20
10/14/2013	Editing track 4 request for hearings.					0.50	0.50
10/18/2013	Reading testimony from Track 4	1.00	1.50				2.50
10/18/2013	LTPP PHC prep call with other environmental parties.				0.90		0.90
10/21/2013	Talk with Rostov about LTPP		0.20				0.20
10/21/2013	Research Track 4 testimony for cross examination questions.		3.00				3.00
10/21/2013	Call with CEJA about LTPP PHC				0.90		0.90
10/23/2013	Edits to Comparison Table for CPUC Track 4 LTPP					4.90	4.90
10/24/2013	Reviewing other parties rebuttal testimony for Track 4 Evidentiary Hearings	2.00	2.00	1.50			5.50
10/25/2013	Working on cross examination questions for Track 4 of the LTPP.		3.50	3.50			7.00
10/29/2013	Working on track 4 cross examination questions for SCE witnesses.	2.00	2.00				4.00
10/30/2013	Witness prep meeting with Powers.			1.50			1.50
10/30/2013	Working on track 4 cross examination questions		2.70	1.50			4.20
10/31/2013	Talk with Rostov after hearing.		0.50				0.50
10/31/2013	Track 4 Evidentiary Hearings					6.50	6.50
11/1/2013	Reviewing transcript of Track 4 evidentiary hearings	3.00	3.50				6.50
11/4/2013	Reviewing transcripts from evidentiary hearing in preparation for opening brief.	2.00	2.00				4.00
11/4/2013	Making corrections to track 4 evidentiary hearings transcript.				2.00		2.00
11/5/2013	Revising corrections to transcript.				0.30		0.30
11/5/2013	Reviewing transcripts from evidentiary hearing in preparation for opening brief.	2.00	2.50				4.50
11/6/2013	Reviewing transcripts from evidentiary hearing in preparation for opening brief.	2.00	2.50				4.50
11/7/2013	Talk with Rostov about opening brief drafting	0.10	0.10	0.10			0.30
11/7/2013	Reviewing transcripts from evidentiary hearing and compiling notes on transcripts for opening brief	2.50	2.50	1.00			6.00
11/8/2013	Reviewing comments and transcripts in LTPP Track 4 to compile outline for briefs.	1.50	1.50	1.10			4.10
11/11/2013	Reviewing comments and transcripts in LTPP Track 4 to compile outline and chart for briefs.	2.00	2.00	1.00			5.00
11/13/2013	Talk with Rostov about LTPP briefs	0.10	0.10	0.10			0.30

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

11/13/2013	Work on section of LTPP brief on contingent generation	2.00					2.00
11/14/2013	Read Sierra Club opening comments and brief, and Sierra Club SONGS closure fact sheet, to write section of brief of energy efficiency and demand forecast.		1.40				1.40
11/15/2013	Work on sections of LTPP Track 4 brief and review opening comments and testimony		3.20				3.20
11/18/2013	Work on sections of LTPP Track 4 brief and review opening comments and testimony, talk with Rostov about brief.		6.80				6.80
11/19/2013	Work on sections of LTPP Track 4 brief and review opening comments and testimony		5.50				5.50
11/20/2013	Work on sections of LTPP Track 4 brief and review opening comments and testimony		5.50				5.50
11/21/2013	Work on sections of LTPP Track 4 brief and review opening comments and testimony		7.50				7.50
11/22/2013	Work on sections of LTPP Track 4 brief and review opening comments and testimony		0.50				0.50
12/3/2013	Talk with Rostov re: CEC forecast		0.20				0.20
12/5/2013	Reading track 4 LTPP opening briefs.	2.50	2.50	1.50			6.50
12/6/2013	Talk with Rostov about reply brief.	0.10	0.20				0.30
12/6/2013	Researching SDG&E load shedding assumptions for residual need finding.			1.50			1.50
12/6/2013	Reviewing reply briefs.		1.30				1.30
12/6/2013	Researching SDG&E resource assumptions for residual need finding.	1.20					1.20
12/6/2013	Researching SDG&E resource assumptions for residual need finding.	3.00					3.00
12/9/2013	Drafting section of Track 4 LTPP reply brief.		7.20				7.20
12/9/2013	Talk with Rostov re: reply brief.		0.10				0.10
12/10/2013	Drafting sections of LTPP reply brief on load shedding and SDG&E resource assumptions.		2.50	3.00			5.50
12/10/2013	Meeting with Rostov about LTPP reply brief (load shedding and SDG&E resource assumptions)		0.10	0.10			0.20
12/11/2013	Drafting sections of LTPP Track 4 reply brief <sup>11</sup> load shedding and second contingency sections.		3.00				3.00
12/11/2013	Revising energy efficiency estimates to include most recent CEC energy demand forecast.		3.30				3.30
12/11/2013	Cite checking draft of LTPP Track 4 reply brief.	0.40	0.30				0.70
12/12/2013	Drafting sections of Track 4 reply brief <sup>11</sup> load shedding.			2.80			2.80
12/12/2013	Talk with Rostov about track 4 reply brief <sup>11</sup> load shedding.			0.20			0.20

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013 and 2014 (Track 4)

12/12/2013	Research for Track 4 reply brief on demand forecasts, energy storage, and preferred resources.		2.80					2.80
12/13/2013	Cite checking LTPP Track 4 reply brief draft	1.00	1.30	1.00				3.30
12/13/2013	Talk with Rostov about LTPP Track 4 reply brief draft	0.10	0.20	0.20				0.50
12/13/2013	Editing LTPP Track 4 reply brief draft UEP critique and section on energy storage.		4.30					4.30
12/16/2013	Revisions to final draft of Track 4 reply brief	1.00	1.50	1.00				3.50
12/16/2013	Review final drafts of Track 4 Reply Brief	0.30	0.30	0.40				1.00
Issue Areas		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Total	
<b>Total Hours for Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2013</b>		<b>52.20</b>	<b>143.90</b>	<b>68.70</b>	<b>16.10</b>	<b>12.40</b>	<b>293.30</b>	

2/10/2014	Setting up exparte meeting with Peevey.					0.30		0.30
2/10/2014	Reviewing exparte notices to prepare for strategy call with client.				1.30			1.30
2/10/2014	Strategy call for expartes with client, NRDC, CEJA.				0.70			0.70
2/18/2014	Reading LTPP Track 4 PD	1.00	1.00	1.00				3.00
2/19/2014	Strategy call with client about the proposed decision in track 4				0.20			0.20
2/19/2014	Reading the proposed decision in track 4	0.30	0.30	0.30				0.90
2/19/2014	Submitting exparte request.					0.20		0.20
2/19/2014	Analyzing the proposed decision in track 4		1.60					1.60
2/19/2014	Searching the record for information supporting addition of transmission projects and preferred resources to the Track 4 PD.		4.50	4.00				8.50
2/19/2014	Strategy call with clients, CEJA, NRDC about the proposed decision in track 4				0.80			0.80
2/24/2014	Research on Mesa Loop In, energy storage, and PV for track 4 PD comments.		3.00	2.20				5.20
2/25/2014	Call with Rostov, Zakim, and Sierra Club about track 4 PD comments.				0.80			0.80
2/25/2014	Writing up and sending exparte requests for meetings re: track 4 PD comments.					0.50		0.50
2/26/2014	Research on Mesa Loop In, energy storage, and PV for track 4 PD comments.		0.30	0.20				0.50
2/26/2014	Research for Track 4 PD comments on previous need requests by ISO and IOU and amounts granted by the PUC.	1.50						1.50
3/3/2014	Editing comments on Track 4 proposed decision	3.00	3.00					6.00
Issue Areas		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	Total	
<b>Total Hours for Adenike Adeyeye, Research Analyst (Advocate) in 2014</b>		<b>5.80</b>	<b>13.70</b>	<b>7.70</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>32.00</b>	

Hours of Bill Powers, Expert in 2013 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Bill Powers							
6/20/2013	document review to develop discovery requests			2.00			2.00
6/21/2013	document review to develop discovery requests, call with Earthjustice			0.20	1.80		2.00
7/5/2013	review CAISO 2012/2013 transmission plan			3.00			3.00
7/6/2013	review CAISO 2012/2013 transmission plan			3.00			3.00
7/10/2013	e-mails on relevant LTPP documents			1.00			1.00
7/11/2013	research into load shedding under N-1-1			1.00			1.00
7/12/2013	research into post Sunrise Powerlink LCR cut-plane in SDG&E territory			1.00			1.00
7/19/2013	provide paragraphs for public interest coalition letter on LTPP Track 4			1.00			1.00
8/1/2013	preparation of data response questions on N-1-1			4.00			4.00
8/2/2013	preparation of data response questions on N-1-1			1.00			1.00
8/3/2013	preparation of data response questions on N-1-1			2.00			2.00
8/20/2013	conference call with Earthjustice			1.00			1.00
8/24/2013	follow-up review of relevant Track 4 documents			1.00			1.00
8/25/2013	follow-up review of relevant Track 4 documents			1.00			1.00
8/26/2013	review CAISO, SCE, SDG&E opening testimony			2.00			2.00
8/28/2013	prepare additional data response requests based on testimony review			3.00			3.00
9/1/2013	prepare additional data response requests based on testimony review			1.00			1.00
9/2/2013	prepare additional data response requests based on testimony review			4.00			4.00
9/3/2013	prepare additional data response requests based on testimony review, call with Earthjustice			2.00			2.00
9/4/2013	prepare additional data response requests based on testimony review, call with Earthjustice			1.00			1.00
9/12/2013	outline scope of opening testimony		0.50	0.50			1.00
9/13/2013	outline scope of opening testimony		0.50	0.50			1.00
9/14/2013	prepare rough draft of opening testimony		0.70	1.30			2.00
9/15/2013	prepare rough draft of opening testimony		0.50	1.50			2.00
9/16/2013	prepare rough draft of opening testimony		1.00	3.00			4.00
9/17/2013	continued work on rough draft		0.50	3.50			4.00
9/20/2013	work on draft opening testimony #1		1.00	1.00			2.00
9/21/2013	work on draft opening testimony #1		2.50	2.50			5.00
9/22/2013	complete draft opening testimony #1		3.00	9.00			12.00
9/23/2013	work on draft #2 opening testimony		4.50	4.50			9.00
9/24/2013	work on draft #3 opening testimony/consultation w Earthjustice		2.00	8.00			10.00
9/25/2013	work on draft #4 opening testimony			5.00			5.00
9/26/2013	work on draft #5 opening testimony			6.00			6.00
9/27/2013	work on draft #6 opening testimony/consultation w Earthjustice			8.00			8.00
9/28/2013	work on draft #7 opening testimony			8.00			8.00
9/29/2013	complete pre-final opening testimony			6.00			6.00
9/30/2013	finalize opening testimony		0.50	1.50			2.00
10/10/2013	review opening testimony of parties, prepare reply testimony		1.00	5.00			6.00
10/19/2013	review reply testimony of other parties	0.20	0.30	0.50			1.00

Hours of Bill Powers, Expert in 2013 (Track 4)

Date	Description	1	2	3	4	5	Total
User: Bill Powers							
10/22/2013	review reply testimony of other parties	0.20	0.20	0.50			0.90
10/23/2013	prepare draft cross-examination questions for opposing witnesses			6.00			6.00
10/24/2013	prepare draft cross-examination questions for opposing witnesses			6.00			6.00
10/28/2013	prepare draft cross-examination questions for opposing witnesses			2.00			2.00
10/29/2013	prepare draft cross-examination questions for opposing witnesses			1.00			1.00
10/30/2013	prep for cross-examination, travel to San Francisco				8.00		8.00
10/31/2013	cross-examination by SCE and IEP at CPUC				8.00		8.00
11/4/2013	revisions to 10/31/13 hearing transcript,					2.00	2.00
<b>Issue Areas</b>		<b>#1</b>	<b>#2</b>	<b>#3</b>	<b>#4</b>	<b>#5</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Total Hours for Bill Powers, Expert in 2013</b>		<b>0.40</b>	<b>18.70</b>	<b>126.00</b>	<b>17.80</b>	<b>2.00</b>	<b>164.90</b>

# ATTACHMENT 6



Summary of Sierra Club CA Hours

TRACK A									
Name	Year	Rate	A	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Will Rostov	2012		24.3	71.4	42.2	48.5	66.5	53.6	306.5
Total 2012		\$360.00	\$8,748.00	\$25,704.00	\$15,192.00	\$17,460.00	\$23,940.00	\$19,296.00	\$110,340.00
Will Rostov	2013		1.2	53.8	21.2	17.4	8.3	3.4	105.3
Total 2013		\$390.00	\$468.00	\$20,982.00	\$8,268.00	\$6,786.00	\$3,237.00	\$1,326.00	\$41,067.00
Adenike Adeyeye	2012		0	36.5	79.9	5	2	29.8	153.2
Total 2012		\$130.00	\$0.00	\$4,745.00	\$10,387.00	\$650.00	\$260.00	\$3,874.00	\$19,916.00
Adenike Adeyeye	2013		0	1.2	14.2	4.1	3.9	0.8	24.20
Total 2013		\$135.00	\$0.00	\$162.00	\$1,917.00	\$553.50	\$526.50	\$108.00	\$3,267.00
<b>Total Track A</b>									<b>\$174,590.00</b>

Track B							
Name	Year	Rate	1	2	3	4	Total
Will Rostov	2012		13.4	0	9.1	3.3	25.8
Total 2012		\$360.00	\$4,824.00	\$0.00	\$3,276.00	\$1,188.00	\$9,288.00
Will Rostov	2013		16.9	3.3	5	2	27.2
Total 2013		\$390.00	\$6,591.00	\$1,287.00	\$1,950.00	\$780.00	\$10,608.00
Will Rostov	2014		0.5	0.2	13.6	1	15.3
Total 2014		\$410.00	\$205.00	\$82.00	\$5,576.00	\$410.00	\$6,273.00
Adenike Adeyeye	2013		1.5	0.2	1		2.7
Total 2013		\$135.00	\$202.50	\$27.00	\$135.00	\$0.00	\$364.50
Adenike Adeyeye	2014				2.2		2.2
Total 2014		\$140.00			\$308.00		\$308.00
<b>Total Track B</b>							<b>\$26,841.50</b>

TRACK A								
Name	Year	Rate	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Will Rostov	2013		77.2	87.1	72.2	80.1	10.1	326.7
Total 2013		\$390.00	\$30,108.00	\$33,969.00	\$28,158.00	\$31,239.00	\$3,939.00	\$127,413.00
Will Rostov	2014		29.3	8	9.8	8.6	1	56.7
Total 2014		\$410.00	\$12,013.00	\$3,280.00	\$4,018.00	\$3,526.00	\$410.00	\$23,247.00
Adenike Adeyeye	2013		52.2	143.9	68.7	16.1	12.4	293.3
Total 2013		\$135.00	\$7,047.00	\$19,426.50	\$9,274.50	\$2,173.50	\$1,674.00	\$39,595.50
Adenike Adeyeye	2014		5.8	13.7	7.7	3.8	1	32
Total 2014		\$140.00	\$812.00	\$1,918.00	\$1,078.00	\$532.00	\$140.00	\$4,480.00
Bill Powers	2013		0.40	18.70	126.00	17.80	2.00	164.90
Total 2013		\$150.00	\$60.00	\$2,805.00	\$18,900.00	\$2,670.00	\$300.00	\$24,735.00
<b>Total Track A</b>								<b>\$219,470.50</b>

Allocation Percentages		
Category A (Track A)	\$9,216.00	2.19%
Category 1	\$51,593.00	12.26%
Category 2	\$35,764.00	8.50%
Category 3	\$25,449.50	6.05%
Category 4	\$27,963.50	6.64%
Category 5	\$24,604.00	5.85%
Category 1 (Track B)	\$11,822.50	2.81%
Category 2	\$1,396.00	0.33%
Category 3	\$11,245.00	2.67%
Category 4	\$2,378.00	0.56%
Category 1 (Track A)	\$50,040.00	11.89%
Category 2	\$61,398.50	14.59%

Summary of Sierra Club CA Hours

Category 3	\$61,428.50	14.59%
Category 4	\$40,140.50	9.54%
Category 5	\$6,463.00	1.54%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$420,902.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

# ATTACHMENT 7

Date	Time	Description
5/5/2014	4.50	Review hours and draft form from A. Adeyeye
5/6/2014	0.10	OCW A.Adeyeye re: next projects on intervenor compensation
5/6/2014	0.20	OCW A.Adeyeye re: showing substantial contribution
5/6/2014	1.50	Draft rates, legal section of NOI and intro, review A.Adeyeye description of case
5/6/2014	0.20	Review revised version of decision descriptions and edit.
5/6/2014	0.80	Draft sections of compensation request
5/7/2014	3.50	OCW Rosie re: getting timesheets in order; review Track 1 time; review draft contribution section; multi-OCW A.Adeyeye re: revising contribution
5/8/2014	6.50	Allocating time in Track 1; Track 4; multi-OCW Rosie re: formatting timesheets; multi-OCW A.Adeyeye re: time allocation and issue breakdown; themes for document; drafting other sections of request
5/9/2014	6.00	Continue allocating time; work on A.Adeyeye's drafts of contribution sections; draft Part III of NOI
5/11/2014	4	Review and revise contribution sections
5/12/2014	8	Review Track 1, 3 and 4 decisions, review and revises contribution sections; draft and revise Part III of NOI section
5/13/2014	3.5	Allocate Track 3 time, review time sheets, final edits of time, review and edit NOI document, review all documents for filing
<b>Total 2014</b>	<b>38.8</b>	

<b>Total</b>	<b>38.8</b>
<b>Rate \$205</b>	<b>\$7,954.00</b>

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS FOR ROSTOV TIMESHEET	
DR	Draft
OCW	Office call with
R	Review
RV	Revise
TCW	Telephone call with

Hours of Adenike Adeyeye (NOI)

Date	Time	Description
User: Adenike Adeyeye		
3/5/2013	1.00	Looking up cites for request for compensation in Track 1.
3/5/2013	1.60	Looking up cites for request for compensation in Track 1.
3/13/2013	1.80	Reviewing proposed decision and scoping memo for intervenor compensation request.
3/13/2013	1.70	Reviewing proposed decision memo for intervenor compensation request.
3/14/2013	2.10	Reviewing proposed decision memo for intervenor compensation request.
<b>TOTAL 2013</b>	<b>8.20</b>	
<b>2013 Rate \$67.5</b>		<b>\$553.50</b>

4/16/2014	2.50	Working on request for intervenor compensation for Tracks 3 and 4.
4/17/2014	2.40	Working on request for intervenor compensation for Tracks 3 and 4.
4/18/2014	2.00	Working on request for intervenor compensation for Tracks 3 and 4.
4/21/2014	7.00	Working on request for intervenor compensation for Tracks 3 and 4.
4/23/2014	0.50	Reviewing Track 3 and Track 4 requests for intervenor compensation
4/25/2014	0.50	Intervenor compensation forms
5/6/2014	4.00	Review all documents submitted in Tracks 3 and 4 to compile list of topics covered in those tracks.
5/6/2014	0.50	Write summaries of decisions in Tracks 1, 3, and 4
5/6/2014	0.50	Edit formatting of Request for Compensation
5/7/2014	6.30	Drafting substantial contribution section of compensation claim.
5/8/2014	8.20	Drafting substantial contribution section of compensation claim.
5/12/2014	4.50	Working on revised substantial contribution section of compensation claim.
5/12/2014	4.50	Reviewing timesheets to submit with request for compensation
<b>Total 2014</b>	<b>43.40</b>	
<b>2014 Rate \$70</b>		<b>\$3,038.00</b>

<b>Total</b>		<b>\$3,591.50</b>
--------------	--	-------------------

# ATTACHMENT 8

# ADENIKE S. ADEYEYE

## EDUCATION

---

**Yale University, School of Forestry & Environmental Studies**, New Haven, CT

*Master of Environmental Management*, Social Ecology of Conservation & Development, May 2011.

ffi Awards: U.S. Department of Education Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellow, Teresa Heinz Scholar for Environmental Research, Lindsay Fellow for Research in Africa, Yale Tropical Resources Institute Fellow

**Yale University**, New Haven, CT

*Bachelor of Arts*, Environmental Studies, May 2007.

ffi Awards: Gaylord Donnelley Prize for Excellence in Environmental Studies, Yale Mellon Undergraduate Research Grant

**Pontificia Universidad Católica Madre y Maestra**, Santiago, Dominican Republic (Spring 2006)

ffi Concentration: Caribbean Studies and Community Development. All courses conducted in Spanish.

## RELEVANT EXPERIENCE

---

**Earthjustice**, San Francisco, CA

*Research and Policy Analyst* (January 2012 – Present)

ffi Conduct research and client outreach to support litigation in the air, environmental health, and climate change practice groups.

**The World Bank**, Washington, DC

*Consultant* (December 2011 – January 2012)

ffi Analyzed the Bank portfolio of over 600 municipal solid waste management projects globally, with a focus on environmental and social co-benefits that solid waste management provides.

**Yale Hixon Center for Urban Ecology**, New Haven, CT

*Research Assistant for Professor Amity Doolittle* (September 2011 – December 2011)

ffi Transcribed and coded stakeholder interviews about natural resource management and use in New Haven.

**Urban Resources Initiative (URI)**, New Haven, CT

*Community Forester* (September 2009 - August 2011)

ffi Advised eight community groups on urban environmental design, tree and plant selection, and environmental stewardship as they revitalized open spaces and streetscapes in their neighborhoods. Coordinated 64 volunteer events, where 233 volunteers devoted over 900 hours to neighborhood green space projects.

ffi Instructed a high school student crew and an ex-offender crew in street tree planting and environmental benefits of trees.

**Yale University, School of Forestry & Environmental Studies**, New Haven, CT

*Teaching Fellow (Social Science Research Methods)* (September 2010 - December 2010)

ffi Organized class logistics, facilitated in-class discussion, advised students on writing research grants, and presented Master's Project research to the 18-person class.

**WaterAid Nigeria**, Abuja and Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria

*Independent Researcher* (June 2010 - August 2010)

ffi Designed a research project focused on gender roles and decision-making in community-led total sanitation projects in Ekiti State, Nigeria. Conducted interviews in three rural communities and local government offices. Drafted report evaluating the sanitation projects' progress on achieving gender equity.

**Environmental Law Institute**, Washington, DC

*Research Associate* (July 2007 - June 2009); *Intern Coordinator* (May 2008 - June 2009)

ffi Conducted research and planned workshops for topics such as climate justice, brownfields revitalization, environmental laws and alternative dispute resolution, gender and natural resource management, and sustainable fisheries management.

ffi Hired and managed undergraduate interns for the Research & Policy Division.

**Saturday Environmental Academy**, Washington, D.C.

*Teacher* (September 2008 – May 2009)

- ffi Taught 25 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students from Southeast Washington, D.C. public schools about the Anacostia River and Chesapeake Bay watersheds through games, activities, and field trips each Saturday morning.

#### PUBLICATION

---

Adeyeye, A. (2011). Gender and Community-Led Total Sanitation: A Case Study of Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Tropical Resources Bulletin*, 30, 15-24.

#### SKILLS AND LANGUAGES

---

- ffi Microsoft Office suite, Macromedia Dreamweaver, Adobe Contribute, Adobe Soundbooth, ArcGIS.
- ffi **Spanish:** Professional working proficiency. **Yoruba:** Elementary oral proficiency; Intermediate written proficiency.