



Decision _____

FILED
08/23/21
04:59 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Continue Electric Integrated Resource Planning and Related Procurement Processes	Rulemaking 20-05-003 (Filed May 7, 2020)
--	---

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL (NRDC) AND DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF NRDC

NOTE: After electronically filing a PDF copy of this Intervenor Compensation Claim (Request), please email the document in an MS WORD and supporting EXCEL spreadsheet to the Intervenor Compensation Program Coordinator at lcompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

Intervenor: NRDC	For contribution to Decision (D.) 21-06-035	
Claimed: \$45,813.40	Awarded: \$	
Assigned Commissioner: Clifford Rechtschaffen	Assigned ALJ: Julie Fitch	
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/ Mohit Chhabra
Date: 8/23/21	Printed Name:	Mohit Chhabra

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

A. Brief description of Decision:	This decision addresses the mid-term reliability needs of the electricity system within the California Independent System Operator’s (CAISO’s) operating system by requiring at least 11,500 megawatts (MW) of additional net qualifying capacity (NQC) to be procured by all of the load-serving entities (LSEs) subject to the Commission’s integrated resource planning (IRP) authority.
--	---

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812¹:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	July 14, 2020	
2. Other specified date for NOI:	n/a	
3. Date NOI filed:	3/27/14 in the original R.13-12-010 proceeding, which turned into R.16-02-007 and subsequently into R.20-05-003. Per the OIR issued in this proceeding on 5/14/20, we confirm there have been no changes to NRDC’s bylaws or financial status. “Parties who were previously found eligible to request compensation in R.16-02-007 shall remain eligible in this proceeding and do not need to file an NOI within 30 days, provided there are no material changes in their by-laws or financial status.” OIR, p.19	

¹ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

4. Was the NOI timely filed?		
Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.18-05-015	
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 10, 2019	
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	n/a	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		
Showing of “significant financial hardship” (§1802(h) or §1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	A.18-05-015	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	January 10, 2019	
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	n/a	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.21-06-035	
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	June 24, 2021	
15. File date of compensation request:	August 23, 2021	
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		

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

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION
(to be completed by Intervenor except where indicated)

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059): (For each contribution, support with specific reference to the record.)

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p><i>(C) Ensuring carbon free energy production from diablo replacement.</i></p> <p>On February 22, 2021, Assigned Administrative Law Judge Fitch issued a “Ruling Seeking Feedback on Mid-Term Reliability Analysis and Proposed Procurement Requirements.” Although the Ruling made reference to the planned retirement of the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant in 2024-2025, it did not propose any procurement of greenhouse gas (“GHG”) free resources to prevent an increase in emissions of GHGs or other pollutants during the period between 2024 and 2030.</p> <p>NRDC worked with multiple environmental organizations to submit joint comments to replace the capacity and carbon free energy production in advance of the retirement of Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant. NRDC and the environmental parties filed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Comments of Natural Resources Defense Council, Union of Concerned 	<p>The Decision notes the Joint Environmental Parties’ comments to replace Diablo with carbon free resources to avoid an increase in emissions when Diablo retires. See D.21-06-035, p. 32, Section 5.1.3 (describing comments by the Joint Environmental Parties), and pp. 44-45, Section 5.2.3 (adopting requirements for LSEs to procure “at least 2,500 MW” of emissions-free resources during the period between 2024 and 2030, to replace the output of Diablo Canyon.</p> <p>In response to comments by the Joint Environmental Parties on replacing Diablo’s carbon free energy production, the final Decision (at 83) after noting these comments states that: “To address all of these concerns, we have made clarifications to the requirements for the 2,500 MW of Diablo Canyon replacement capacity to specify that this category of capacity requirement must be met with a generation resource or generation paired with storage, but may not be met with standalone storage only.”</p>	

<p>Scientists, California Environmental Justice Alliance, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, Green Power Institute, and Sierra Club on Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Issued February 22, 2021 (Filed 3/26/21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint Reply Comments of Natural Resources Defense Council, Union of Concerned Scientists, California Environmental Justice Alliance, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, Green Power Institute, and Sierra Club on Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Issued February 22, 2021 (Filed 4/9/21) <p>Both sets of comments entirely focused on the legal and policy rationale to replace Diablo with clean energy resources.</p>		
<p><i>(D) Conducting analysis on capacity needs, capacity shortfall, and proposals to meet reliability needs</i></p> <p>NRDC provided comments on various analytic and policy aspects of the Ruling, Proposed Decision and Alternate Proposed Decision.</p> <p><i>In Comments of Natural Resources Defense Council on Administrative Law Judge's</i></p>	<p>The Decision draws on NRDC and multiple party comments (Decision pages 8 through 10) to conclude that a more robust analysis is required before changing standards for reliability. The Decision, at 11, states that: “Therefore, we will refrain, in this order, from setting new standards for PRM, LOLE, or weather variants of the demand forecast, and instead will continue additional analysis and stakeholder engagement before making major changes.”</p>	

<p><i>Ruling Seeking Feedback on Mid-Term Reliability Analysis and Proposed Procurement Requirements</i> (filed 3/26/21) NRDC explains why additional reliability analysis is required before the CPUC sets planning reserve margins (PRM) for future procurement. (see pages 2 – 4 of NRDC’s comments).</p> <p><i>In Comments of the Natural Resources Defense Council on Proposed and Alternate Proposed Decision Requiring Procurement to Address Midterm Reliability (2023 – 2026)</i> (filed 6/10/21), NRDC recommended that no carve outs be included for fossil resources, that demand side resources be included as resources that qualify for additional procurement, and that green hydrogen be better defined by the decision. (see pages 2 – 4 of NRDC’s comments)</p>	<p>In response to concerns raised by NRDC and other environmental organizations on the PD’s proposal to procure fossil resources, the Decision, at 43, states that “in response to comments from numerous parties on the proposed decision representing a broad spectrum of viewpoints, we find that we would like additional analysis of the reliability impacts before requiring additional fossil-fueled capacity procurement.”</p> <p>NRDC commented on that demand side resources should also be applied to meet reliability needs. The Decision, at 46, recognizes this and states that “In response to comments on the proposed decision from numerous parties, including CalCCA and NRDC, we state definitively that demand-side resources and distributed energy resources, are eligible to count toward the capacity requirements in this decision. We also emphasize that these types of resources are our highest priority”</p>	
--	---	--

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

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
a. Was the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?²	Yes.	
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes.	
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Union of Concerned Scientists, California Environmental Justice Alliance, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Defense Fund, Friends of the Earth, Green Power Institute, and Sierra Club		

² The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill No. 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

<p>d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: NRDC’s advocacy was not duplicative as we worked closely with other parties (listed above) to develop joint comments and to discuss areas of synergies/resolve disagreements prior to filing individual comments. NRDC was uniquely positioned to develop joint comments by pulling together such a large and diverse coalition of environmental advocacy and environmental justice organizations; NRDC thereby helped efficiently develop comments on behalf of multiple parties for the Commission’s decisional process.</p> <p>Our time claimed is only for substantive contributions that were intended to be additive or supplemental to other parties. All calls claimed with other parties were focused on resolving key issues ahead of time and were kept as brief as possible. Calls less than 30 minutes were not claimed nor were extensive email exchanges where a number of items were resolved prior to formal filings.</p> <p>In addition, NRDC took steps to ensure no duplication of work within our organization by assigning specific issues, tasks, and workshops/meetings to each team member.</p> <p>We were judicious in our assignments, conservative in our request time, and effective in our advocacy. For these reasons, our coordinated work was not duplicative and should be awarded in full.</p>	
--	--

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

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion

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

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness: NRDC consistently advocates for policies to maximize affordable and equitable clean energy options, ensuring that the benefits of clean energy resources are properly accounted for, that policies and goals align to enable the utilities to use clean energy as their first energy resource choice (as required by California law), and that opportunities are available to all customers. NRDC’s continued focus in this and other proceedings is on policies that ensure a reliable, affordable, equitable, and environmentally sustainable energy resource portfolio that should have lasting benefits available to all customers. In addition, NRDC continually works to increase collaboration to reduce disagreement prior to filing comments.</p> <p>We evaluate the reasonableness of this claim’s cost against the significant changes made in D.21-06-035 regarding the updates made to ensure Diablo’s retirement does not lead to increased emissions and air pollution. The reduction in harmful emissions and air pollution, as well as the contribution to meeting the state’s climate goals, will have substantially more value –including improved affordability and health – for customers than the amount requested in this compensation claim.</p> <p>We have intervened in the IRP for many years, working to improve the effectiveness of the process to get to California’s clean energy goals in a cost-effective manner. As detailed in our discussion in II., above (“Substantial Contribution”), we have contributed to significant updates to the decision.</p> <p>Our contributions thereby justify the requested amount.</p>	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed: The substantial contributions to Commission policy and process described above would not have been possible without the individual contributions of NRDC staff lead. We ensured that only substantive hours are claimed by assigning one person per major topic, with minimal time spent by other staff focused predominately on enhancing NRDC’s substantive arguments. Frank Lindh oversaw legal analysis and preparing Joint Comments on replacement of Diablo’s energy production with clean resources. Mohit Chhabra was the lead technical analyst for all issues and managed the development of both NRDC’s comments and Frank Lindh’s engagement to develop joint comments. Even where substantial time was spent, we do not claim time so as to ensure our claim in conservative and focused on the primary staffer working on a particular issue.</p>	

We have exercised extensive billing judgment to minimize the hours claimed for compensation. We did not claim for internal NRDC strategizing. Because of these efforts, our time is reasonable.			
c. Allocation of hours by issue: (hours and %, to nearest whole %)			
		Total Hours	Total %
A	Read and review CPUC rulings, proposed decisions, and decisions.	7.00	9%
B	Meetings with stakeholders	8.10	11%
C	Ensuring carbon free energy production from diablo replacement	45.60	61%
D	Conducting analysis on capacity needs, capacity shortfall, and proposals to meet reliability needs	14.00	19%
	TOTAL	74.70	100%

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Frank Lindh	2021	53.20	\$ 699.03	Res ALJ-393 + CPUC hourly rate chart	\$ 37,188.40			
Mohit Chhabra	2021	21.50	\$ 375.00	Res ALJ-393 + CPUC hourly rate chart	\$ 8,062.50			
Subtotal: \$45,250.90						Subtotal: \$		
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 \$
n/a								
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$		

INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hour s	Rate	Total \$
Mohit Chhabra	2021	3	\$ 187.50	Res ALJ-393 + CPUC hourly rate chart	\$ 562.50			
Subtotal: \$562.50						Subtotal: \$		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
	n/a							
Subtotal: \$						Subtotal: \$		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$45,813.40						TOTAL AWARD: \$		
<p>*We remind all intervenors that Commission staff may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§1804(d)). Intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenors' records should identify specific issues for which it seeks compensation, the actual time spent by each employee or consultant, the applicable hourly rates, fees paid to consultants and any other costs for which compensation was claimed. The records pertaining to an award of compensation shall be retained for at least three years from the date of the final decision making the award.</p> <p>**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer's normal hourly rate</p>								
ATTORNEY INFORMATION								
Attorney		Date Admitted to CA BAR ³	Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If "Yes", attach explanation			
n/a								

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Attachment 1	Staff Hours and Issue Areas
Attachment 2	Mohit Chhabra Resume
Attachment 3	Frank Lindh Resume

³ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch> .

<p>Comment 1</p>	<p>In Resolution (Res.) ALJ-393, the Commission adopted a new methodology for setting Intervenor Compensation hourly rates, based on a Market Rate Study. The new methodology defines comparable hourly rates for seventy-nine intervenor “labor roles,” at five levels of experience and education. For each level, a market-based hourly rate range is established. The Commission directed intervenors “to use the Hourly Rate Chart spreadsheet available on the Commission’s I-COMP website (https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/proceedings-and-rulemaking/intervenor-compensation) to determine the appropriate hourly rate when completing claims for work performed on or after January 1, 2021.” (Res. ALJ-393, pp. 3-4.) The Commission clarified that hourly rates for 2021 will be based on the approved hourly rate ranges in the Market Rate Study, without regard to previously established hourly rates for 2020 or prior years. (<i>Id.</i>, p. 4.) Finally, the Commission directed intervenors to submit, in their first claim seeking compensation for work completed in 2021 and beyond, the following information to establish hourly rates: (1) a current resume as a supporting document, and (2) a justification for the requested rate that ties to the individual’s labor role and level of experience, per the Market Rate Study’s Hourly Rate Chart. (<i>Id.</i>, p. 5.)</p> <p>Pursuant to the requirements of Res. ALJ-393, NRDC hereby submits its request for 2021 hourly rates. This request for 2021 hourly rates includes the following individuals: Mohit Chhabra, and NRDC’s outside counsel, Frank R. Lindh.</p>
<p>Comment 2</p>	<p>Mohit Chhabra’s Rates Labor Role: Policy Analyst Level: IV 2021 Hourly Rate Range: \$263 - \$493 Requested Hourly Rate: \$375 Current Resume: See Attachment [2] Justification for the Requested Hourly Rate:</p> <p>2021 Rate: Using the new “Hourly Rate Chart (Effective January 1, 2021), we request a rate of \$375, which is the rounded rate for the middle range for a Public Policy Analyst, Level IV, with 10-15 years of experience. We choose the middle range as Mr. Chhabra has nearly 15 years of experience.</p> <p>At NRDC, Mohit Chhabra focuses on affecting policy to accelerate the transition to a sustainable and clean energy future. He provides analysis and strategic guidance to policymakers and other stakeholders at the state, regional, and national levels. Chhabra is currently working on developing cost-efficient pathways to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from California's rapidly transforming electric grid. Chhabra has an extensive background in energy conservation analysis. He is a voting member of the Regional Technical Forum of the Pacific Northwest and is also a part of the Conservation Resources Advisory Committee of the Pacific Northwest. He holds a master's in civil environmental and architectural engineering from the University of Colorado, Boulder and a bachelor's in mechanical engineering from the University of Pune in India. His attached resume, that details his experience, provides justification for his hourly rate.</p>

<p>Comment 3</p>	<p>Frank Lindh’s Rate Labor Role: Attorney Level: V 2021 Hourly Rate Range: \$486.31 - \$699.03 Requested Hourly Rate: \$699.03 Current Resume: See Attachment [3] Justification for the Requested Hourly Rate:</p> <p>2021 Rate: Mr. Lindh is a highly regarded attorney with an exceptional depth of experience. Mr. Lindh served as General Counsel of the Commission for six years (2008-2014). He has practiced in the field of public utilities law and regulation for 36 years. Mr. Lindh has practiced before the Commission as an attorney since 1991, a period of 30 years. He is a 1985 honors graduate of Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, D.C. and has the distinction of being the first person in history to serve as Law Clerk to the Solicitor General of the United States (1984-1985). Early in his career, Mr. Lindh was an appellate attorney in the Office of the Solicitor of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (“FERC”) in Washington, D.C. Mr. Lindh was twice elected to the Board of Directors of the Conference of California Utility Counsel, a professional association of attorneys and advocates who appear before the Commission. He also has served on the National Board of Directors of the Energy Bar Association (EBA), a professional association of FERC practitioners, and as a founding member and two-term President of the EBA’s Western Chapter. Mr. Lindh has been an adjunct law professor since 2009, teaching courses on energy law and regulation at several accredited law schools in the San Francisco Bay Area. Given his unusually strong credentials, his exceptional range of experience, and his stature as a leader of the bar, Mr. Lindh deserves to be compensated at the highest market rate applicable to attorneys.</p>
------------------	---

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

A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?	
---	--

If so:

Party	Reason for Opposition	CPUC Discussion

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

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

(Green items to be completed by Intervenor)

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)** [has/has not] made a substantial contribution to D.21-06-035.
2. The requested hourly rates for **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)**'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 compensation 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. **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)** shall be awarded \$_____.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, _____ shall pay **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)** the total award. [for multiple utilities: “Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, ^, ^, and ^ shall pay **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)** 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. If such data is unavailable, the most recent [industry type, for example, electric] revenue data shall be used.”] 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 75th day after the filing of **Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)**’s request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today’s decision [is/is not] waived.
4. This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	
Contribution Decision(s):	D.21-06-035		
Proceeding(s):	R.20-05-003		
Author:			
Payer(s):			

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
NRDC	August 23, 2021	\$45,813.40		N/A	

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Mohit	Chhabra	Expert	\$375	2021	
Frank	Lindh	Attorney	\$699.03	2021	

(END OF APPENDIX)

Attachment 1 – Staff Hours and Issue Areas

Issue Areas for All Staff Hours

A	Read and review CPUC rulings, proposed decisions, and decisions.
B	Meetings with stakeholders
C	Ensuring carbon free energy production from diablo replacement
D	Conducting analysis on capacity needs, capacity shortfall, and proposals to meet reliability need

Mohit Chhabra's Hours

Date	Description	A	B	C	D	Total Hours
2021	Mohit Chhabra's Hours					
3/10/2021	Review CPUC Ruling on Midterm Reliability	4				4
3/12/2021	Review first draft of Joint Comments (filed with other environmental parties on Diablo's replacement)			1.00		1
3/19/2021	Review second draft of Joint Comments			0.50		0.5
3/20/2021	Conduct research on reliability issues, and climate change				4	4
3/25/2021	Develop NRDC's Comments on CPUC Ruling on Midterm Reliability				8	8
3/26/2021	Final substantive review of joint comments			0.50		0.5
4/8/2021	Review Joint Reply draft comment			0.50		0.5
5/21/2021	Review ALJ Proposed Decision and Alternate Proposed Decision		0.50			0.5
6/6/2021	Draft NRDC comments on mid-term reliability PD and APD				2	2
6/10/2021	Review Joint Enviro draft comments on PD and APD			0.50		0.5
\$ 8,062.50	2021 Hours	4.00	0.50	3.00	14.00	21.50
	2021 % issue area	19%	2%	14%	65%	100%
\$ 8,062.50	Total Hours	4.00	0.50	3.00	14.00	21.50
	Total % issue area	19%	2%	14%	65%	100%

Frank Lindh's Hours

Date	Description	A	B	C	D	Total Hours
2021	Frank Lindh's Hours					
3/9/2021	Confer w/ NRDC and UCS representatives about the prospect of joint comments re: Diablo Canyon		1			1
3/10/2021	Commencement preparation of draft of Joint Comments of Environmental Parties in response to ALJ Ruling		2.80			2.8
3/11/2021	Complete first draft of Joint Comments of Environmental Parties in response to ALJ Ruling issued 2/22/21.			6.30		6.3
3/12/2021	Complete first draft of Joint Comments, incorporating client suggestions, for circulation to aligned parties.			2.50		2.5
3/19/2021	Complete second draft of Joint Comments, incorporating suggestions from other sponsoring parties.			3.90		3.9
3/23/2021	Revise draft Joint Comments to incorporate substantial suggestions from several of the other sponsoring parties.			4.50		4.5
3/25/2021	Revise Joint Comments document to incorporate further suggestions on the second draft from several of the sponsoring parties.			1.70		1.7
3/26/2021	Final substantive editing of Joint Comments of Environmental Parties prior to filing.			1.50		1.5
4/5/2021	Preparation of Joint Reply Comments on Diablo Canyon emissions issues.			2.50		2.5
4/6/2021	Complete first draft of Joint Reply Comments re: ALJ Ruling issued Feb. 22, 2021.			4.30		4.3
4/8/2021	Final substantive edits on Joint Reply Comments.			1.30		1.3
5/21/2021	Briefly review new Proposed Decision issued by ALJ Julie Fitch and companion Alternate Proposed Decision by Commissioner Rechtschaffen		0.25			0.25
5/21/2021	Prepare brief, preliminary assessment for NRDC team.		0.25			0.25
5/22/2021	Review in detail ALJ Proposed Decision issued 5/21/21; prepared detailed written assessment for NRDC team.		2.50			2.5
5/26/2021	Participate in multi-party meeting among PG&E and Joint Environmental Parties re: Diablo Canyon replacement resources, focused on ALJ Proposed Decision issued 5/22/21.	1.00				1
6/1/2021	Prepare summary for NRDC team re: PG&E meeting held on 5/26/22.	1.00				1
6/4/2021	Confer w/ individual members of Joint Environmental Parties re: the prospect of filing Joint Comments on the PD & APD issued 5/21/21.		0.80			0.8
6/4/2021	Preparation of first draft of Comments of Joint Environmental Parties on PD & APD issued 5/21/21			2.50		2.5
6/6/2021	Complete first draft of Comments of Joint Environmental Parties on PD & APD issued 5/21/21			3.00		3
6/7/2021	Revise based on feedback from other parties the draft of Comments of Joint Environmental Parties on PD & APD issued 5/21/21			1.80		1.8
6/10/2021	Review Comments of other parties, focusing on Diablo Canyon replacement issues, in response to PD & APD issued 5/21/21.			1.50		1.5
6/10/2021	Final revisions, based on feedback from sponsoring parties, of Comments of Joint Environmental Parties on PD & APD issued 5/21/21			2.50		2.5
6/11/2021	Prepare first draft of Reply Comments of Joint Environmental Parties re: PD & APD issued 5/21/21.			2.80		2.8
6/24/2021	Monitor Commission meeting discussion & vote on Diablo Canyon replacement in IRP proceeding.	1.00				1
\$ 37,187.33	2021 Hours	3.00	7.60	42.60	-	53.20
	2021 % issue area	6%	14%	80%	0%	100%
\$ 37,187.33	Total Hours	3.00	7.60	42.60	-	53.20
	Total % issue area	6%	14%	80%	0%	100%

Attachment 2 – Mohit Chhabra Resume

Mohit Singh Chhabra

Senior Scientist, Natural Resources Defense Council • (415) 875-6132 • mchhabra@NRDC.org

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

Energy Sector Expertise:

- Energy sector advocate for the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) at the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) and California Energy Commission (CEC).
- Advocate for cost-effectively reducing carbon in the energy sector through advocacy at regulatory agencies in California.
- Subject matter expertise in distributed energy resources, integrated resource planning, and cost effectiveness policy development.
- Work to integrate climate change adaptation in energy sector planning.
- Appointed as a voting member to the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's Regional Technical Forum (RTF).
- Presented energy efficiency analysis to the RTF and regional stakeholders on an almost monthly basis from 2013 through 2016.
- Helped develop the 2011, and 2013 California Potential Goals & Targets Models. Presented analysis to regional stakeholders at all public meetings during the course of the analysis
- Impact evaluation lead for program portfolios in the Pacific Northwest, Mountain West, California, and Arizona.
- Data analysis and modeling in R, Analytica, Excel, and Access.
- Building simulation expert with experience in eQuest, Energy Plus, TRNSYS, and SEEM.

Management & Communication:

- Intervenor in CPUC and CEC state proceedings on behalf of NRDC. Filed written, presented oral comments in numerous state proceedings and workshops
- Presented analysis and research to inform energy efficiency decision making at monthly public RTF meetings from June 2012 through 2016.
- Successfully created a collaborative atmosphere for advancing energy efficiency in the Pacific Northwest through the RTF, and in California through California Energy Efficiency Potential Goals & Targets study
- Managed consulting firms with subject matter expertise to develop RTF work products.
- Coordination and management of RTF's Research & Evaluation, Health Impacts of Wood Smoke, New Efficient Manufactured Homes, and Refrigerator Decommissioning subcommittees.
- Managed teams of colleagues and partners to conduct energy efficiency evaluations and potential studies; conducted stakeholder meetings, interviews, and informal communications for numerous projects.

RECENT WORK EXPERIENCE

Natural Resources Defense Council | San Francisco, CA

Senior Scientist

January 2017– Present

Energy Efficiency and Distributed Energy Resources: Represent NRDC at CPUC's energy efficiency and various distributed energy resource (DER) related proceedings at the CPUC to ensure that all DERs are accurately valued for their contribution to meeting California's carbon reduction targets. Presented to California's energy commissioners at multiple public workshops. Serve as a technical resource for NRDC's energy efficiency and DER advocacy in other states in the country as needed.

Integrated Resource Planning: Lead NRDC's efforts in the CPUC led statewide integrated resource planning (IRP) proceeding to comply with California's greenhouse gas reduction targets. Responsibilities include technical review of statewide IRP models, developing feedback to ensure that the state IRP meets SB350's greenhouse gas reduction requirements while minimizing electric sector spending, impact on customer rates, and considering the unique needs of disadvantaged communities.

Cost Effectiveness: Worked to improve energy sector cost effectiveness practices in California. Intervention in the Integrated Distributed Energy Resources (IDER) proceeding at the CPUC to develop accurate cost effectiveness policy. Also serve on the Advisory Committee for the development of the National Standard Practice Manual.

Climate Adaptation: Advocate for integrating climate change impacts in energy sector planning at the CPUC.

Northwest Energy Sector Planning: Appointed to the Northwest Power Council's Conservation Resources Advisory Committee to participate in development of regional power plans and provide expert feedback. Serve on the RTF, an independent forum of energy efficiency experts, as a voting member.

Regional Technical Forum | Ptarmigan Research LLC, Oakland, CA

Contract Analyst

April 2013 – December 2016

Measure Analysis for the Regional Technical Forum – Developed estimates of energy efficiency measure savings, incremental cost, and benefit-cost ratios. Summarized and presented analysis to the RTF on an almost monthly basis.

Developing Protocols and Research Documents for the RTF – Developed protocols to estimate reliable energy savings for industrial pumps, efficient new homes, and industrial air compressors. Developed research strategies required to reliably estimate energy savings for multiple measures including residential weatherization. Helped draft the RTF report on the health impacts of reduced wood burning due to heat pump installations.

Regional Coordination for the RTF – Managed technical subcommittees for the RTF; these subcommittees included the RTF's Research & Evaluation, Health Impacts of Wood Smoke, New Efficient Manufactured Homes, and Refrigerator Decommissioning subcommittees

Assisted in Developing Energy Efficiency Potential in the 7th Power Plan – Developed estimates for the 7th Plan for residential and commercial energy efficiency measures.

Navigant Consulting, Inc. (Formerly Summit Blue Consulting, LLC.) | Walnut Creek, CA
Managing Consultant *March 2007 – March 2013*

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) Potential Goals & Targets Study (2011, and 2013). Helped develop a potential model to estimate achievable energy savings potential in California. This model analyzed energy savings potential in the Residential, Commercial, Industrial and Agricultural sector. Responsible for developing the technical inputs for all sectors across all Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs).

Impact Evaluations for Puget Sound Energy (PSE), PacifiCorp Commercial & Industrial Program Evaluations. Led a multi-year impact evaluation of prescriptive C&I program in PacifiCorp and PSE service territory. This evaluation included sampling and on-site M&V activity to achieve evaluation statistically significant results. The evaluation activity included data logging at customer sites, site level analysis, reporting, and presentation. Managed and led similar evaluations for Tucson Electric Power's residential energy efficiency portfolio.

Regional Technical Forum (RTF) Unit Energy Savings (UES) Measure Compliance. Project manager and technical lead for a project with the RTF to develop standardized workbooks for 10 UES measures and bring them into compliance with RTF guidelines. Mr. Chhabra managed the day to day working of this project and provides in-person measure updates to the RTF every month.

CPUC Evaluation 2006 – 08. Worked with a team across consulting firms to develop the Evaluation Reporting Template for the 2006 – 08 evaluations. Developed code to do Net to Gross analysis for a subset of California IOU programs based on CPUC NTG guidelines.

TECHNICAL EXPERTISE

Building Energy Simulation: eQuest, DOE2, Energy Plus and TRNSYS

Database Analysis and Data Management: Database analysis using R, SAS, Access, basic SQL skills.

Modeling: Analytica™, R, and Excel.

PUBLICATIONS

Chhabra, Mohit: "Restructuring Portfolios to Bring Out the Best in Energy Efficiency" (May, 2021), [Submitted](#) to the California Public Utilities Commission.

Chhabra, Mohit: "Designing Cost Effectiveness Tests for Demand Side Management Programs" (May, 2021), [Submitted](#) to the California Public Utilities Commission.

Chhabra, Mohit: "Using the Total Economic Value to Set Resource Energy Efficiency Program Goals" (May, 2021), [Submitted](#) to the California Public Utilities Commission.

Hay, Catherine and Chhabra, Mohit: "The Impact of Wildfires and Beneficial Electrification on Electricity Rates in PG&E's Service Territory," (April 3, 2020), *Electricity Journal* (Volume 33, Issue 3)

Chhabra, Mohit: "Solar Domestic Hot Water Performance: Effect of Changing Annual Load and Average Use Profile" (US Copyright Registration Number TX 8-092-277)

Chhabra, Mohit and Lee, Angie. "Think Outside the Grid: Savings from Appliance Recycling Programs". (August, 2013) Presented at the proceedings of the International Energy Program Evaluation Conference (IEPEC)

Chhabra, Mohit. 2011, "Separating the Wheat from the Chaff: Quantifying Savings from Truly Efficient Motor Rewinds". Presented at the proceedings of the International Energy Program Evaluation Conference (IEPEC)

EDUCATION

B.S. in Mechanical Engineering with First Class, University of Pune, India

M.S. in Civil Environmental and Architectural Engineering, University of Colorado at Boulder

Mathematics: 42nd in all Delhi Math Olympiad (High School)

Attachment 3 – Frank Lindh Resume

FRANK R. LINDH ATTORNEY AT LAW

110 Taylor St.
San Rafael, CA 94901
Telephone 415-596-3931
Email: FrankLindh@comcast.net

EDUCATION

1985: *Juris Doctor*, with honors, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.
1980: Master of Social Work, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
1974: Bachelor of Arts, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

LEGAL EXPERIENCE (1984 to Present)

October 2015 – Present: Solo practitioner in San Rafael, California, specializing in energy and public utilities matters.
2014 –2015: Crowell & Moring, LLP – Partner in the San Francisco office of a large national law firm.
2008 –2014: General Counsel, California Public Utilities Commission. Supervised a staff of over 65 lawyers.
1993 - 2008: Attorney, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, San Francisco.
1996 - 1998: General Counsel, Pacific Gas Transmission Company, Portland, Oregon, a major natural gas pipeline company serving California.
1985-1993: Private Law Practice at several major law firms in Washington, D.C., and San Francisco, specializing in energy law.
1987 - 1989: Appellate Attorney, Office of the Solicitor, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C.
1984 - 1985: Law Clerk to the Solicitor General of the United States, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

EXPERIENCE AS A PROFESSOR OF LAW (2009 to Present)

I have taught as an adjunct faculty member at several Bay Area law schools, and have published a number of scholarly articles.

EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL WORK (1975-1984)

I worked in a variety of social service agencies, both private and government, focused addiction issues. I also worked at the U.S. Office of Child Support Enforcement and the Social Security Administration.