

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Rulemaking to Consider Regulating Telecommunications Services Used by Incarcerated People.
--

Rulemaking 20-10-002

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO
CENTER FOR ACCESSIBLE TECHNOLOGY
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 21-08-037**

Intervenor: Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT)	For contribution to Decision (D.)21-08-037
Claimed: \$125,174.00	Awarded: \$113,362.00
Assigned Commissioner: Darcie Houck ¹	Assigned ALJ: Robert Haga ²

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	D.21-08-037 adopted interim rate caps on intrastate rates for incarcerated persons calling services including services for incarcerated persons with disabilities, prohibited the imposition of certain fees and prohibited the imposition of any ancillary fee or service fee not explicitly approved in this decision.
--	--

¹ This proceeding was reassigned to Commissioner Houck on February 1, 2022

² This proceeding was reassigned to ALJ Haga on February 14, 2022

B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812³:

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	12/10/2020	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	N/A	
3. Date NOI filed:	1/11/2021	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?		Yes
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:	No ruling has been issued on CforAT's NOI in this proceeding. CforAT's most recent finding of eligible customer status was issued in R.20-01-007. CforAT has requested an updated finding of eligible customer status in our NOI submitted in A.20-11-001 (proposed Verizon / TracFone merger), filed on February 25, 2021.	Verified in R.20-01-007
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	5/29/20	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?		Yes
Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)):		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	No ruling has been issued on CforAT's NOI in this proceeding. CforAT's most recent finding of significant financial hardship was issued in R.20-01-007. CforAT has requested an updated finding of significant financial	Verified in R.20-01-007

³ All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
	hardship in our NOI submitted in A.20-11-001	
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	5/29/20	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	N/A	
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.21-08-036	D.21-08-037
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	8/23/2021	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	10/22/2021	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?		Yes

PART II: SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION

A. Did the Intervenor substantially contribute to the final decision (see § 1802(j), § 1803(a), 1803.1(a) and D.98-04-059):

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>Background/Overview: Since the proceeding was first opened in 2020, CforAT has been an active participant in order to address issues of concern to our constituency of customers with disabilities, including the large number of incarcerated persons with disabilities. CforAT has worked in conjunction with an outside consultant with deep subject matter expertise (the Human Rights Defense Center or HRDC) and has participated in a broad coalition of advocates as appropriate in order to efficiently advance the interests of our constituency.</p>		Noted

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>Contributions to Interim Decision</p> <p>In conjunction with the Interim Decision, CforAT addressed multiple issues including the Commission’s jurisdiction; the state of competition in the IPCS market(s), IPCS services for people with disabilities, rate caps, and ancillary fees. Each of these items is addressed separately below.</p>		<p>Noted</p>
<p>Jurisdiction: CforAT recommended that the Commission separately address, as part of the proceeding, the issue of the extent of its jurisdiction. Opening Comments on OIR at pp. 2-3, 6.</p> <p>“There is no reasonable dispute that the Commission has jurisdiction to address rates and fees for intrastate communication services to prisoners in California.” Reply Comments on OIR at p. 1.</p> <p>CforAT argued that the Commission’s authority “to regulate ancillary services and fees is not limited to the specific fees that are regulated at the federal level, and should include a review of all ancillary fees as well as other issues as noted here.” Reply Comments on OIR at pp. 2, 10.</p> <p>CforAT argued that the Commission did not need to defer to the FCC regarding ancillary services. Reply Comments on OIR at p. 10.</p>	<p>The Commission confirmed that it had jurisdiction over specific intrastate communication services: “We define intrastate IPCS for purposes of this decision as including (but not limited to) voice and interconnected VoIP calling, including voice and VoIP voice communications services serving people with disabilities. As discussed above, IPCS providers providing such services are telephone corporations and public utilities and as such are subject to our jurisdiction and the requirement of Public Utilities Code Section 451 to ensure just and reasonable rates.” Decision at p. 21.</p> <p>The Decision held that the Commission had the jurisdiction to regulate ancillary services. Decision at p. 75. “It is within the Commission’s authority and jurisdiction to adopt lower ancillary fee caps than those adopted for interstate IPCS and to require IPCS providers to adhere to our adopted fee requirements for intrastate and jurisdictionally mixed ancillary services.” Decision at p. 76.</p>	<p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>Competition</p> <p>CforAT argued that there were two relevant markets for ICPS. Reply Comments on OIR at p. 68; Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 3-5.</p> <p>CforAT argued that a lack of competition in the ICPS market could lead to supracompetitive prices. Opening Comments on OIR at p. 7.</p> <p>CforAT argued that the lack of competitive pressure to ensure rates are just and reasonable has led to prices higher than they would be in a competitive market. Reply Comments on OIR at p. 8; Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 2-3.</p> <p>CforAT argued that providers of IPCS offered service on a monopoly basis. Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 4-5; Reply Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 4-6; Opening Comments on PD at pp. 2-3; Reply Comments on Proposed Decision at p. 3.</p>	<p>“Additionally, as CforAT described, the IPCS market is properly thought of as consisting of two markets or two sets of customers: providers ‘compete’ for the right to provide IPCS to the incarcerated.” Decision at p. 35.</p> <p>The Decision found that “[b]ased on a careful review of the record in this proceeding and informed by the FCC’s actions, we conclude that IPCS providers in California operate as locational monopolies within incarceration facilities and exercise market power to charge unjust and unreasonable rates. We define “market power” in this case as the ability of a company to sustain prices at levels above those a competitive market would produce.” Decision at p. 39 (citing CforAT Reply Comments on Proposed Decision at p. 3).</p> <p>The Commission found that “[i]ncarceration facilities typically limit provision of IPCS with in a facility to one provider” and therefore operated monopolies. Decision at p. 34.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>
<p>Incarcerated Persons with Communications Disabilities [Procedural Contribution]</p> <p>CforAT argued that the Commission should expand the scope of the proceeding’s examination of ICPS for people with disabilities beyond text telephones. Opening Comments</p>	<p>The Decision did not limit its scope to text telephones, instead addressing communications services for people with disabilities more broadly: “We define intrastate IPCS for purposes of</p>	<p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
<p>on OIR at pp. 4-5; Reply Comments on OIR at pp. 4-5.</p>	<p>this decision as including (but not limited to) voice and interconnected VoIP calling, including voice and VoIP voice communications services serving people with disabilities.” Decision at p. 21; Conclusion of Law 5; Ordering Paragraph 1. The Commission also made clear its intent to address this issue comprehensively in the next phase of the proceeding. Scoping Memo at p. 26.</p>	
<p>Rate Caps</p> <p>CforAT supported the Commission’s setting rate caps on IPCS that are just and reasonable. Opening Comments on OIR at p. 3; Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling at p. 5.</p> <p>CforAT supported the Commission’s imposing rate caps on an interim basis. Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 6-7.</p> <p>CforAT initially supported the Commission’s lowering interim rate caps to FCC levels. CforAT Opening Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 7-8. However, after further review, CforAT supported a lower rate cap of \$0.05/minute. Reply Comments on ALJ Ruling at pp. 2, 6-7(“Commission adoption of the Staff Proposal is preferable to a delay in imposing rate caps but does not make the FCC rates reasonable”); Opening Comments on Proposed Decision at p. 3-4.</p> <p>CforAT argued that ICPS providers failed to demonstrate any nexus between the costs of providing service and the high rates charged to</p>	<p>The Decision held that a \$0.05/minute rate was “a reasonable ‘base rate’ to use to identify an appropriate interim per-minute rate.” Decision at p. 53.</p> <p>The Decision states that “as CforAT... noted, IPCS providers had the opportunity to but did not file data summarizing the range of security or other costs to IPCS providers. IPCS providers had the opportunity to but did not link filed data on IPCS security costs to the rates they charge. IPCS providers had the opportunity to but did not file data justifying the significantly higher rates for county or city jails Cal Advocates identified.” Decision at p. 32.</p>	<p>Verified</p> <p>Verified</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
customers. Reply Comments on ALJ Ruling at p. 3.		
<p>Ancillary Fees</p> <p>CforAT argued that the Commission should either limit or ban entirely ancillary fees on IPCS. Opening Comments on OIR at pp. 3-4.</p>	<p>The Decision held that “[t]he following requirements for all ancillary service fees associated with the provision of intrastate and jurisdictionally mixed incarcerated person’s calling services in California are adopted: (a) imposition of any single-call, paper bill, live agent, and/or automated payment fees is prohibited; (b) collection of third-party financial transaction fees is limited to the pass through of the exact fee only, with no mark up, and excluding any credit card charges, up to a cap of \$6.95 per transaction; (c) collection of government-mandated taxes and fees is limited to the pass through of the exact fee only, with no mark up; and, (c) imposition of any other type of ancillary service fee or service charge not explicitly approved here is prohibited.” Decision at pp. 115-116, Ordering Paragraph 3.</p>	Verified
<p>CforAT noted that “Participants at the Public Participation Hearings described significant confusion and bill shock regarding ancillary service fees.” Reply Comments on ALJ Ruling at p. 8.</p>	<p>The Decision stated that “[a]s noted by CforAT, this Commission heard significant confusion and customer complaints about IPCS ancillary fees during our April 28, 2021 and April 29, 2021 PPHs, making clear that the current ancillary fees are a major burden to families of the incarcerated as they strive to stay in communication with their loved ones.” Decision at p. 73.</p>	Verified
<p>CforAT argued that ancillary fees are largely nonexistent for non-IPCS offerings and, to the extent that those fees are unjust or unreasonable, the</p>	<p>In prohibiting all ancillary service fees (except for third-party financial transaction fees and government-mandated taxes and fees)</p>	Verified

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
Commission should ban them. Reply Comments on OIR at p. 4.	the Decision notes that “CforAT...observe[s] that telecommunications and other utilities provide customer service outside of IPCS facilities for free.” Decision at p. 67. The Decision further noted that “[t]he costs for these services are included in most commercial calling rates and we have no record discussing why such costs should not be similarly included in intrastate IPCS calling rates.” Decision at p. 73.	

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?⁴	Yes	Yes
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	Yes	Yes
c. If so, provide name of other parties: Cal Advocates Californians for Jail and Prison Phone Justice Coalition Ella Baker Center The Greenlining Institute Media Alliance NCIC Prison Policy Initiative Returning Home Foundation The Utility Reform Network (TURN) Worth Rises Youth Law Center		Verified
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication:		Noted

⁴ The Office of Ratepayer Advocates was renamed the Public Advocate’s Office of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Senate Bill 854, which the Governor approved on June 27, 2018.

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
	<p>Other parties including one of the regulated utilities (NCIC) also held positions that overlapped with those of CforAT on certain issues, because those parties share an interest in ensuring that rates for IPCS are just and reasonable. CforAT prepared filings in conjunction with our outside subject matter expert consultants, HRDC; in addition, CforAT worked with Prison Policy Initiative, and The Utility Reform Network when possible. Additionally, CforAT coordinated with and engaged in other activities in this proceeding in conjunction with Cal Advocates, Californians for Jail and Prison Phone Justice Coalition, Ella Baker Center, The Greenlining Institute, Media Alliance, Prison Policy Initiative, Returning Home Foundation, The Utility Reform Network, and Worth Rises, and Youth Law Center when possible, including participating in coordinating calls regularly scheduled by TURN.</p> <p>In order to effectively address the important effort to provide such relief and to focus specifically on the needs of our constituency, CforAT worked diligently to gather information and prepare material responsive to the reasonableness of IPCS rates.</p> <p>Overall, CforAT worked effectively to avoid duplication and to ensure that our input served to complement or supplement the input of other parties that share interests similar to our own. With our joint filings, CforAT and the other advocates coordinated internally, assigning various sections of document preparation to each organization with an eye to effectively relying on the varied experience of counsel, and then harmonizing the drafts into unified documents. This was more efficient than would have been the case for separate filings. Elsewhere, CforAT relied on the expertise of other parties; for example, we consulted with experts and other organizations that are more involved with the advancement of the rights of, and provide protections for, incarcerated persons and have worked specifically on phone justice issues for incarcerated persons. Overall, our work was efficient and effective, and conducted reasonably in conjunction with other stakeholder and advocates, without unreasonable duplication of effort.</p> <p>To the extent that CforAT took similar positions to other parties on Phase 1 issues, this reflects the substantial shared concerns of impacted stakeholders. In these areas of shared concern, CforAT worked to represent the perspective of our constituency of incarcerated persons with disabilities and their families and support networks. In order to effectively address these important issues on behalf of our constituency</p>	

	Intervenor’s Assertion	CPUC Discussion
	<p>and California consumers more generally, CforAT worked diligently to act effectively to prepare material that often required intensive and expedited effort. This was facilitated by the coordination among the consumer advocates. To the extent that there was any modest duplication of effort in the various filings that took place during an extremely accelerated proceeding schedule, it does not reach the level where CforAT’s compensation should be reduced.</p>	

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</p> <p>This initial phase of the proceeding was focused on efforts by the Commission to ensure that interim rates for ICPS were just and reasonable. CforAT’s constituency of incarcerated persons with disabilities (and relatedly, their families and support networks) are both disproportionately low-income and also highly reliant on affordable communications services. In order to support our constituency, CforAT has appropriately dedicated substantial time and resources to this proceeding.</p> <p>The Commission’s efforts to address the needs of incarcerated persons with disabilities, their families and support networks will help those populations by reducing the burden of communications services. The relief measures and the ongoing effort to ensure that rates for ICPS remain just, reasonable, and affordable, as well as the commitment to specifically address the unique communications needs of people with disabilities, will help mitigate the societal, personal, and financial impacts associated with incarceration.</p> <p>The dollar value of relief to any individual customer or group of customers that can be attributed specifically to the Commission’s efforts is not clear, but reduction of phone rates to \$0.07/minute and the elimination of unreasonable ancillary fees will result in substantial cost savings to impacted prisoners and their families. While the benefit to CforAT’s constituency cannot be assigned a direct value, the support we have provided to the Commission’s efforts to ensure just and reasonable</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	CPUC Discussion
rates for ICPS far exceeds the amount of compensation we are requesting.	
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>In conducting work in this proceeding, CforAT worked reasonably and efficiently, including work in coalition with the other advocates for incarcerated persons, with which we jointly submitted filings when possible, and through ongoing coordination with other stakeholders. In coordination with other organizations, the organizations divided responsibility for drafting written submissions, and were more efficient than would have been the case if each organization had participated separately. CforAT took the lead in areas where detailed legal and policy expertise, particularly in Commission proceedings, were most significant, while relying on our outside expert (HRDC) and deferring to other parties on issues where we had less direct expertise, such as gathering information regarding the impacts of ICPS costs on incarcerated populations. This shared expertise allowed us to submit joint filings that included substantial information that the Commission could review in developing a path forward for the regulated water companies.</p> <p>Substantial work in this proceeding was conducted by an attorney with significant expertise in telecommunications and antitrust issues. This expertise was specifically relied on by the Commission, even as the attorney’s billing rate is lower than that of CforAT’s Legal Director. Overall, this resulted in reasonable overall efficiency and cost to obtain a substantial contribution to the proceeding so far.</p>	Noted
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2021 Time – Goodman (44.6 Hours)</p> <p>Discovery: 5 hours (11.21%) The issue area “Discovery” includes time spent on data requests and participation in the ongoing proceed to address confidentiality of relevant materials.</p> <p>Coordination: 3.2 hours (7.17%) The issue area “coordination” includes work spent on coordination with other parties and stakeholders, including coordinating calls and collaborating on joint drafts.</p> <p>General Participation: 2 hours (4.48%)</p>	Noted

	CPUC Discussion
<p>The issue area “General Participation” includes items that do not fall under other issue categories, including procedural matters such as scheduling and initial participation in the early phases of the proceeding.</p> <p>Interim: 24.6 hours (55.16%) The issue area “Interim” includes time spent on CforAT’s substantive written filings, addressing a range of issues as set forth above in our discussion of our substantial contributions. CforAT documented contributions on four separate issues above; while it is impossible to separate individual entries into work on particular issues, it would be reasonable to allocate each issue area as follows:</p> <p>Jurisdiction: 15% Competition: 35% Incarcerated persons with disabilities: 10% Rate caps: 20% Ancillary charges: 20%</p> <p>PD: 9.8 hours (21.97%) The issue area “PD” includes time spent on time spent coordinating, researching, and drafting opening and reply comments on the proposed decision.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2020 Time – Kasnitz (45.6 Hours)</p> <p>Discovery: 3.9 hours (7.89%) Coordination: 12.2 hours (24.7%) General Participation: 5.4 hours (10.93%) Interim: 27.9 hours (56.48%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2021 Time – Kasnitz (19.7 Hours)</p> <p>Discovery: 1.6 hours (8.12%) Coordination: 2.5 hours (12.69%) General Participation: 7.2 hours (36.55%) Interim: 7.1 hours (36.04%)</p>	

	CPUC Discussion
<p>PD: 1.3 hours (6.60%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2020 Time – Ruff (4.1 Hours)</p> <p>Coordination: 1.8 hours (43.90%)</p> <p>General Participation: 2.3 hours (56.10%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2021 Time – Ruff (3.3 Hours)</p> <p>Discovery: 0.8 hours (24.24%)</p> <p>Coordination: 1 hour (30.30%)</p> <p>General Participation: 1.5 hours (45.45%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2020 Time – Woodford (0.5 Hours)</p> <p>General Participation: 0.5 hours (100%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2021 Time – Woodford (4.6 Hours)</p> <p>Coordination: 1.8 hours (39.13%)</p> <p>General Participation: 2.8 hours (60.87%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2020 Time – Wright, Outside Expert (65.1 Hours)</p> <p>Coordination: 16.8 hours (25.81%)</p> <p>General Participation: 47.8 hours (73.43%)</p> <p>Interim: 0.5 hours (0.77%)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2021 Time – Wright (35.7 Hours)</p> <p>Discovery: 0.6 hours (1.68%)</p> <p>Coordination: 6.3 hours (17.65%)</p> <p>General Participation: 15.9 hours (44.54%)</p> <p>Interim: 8.3 hours (23.25%)</p> <p>PD: 4.6 hours (12.89%)</p>	

	CPUC Discussion
<p align="center">2020 Time – Marshall, Outside Expert (2.5 Hours)</p> <p>Coordination: 2 hours (80.00%)</p> <p>General Participation: 0.5 hours (20.00%)</p> <p align="center">2021 Time – Marshall (0.5 Hours)</p> <p>Coordination: 0.4 hours (80%)</p> <p>General Participation: 0.1 hours (20.00%)</p>	

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2021	19.7	\$760.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$14,972	19.7	\$670.00 [1]	\$13,199.00
Melissa W. Kasnitz	2020	46.3	\$500.00	D.20-11-012	\$23,150	46.3	\$500.00	\$23,150.00
Paul Goodman	2021	44.6	\$650.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$28,990	44.6	\$550.00 [2]	\$24,530.00
Rebecca Ruff	2021	3.3	\$250.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$825	3.3	\$250.00 [3]	\$825.00
Rebecca Ruff	2020	4.1	\$190.00	D.21-07-025	\$779	4.1	\$190.00	\$779.00
Kathryn Woodford	2021	4.6	\$160.00 ⁵	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$736	4.6	\$260.00 [4]	\$1,196.00

⁵ Correct requested rate per comment in Part III.C is \$260.00.

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Kathryn Woodford	2020	0.5	\$145.00	D.20-11-012	\$73	0.5	\$160.00 [5]	\$80.00
Paul Wright	2021	35.7	\$450.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$16,065	33.4 [6]	\$450.00 [7]	\$15,030.00
Paul Wright	2020	65.1	\$450.00	See Comments Below.	\$29,295	65.1	\$450.00 [8]	\$29,295.00
Daniel Marshall	2021	0.5	\$650.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$325	0.5	\$630.00 [9]	\$315.00
Daniel Marshall	2020	2.5	\$650.00	See comments below.	\$1,625	0.5 [10]	\$630.00 [10]	\$315.00
Subtotal: \$116,835.00						Subtotal: \$108,714.00		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
Melissa Kasnitz	2021	1.1	\$375.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$412.50	1.1	\$335.00 [1]	\$368.50
Paul Goodman	2021	22.5	\$325.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$7,312.50	16.3 [11]	\$225.00 [2]	\$3,667.50
Daniel Marshall	2021	0.3	\$325.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$97.50	0.3	\$315.00 [6]	\$94.50
Paul Wright	2021	2.3	\$225.00	Requested under new Market Rate Analysis. See comments below.	\$517.50	2.3	\$225.00 [8]	\$517.50
Subtotal: \$8,340.00						Subtotal: \$4,648.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$125,174.00						TOTAL AWARD: \$113,362.00		
*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								

CLAIMED		CPUC AWARD	
<p>adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Intervenor’s 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 ⁶	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Melissa W. Kasnitz	1992	162679	No
Paul Goodman	2002	219086	No
Rebecca Ruff	2019	325910	No
Daniel Marshall	2002	617210 (Florida Bar)	

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Detailed Time Records (Merits and Compensation)
Comment	<p>Goodman 2020 Rate:</p> <p>Mr. Goodman does not claim any hours for 2020 in this proceeding. However, for context, as Legal Director at The Greenlining Institute, Mr. Goodman's 2020 rate was \$400 (D.21-03-055, issued on March 25, 2021).</p>
Comment	<p>Goodman 2021 Rate:</p> <p>In keeping with the provisions of Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020, CforAT sets forth below our justification for a newly calculated hourly rate for Mr. Goodman based on the Market Rate Study Analysis provided with that resolution. Our analysis under the Market Rate Study and the associated Hourly Rate Chart is summarized as follows:</p> <p>Intervenor Representative: Paul Goodman</p>

⁶ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>Labor Role: Legal--Attorney Level: V 2021 Hourly Rate Range: \$ 486.31 - \$606.31 - \$699.03 Requested Hourly Rate: \$650</p> <p>The detailed explanation of this proposed rate is as follows:</p> <p>Mr. Goodman is a 1991 graduate of UC Berkeley and a 2001 graduate of the John F. Kennedy School of Law. He was admitted to the California Bar in 2002. Following graduation in 1999, Mr. Goodman worked as a criminal defense attorney. From 2010-2011, he attended Santa Clara University School of Law, where he obtained an LLM in intellectual property law. While at Santa Clara University School of Law, he worked as a research assistant for Professor Catherine J.K. Sandoval, focusing on antitrust and intellectual property issues in the pharmaceutical, software, and communications industries. Mr. Goodman is admitted to practice in all state courts within California, as well as the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals.</p> <p>In 2011, after receiving his LLM, Mr. Goodman joined The Greenlining Institute, where he worked for a decade in political and policy work focused on communications issues. In this role, he appeared before the Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the California Legislature to advocate for communications policies that promoted equity and economic opportunity for communities of color. Mr. Goodman remained at the Greenlining Institute until 2021, first as a consultant, then as Legal Counsel, and subsequently as Senior Legal Counsel. In 2019, Mr. Goodman was named as Greenlining's Director, Telecommunications and Technology Policy. As Senior Legal Counsel and Director, Mr. Goodman managed all aspects of Greenlining's participation before the Commission in communications proceedings, including determinations regarding which proceedings to join, and all strategic decision-making. During his tenure at Greenlining, Mr. Goodman expanded Greenlining's policy advocacy at the Commission beyond legacy voice service to include wireless and broadband issues. Mr. Goodman also significantly increased both the amount and scope of Greenlining's antitrust work, acting as lead attorney for Greenlining in the Commission's Competition proceeding (I.15-11-007) and every merger proceeding in which Greenlining was a party (I.11-06-009; A.12-11-022; A.14-04-013 & A.14-06-012; A.15-03-005; A.15-07-009; A.17-03-016; A.18-07-011 & A.18-07-012; A.20-11-001). In addition to that work, Mr. Goodman has taken a leading role on issues including Commission jurisdiction over wireless and broadband services, broadband deployment, affordability, service quality,</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>and supplier diversity. Mr. Goodman authored Greenlining's 2015, 2018, 2019 and 2020 Supplier Diversity Report Cards.</p> <p>In 2021, Mr. Goodman joined the Center for Accessible Technology as Legal Counsel, where he advocates in communications and energy proceedings at the Commission in support of equity and economic opportunity for people with disabilities, including people with disabilities of color. As of October 1, 2021, Mr. Goodman has practiced before the Commission for over ten years, and has worked to advance the rights of, and provide protections for, unserved and underserved communities for almost twenty years.</p> <p>Mr. Goodman served as the President of the Conference of California Public Utility Counsel from 2019-2021, and current serves as Vice President. Mr. Goodman represented the Center for Media Justice on the Federal Communication Commission's Consumer Advisory Committee from 2016-2018.</p> <p>The Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart instructs that an Attorney at Level V should have 15+ years of experience and have a JD degree or equivalent. The study includes a classification specifically for “Attorney,” which is described as a person "authorized by the California Bar to practice law in California" and at higher experience levels has "experience with areas of law and procedures relevant to CPUC matters, such as environmental law or utility regulation.” Mr. Goodman generally satisfies these requirements for a Level V Attorney, in addition to his advanced degree and substantive work as the lead attorney on communications proceedings.</p> <p>Mr. Goodman is a well-respected attorney with an extensive depth and breadth of experience that is highly unusual among CPUC practitioners, including work with diverse unserved and underserved communities and on a wide range of issues. He has consistently worked to focus the attention of the Commission in an ongoing manner on important but previously overlooked segments of the population, including communities of color and the disability community, and to ensure that the Commission and the regulated industries regularly consider the needs of those populations; this now takes place as a matter of course, even without his direct participation in a given proceeding.</p> <p>CforAT is requesting an hourly rate for Mr. Goodman between the “median” and the “high” rate established for a Level V Attorney, which we submit is reasonable for his work before the Commission in 2021.</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	Accordingly, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2021 hourly rate of \$650 for Mr. Goodman. In support of this request, as specified in Resolution ALJ-393, a current resume for Mr. Goodman is attached.
A	Resume for Paul Goodman
Comment	Kasnitz 2021 Rate: On May 7, 2021, CforAT filed an intervenor compensation claim in A.19-09-014 that included a request that the Commission adopt an hourly rate of \$760 for CforAT's Legal Director, Melissa W. Kasnitz, based on the Market Rate Study and guidance adopted in Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020. The Commission has not yet acted on that intervenor compensation claim. Rather than repeat the same showing here for the requested hourly rate for Ms. Kasnitz, CforAT refers the Commission to the showing presented in A.19-09-014.
Comment	Ruff 2021 Rate: On June 24, 2021, CforAT filed an intervenor compensation claim in R.18-03-011 that included a request that the Commission adopt an hourly rate of \$250 for CforAT's Fellowship Attorney Rebecca Ruff, based on the Market Rate Study and guidance adopted in Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020. The Commission has not yet acted on that intervenor compensation claim. Rather than repeat the same showing here for the requested hourly rate for Ms. Ruff, CforAT refers the Commission to the showing presented in R.18-03-011.
Comment	Wright 2020 Rate: Resolution ALJ-387 adopts intervenor compensation rates for 2020. ALJ-387 lists the range for an expert with 13 or more years of experience as \$190-465. Given Mr. Wright's qualifications (set forth below in conjunction with the justification for a rate under the new Market Rate Study for 2021) and 31 years of experience, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2020 hourly rate of \$450 for Mr. Wright.
Comment	Wright 2021 Rate: [Lower in 2021 than in 2020?] In keeping with the provisions of Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020, CforAT sets forth below our justification for a newly calculated hourly rate for Mr. Wright based on the Market Rate Study Analysis provided with that resolution. Our analysis under the Market Rate Study and the associated Hourly Rate Chart is summarized as follows: Intervenor Representative: Paul Wright, Executive Director, Human Rights Defense Center (Consultant to CforAT) Labor Role: Advocate--Executive Director Level: V

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>2021 Hourly Rate Range: \$169.05 - \$283.39 - \$442.37 Requested Hourly Rate: \$450</p> <p>The detailed explanation of this proposed rate is as follows:</p> <p>Mr. Wright is the Executive Director of the Human Rights Defense Center (HRDC), an organization with substantial expertise on issues relevant to people who are incarcerated. The Center for Accessible Technology (CforAT) is working with HRDC, with HRDC serving as a subject matter expert in the proceeding to address just and reasonable rates for communications services for incarcerated populations in California.</p> <p>Mr. Wright is a 1986 graduate of the University of Maryland. A former prisoner, Mr. Wright was imprisoned for 17 years in Washington state until his release in 2003. In 1990, while he was incarcerated, Mr. Wright founded Prisoners’ Legal News (PLN), with the original purpose of publishing a monthly newsletter to give a voice to prisoners. From the modest beginnings of a prison-based newsletter with a \$50 budget and an all-volunteer grassroots base, Mr. Wright grew the organization (later renamed the Human Rights Defense Center, or HRDC) into a national 501(c)(3) organization with 18 employees, including four staff attorneys. HRDC is headquartered in Lake Worth, Florida and has offices in Seattle, Washington; Nashville, Tennessee; and Washington, D.C.</p> <p>Mr. Wright has held the position of founder and executive director of PLN/HRDC since 1990. Mr. Wright has co-authored three PLN anthologies: <i>The Ceiling of America: An Inside Look at the U.S. Prison Industry</i> (Common Courage, 1998); <i>Prison Nation: The Warehousing of America's Poor</i> (Routledge, 2003); and <i>Prison Profiteers: Who Makes Money from Mass Imprisonment</i> (New Press, 2008).</p> <p>Under Mr. Wright’s leadership, HRDC currently distributes around 50 different criminal justice, legal and self-help titles, and continues to publish Prison Legal News, which has become a 72-page monthly publication with subscribers in all 50 states and internationally. HRDC also publishes Criminal Legal News, which reports on criminal case law and news related to prosecutors, policing and sentencing. In addition to publishing, HRDC engages in litigation in support of prisoner rights, with a robust litigation project that has filed suit against prison and jail officials nationwide. During and since his incarceration, Mr. Wright has successfully litigated a wide variety of censorship and public records cases against prison systems around the country, both as a pro se plaintiff and on behalf of PLN.</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>In 2011, under Mr. Wright’s leadership, HRDC co-founded the national Campaign for Prison Phone Justice (www.phonejustice.org, www.prisonphonejustice.org), which seeks to reduce the cost of phone calls made by incarcerated persons. This resource was cited by the Commission when it issued the Order Instituting Rulemaking that initiated the prison phone rates proceeding for which HRDC is consulting. HRDC has maintained the campaign since its founding. Additionally, HRDC founded the Stop Prison Profiteering campaign (www.stopprisonprofiteering.org), which seeks to end the financial exploitation of prisoners and their families through fee-based video visitation, debit release cards and money transfer fees, among other services, and the Prison Ecology Project (www.prisonecology.org), which examines the intersection between criminal justice and environmental justice.</p> <p>Mr. Wright served as the National Lawyers Guild Jailhouse Lawyer co-vice president (1995-2008). He is a 2005 Petra Fellow, and he has been granted multiple awards and honors, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freedom Fighter of the Month, July 2006, from High Times Magazine; • The James Madison Award, 2007, from the Washington Coalition for Open Government; • The Arthur Kinoy Award, 2008 (inaugural recipient), from the National Lawyers Guild; • Distinguished Public Interest Service Award, 2011, from the City of New York Law School; • The Julio Medina Freedom Award, 2017, from Citizens Against Recidivism; • A New York City Council Citation, 2017; • The Frederick Douglas Award, 2018, from the Frederick Douglass Family Initiatives and the Antiracist Research and Policy Center at American University in Washington DC. <p>Mr. Wright also currently serves as the National Vice President of the National Police Accountability Project.</p> <p>The Commission’s Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart instructs that an Advocate at Level V should have 15+ years of experience; it does not require the person in this role to have a JD degree or to be licensed to practice law. The study includes a classification specifically for “Executive Director,” which is described as a person who “[p]rovides overall direction and guidance to a non-profit organization's programs,” is “[r]esponsible for the success of special events, community outreach initiatives, and</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>fundraising activities,” “[a]cts as a spokesperson and represents the organization's programs to the public,” and “[a]ssesses needs and ensures that program objectives are met, initiates changes to maintain member satisfaction and engagement.” Mr. Wright generally satisfies these requirements for a Level V Advocate—Executive Director.</p> <p>As of 1990 Mr. Wright has worked to advance the rights and provide protections for incarcerated persons for 31 years and has worked specifically on phone justice issues for incarcerated persons for at least a decade. He has served as HRDC’s Executive Director for 31 years. In the past, Mr. Wright’s has been compensated at an hourly rate for work done in California with the California Department of Corrections & Rehabilitation of \$455.00.</p> <p>Resolution ALJ-387 adopts intervenor compensation rates for 2020. ALJ-387 lists the range for an expert with 13 or more years of experience as \$190-465. Given Mr. Wright’s qualifications and 31 years of experience, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2020 hourly rate of \$450 for Mr. Wright.</p> <p>CforAT is requesting an 2021 hourly rate for Mr. Wright at the “high” rate established for a Level V Executive Director, which is consistent with his standard rate and which we submit is reasonable for his work before the Commission in 2021. Accordingly, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2021 hourly rate of \$450 for Mr. Wright. In support of this request, as specified in Resolution ALJ-393, a current resume for Mr. Wright is attached.</p>
B	Resume for Paul Wright
Comment	<p>Marshall 2020 Rate: [What rate is requested for 2020?]</p> <p>Resolution ALJ-387 adopts intervenor compensation rates for 2020. ALJ-387 lists the range for an attorney with 13 or more years of experience as \$360- \$630. Given Mr. Marshall’s qualifications (set forth below in conjunction with the justification for a rate under the new Market Rate Study for 2021) and 31 years of experience, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2020 hourly rate of \$650 for Mr. Marshall.</p>
Comment	<p>Marshall 2021 Rate:</p> <p>In keeping with the provisions of Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020, CforAT sets forth below our justification for a newly calculated hourly rate for Mr. Marshall in 2021 based on the Market Rate Study</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>Analysis provided with that resolution. Our analysis under the Market Rate Study and the associated Hourly Rate Chart is summarized as follows:</p> <p>Intervenor Representative: Daniel Marshall, Litigation Director, Human Rights Defense Center (Consultant to CforAT). Labor Role: Legal--Legal Director Level: IV 2021 Hourly Rate Range: \$469.24 - \$622.90 - \$783.36 Requested Hourly Rate: \$650</p> <p>The detailed explanation of this proposed rate is as follows:</p> <p>Mr. Marshall is a 1986 graduate of Colgate University and a 2002 graduate of University of Connecticut School of Law. He was admitted to the Florida Bar in 2002, and was board certified in criminal trail law by the Florida Bar in 2012. Mr. Marshall is admitted to practice in all Florida state courts, as well as the U.S. Supreme Court, the U.S. District Courts for the Northern and Southern Districts of Florida, the Eastern District of Michigan and the U.S. District Court for New Mexico.</p> <p>After earning his J.D., Mr. Marshall worked at the Office of the Public Defender in West Palm Beach, Florida for nearly nine years handling felonies, misdemeanors, juvenile delinquency, and appellate cases. He was the chief of a felony division for several years before becoming the county court resource director, in charge of training more than two dozen new attorneys in the office. After leaving the public defender’s office in 2011, Mr. Marshall went into private practice focusing on criminal defense and civil litigation.</p> <p>In 2017, Mr. Marshall joined the Human Rights Defense Center as Litigation Director.</p> <p>Mr. Marshall is a member of the Florida Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers and the National Police Accountability Project.</p> <p>The Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart includes a classification specifically for “Legal—Legal Director,” which is described as a person "authorized by the California Bar to practice law in California" and who at higher experience levels has "experience with areas of law and procedures relevant to CPUC matters, such as environmental law or utility regulation.” However, in Resolution ALJ-393, the Commission “modified the definition of labor roles for Legal Directors and Attorneys to include “licensing by any jurisdiction within the United States.” Mr. Marshall has over 19 years of</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>experience as an attorney in the area of criminal law, and has worked for HRDC for the past four years, giving him specific experience in legal matters relating to the rights of incarcerated persons. Accordingly, Mr. Marshall generally meets the requirements of Legal—Legal Director Level IV.</p> <p>Resolution ALJ-387 adopts intervenor compensation rates for 2020. ALJ-387 lists the range for an attorney with 13 or more years of experience as \$360-\$630. Given Mr. Wright’s qualifications and over years of experience, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2020 hourly rate of \$650 for Mr. Marshall.</p> <p>CforAT is requesting an hourly rate for Mr. Marshall at “middle” rate established for a Level IV Legal Director, which we submit is reasonable based on his 19 years of experience as an attorney and for his specialized work in a proceeding before the Commission in 2021 in which his area of expertise is directly relevant. Accordingly, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2021 hourly rate of \$650 for Mr. Marshall. In support of this request, as specified in Resolution ALJ-393, a current resume for Mr. Marshall is attached.</p>
C	Resume for Daniel Marshall
Comment	<p>Woodford 2021 Rate:</p> <p>In keeping with the provisions of Resolution ALJ-393, issued on December 22, 2020, CforAT sets forth below our justification for a newly calculated hourly rate for Ms. Woodford in 2021 based on the Market Rate Study Analysis provided with that resolution. Our analysis under the Market Rate Study and the associated Hourly Rate Chart is summarized as follows:</p> <p>Intervenor Representative: Kate Woodford Labor Role: Expert—Public Policy Analyst Level: III 2021 Hourly Rate Range: \$231.53 - \$330.43 - \$437.05 Requested Hourly Rate: \$260</p> <p>The detailed explanation of this proposed rate is as follows:</p> <p>Ms. Woodford is a 2011 graduate of Agnes Scott College. The primary focus of Ms. Woodford’s academic work and thesis were the disparities experienced by persons with vision impairments in employment, research participation and social inclusion compared to non-disabled populations.</p>

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>Ms. Woodford presented her senior thesis, “Theory vs. Practicality: Contrasting Traditional Rehabilitation Practices Against Success Strategies Used by the Blind” at the 2010 CSUN Assistive Technology Conference. She has presented her research at several Sociological and Disability-related conferences and has worked as a research assistant for the Veteran’s Administration in Atlanta. In addition to her academic background and professional experience, Ms. Woodford is an individual with a significant vision impairment.</p> <p>Ms. Woodford began working as a consultant for the Center for Accessible Technology in February 2015. In 2018, she took the position of Staff Policy Analyst at CforAT. Both in her previous role as a consultant and her current role as Staff Policy Analyst, Ms. Woodford’s work includes reviewing CPUC proceedings for CforAT’s legal department to provide social and needs evaluations of Access and Functional Needs populations. Ms. Woodford also designs, conducts & presents qualitative interviews & surveys in support of CforAT’s testimony in Commission proceedings. Additionally, Ms. Woodford serves as CforAT’s representative on multiple working groups and attends various presentations on behalf of CforAT to inform our policy positions in proceeding and in our general work in support of Center for Accessible Technology’s constituency. This includes her participation as the Deaf/Disabled Representative on the Universal LifeLine Telephone Service Advisory Committee, where Ms. Woodford has served since 2019.</p> <p>The Market Rate Study Hourly Rate Chart instructs that an Expert at Level III should have 5-10 years of experience and have a bachelor’s degree or equivalent. The study includes a classification specifically for “Expert—Public Policy Analyst,” which is described as a person that “[r]eviews the impact of state government policies and regulations,” “[a]nalyzes proposed legislative actions and determines the potential impact,” and “[r]eviews policies, plans, and programs to ensure consistency with corresponding government regulations and laws.” Ms. Woodford generally meets the requirements of Expert-Public Policy Analyst Level III.</p> <p>CforAT is requesting an hourly rate for Ms. Woodford between the “low” and “medium” rate established for a Level III Public Policy Analyst, which we submit is reasonable based on her work before the Commission in 2021. Accordingly, CforAT requests that the Commission authorize a 2021 hourly rate of \$260 for Ms. Woodford. In support of this request, as specified in Resolution ALJ-393, a current resume for Ms. Woodford is attached.</p>
D	Resume for Kathryn Woodford

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Melissa Kasnitz 2021 Rate	D.22-09-022 verified a 2021 rate of \$670.00 for Melissa Kasnitz. We apply the same rate here.
[2] Paul Goodman 2021 Rate	D.23-03-030 verified a 2021 rate of \$550.00 for Paul Goodman. We apply the same rate here.
[3] Rebecca Ruff 2021 Hourly Rate	D.22-09-022 verified a 2021 rate of \$250.00 for Rebecca Ruff. We apply the same rate here.
[4] Kate Woodford 2021 Rate	D.22-09-022 verified a 2021 rate of \$160.00 for Kate Woodford. We apply the same rate here.
[5] Kate Woodford 2020 Rate	D.22-09-022 verified a 2021 rate of \$260.00 for Kate Woodford. We apply the same rate here.
[6] Reduction of 2021 Hours for Paul Wright	<p>After review of the submitted timesheets, four entries were found to be clerical or unproductive in nature:</p> <p>3/1/2021 (0.4 hours) - Read Daily news article re GTL CA Rate reduction, emailed to team</p> <p>3/3/2021 (0.4 hours) - Read Orange Register article on CDCR phone rates, emailed to M. Kasnitz</p> <p>3/11/2021 (1.0 hours) - Reviewed CPUC website for posting comments</p> <p>3/12/2021 (0.5 hours) - Reviewed CPUC website docket and interface</p> <p>Per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide at p.12, “The CPUC does not compensate for the time spent on clerical and administrative tasks...” and awards are based on substantial contributions to the overall decision. Due to the nature of these entries, we deduct the 2.3 hours from Paul Wright’s 2021 hours, bringing the total to 33.4 hours.</p>
[7] Paul Wright 2021 Rate	CforAT requested a 2021 rate of \$450.00 for Paul Wright. Based on 17+ years of relevant experience at the time of filing; we find the rate to be reasonable and adopt it here.
[8] Paul Wright 2020 Rate	CforAT requested a 2020 rate of \$450.00 for Paul Wright. Based on 17+ years of relevant experience at the time of filing, we find the rate to be reasonable and adopt it here.
[9] Daniel Marshall 2021 Rate and Reduction for Clerical Work	<p>CforAT requested a 2021 rate of \$650.00 for Daniel Marshall.</p> <p>As a consultant, the reasonableness of rates is considered to be the “fee paid to consultant[s],” per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide</p>

Item	Reason
	at p.24. Therefore, we maintain the 2020 rate of \$630.00 established in Comment [10] below to maintain consistency.
[10] Daniel Marshall 2020 Rate	<p>CforAT requested a 2020 rate of \$650.00 based on Resolution ALJ-387. We note the range for Attorneys is \$360.00 - \$630.00. Based on the submitted resumes and relevant experience of 17+ years at the time of filing for Daniel Marshall, we adopt a 2020 rate of \$630.00 and apply it here.</p> <p>During review of the submitted timesheets, three entries regarding the consultant agreement were on 10/13/2020, 10/16/2020 and 10/20/2020, all of which are considered clerical and could not have substantially contributed to the overall decision. Per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide at p. 12, “The CPUC does not compensate for the time spent on clerical and administrative tasks as these fees are subsumed in the fees paid to attorneys.” We reduce the 2.0 hours associated with the consultant contract, bringing Daniel Marshall’s 2020 total to 0.5. We remind CforAT that awards are based on efforts that substantially contributed to the overall decision and fees paid to consultants.</p>
[11] Paul Goodman Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation Hours Reduction	Review of the submitted timesheets found 7.8 hours of the requested time associated with Intervenor Compensation Claim Preparation included collaboration with Melissa Kasnitz, therefore, we find the requested 22.5 hours for Intervenor Claim preparation to be excessive. We are deducting the 6.2 hours for the 10/21/2022 entry on the timesheets and remind CforAT reasonable participation must be effective and efficient, as described in the Intervenor Compensation Program guide at p.21.

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?	No
B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	Yes

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Center for Accessible Technology has made a substantial contribution to D.21-07-029.
2. The requested hourly rates for Center for Accessible Technology'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 are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.
4. The total of reasonable compensation is \$113,362.00.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

1. The Claim, with any adjustment set forth above, satisfies all requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812.

ORDER

1. Center for Accessible Technology shall be awarded \$113,362.00.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Competitive Local Carriers, Competitive Local Resellers, Local Exchange Carriers, Interexchange Carriers, Interexchange Resellers, and Digital Voice Service Registrants shall pay Center for Accessible Technology their respective shares of the award, based on their California-jurisdictional telecommunication revenues for the 2021 calendar year, to reflect the year in which the proceeding was primarily litigated. If such data are unavailable, the most recent telecommunication 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 January 5, 2022, the 75th day after the filing of Center for Accessible Technology's request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2108037		
Proceeding(s):	R2010002		
Author:	ALJ Haga		
Payer(s):	Competitive Local Carriers, Competitive Local Resellers, Local Exchange Carriers, Interexchange Carriers, Interexchange Resellers, and Digital Voice Service Registrants		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/ Disallowance
Center for Accessible Technology	10/22/21	\$125,174.00	\$113,362.00	N/A	See Part III.D, CPUC Comments, Disallowances and Adjustments

Hourly Fee Information

First Name	Last Name	Attorney, Expert, or Advocate	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
Melissa	Kasnitz	Attorney	\$500	2020	\$500.00
Melissa	Kasnitz	Legal Director	\$760	2021	\$670.00
Paul	Goodman	Attorney	\$650	2021	\$530.00
Rebecca	Ruff	Attorney	\$190	2020	\$190.00
Kathryn	Woodford	Expert	\$145	2020	\$160.00
Kathryn	Woodford	Expert-Public Policy Analyst	\$260	2021	\$260.00
Paul	Wright	Expert	\$450	2020	\$450.00
Paul	Wright	Advocate-Executive Director	\$450	2021	\$450.00
Daniel	Marshall	Attorney	\$650	2020	\$630.00
Daniel	Marshall	Attorney	\$650	2021	\$650.00

(END OF APPENDIX)