

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

FILED

08/13/25

11:48 AM

A2405009

August 13, 2025

Agenda ID #23689
Ratesetting

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN APPLICATION 24-05-009:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Elizabeth Fox. Until and unless the Commission hears the item and votes to approve it, the proposed decision has no legal effect. This item may be heard, at the earliest, at the Commission's **9/18/2025** Business Meeting. To confirm when the item will be heard, please see the Business Meeting agenda, which is posted on the Commission's website 10 days before each Business Meeting.

Parties to the proceeding may file comments on the proposed decision as provided in Rule 14.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure. Electronic copies of comments should also be sent to the Intervenor Compensation Program at icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE

Michelle Cooke
Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC: smt

Attachment

Decision **PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ FOX** (Mailed 8/13/2025)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Adoption of Electric Revenue Requirements and Rates Associated with its 2025 Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) and Generation Non-Bypassable Charges Forecast and Greenhouse Gas Forecast Revenue Return and Reconciliation (U39E).

Application 24-05-009

**DECISION GRANTING COMPENSATION TO SMALL BUSINESS UTILITY
ADVOCATES FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTION TO DECISION 24-12-038**

Intervenor: Small Business Utility Advocates	For contribution to Decision (D.) 24-12-038
Claimed: \$82,031.50	Awarded: \$35,658.75
Assigned Commissioner: John Reynolds	Assigned ALJ: Elizabeth Fox

PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES

A. Brief description of Decision:	Decision (D.) 24-12-038 adopts the 2025 Energy Resource Recovery Account (ERRA) and related forecasted energy costs and the 2025 electric sales forecast for Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). The decision also adopts PG&E's Common Cost allocation proposal and forecast revenue requirements for greenhouse gas and climate-related costs.
--	---

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 9, 2024	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:		

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

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
3. Date NOI filed:	Aug. 7, 2024	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:	Application (A.) 23-10-001	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 3, 2024	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
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:	A.23-10-001	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	June 3, 2024	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):		
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?		Yes
Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.24-12-038	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	Dec. 20, 2024	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	Feb. 18, 2025	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
<u>Appropriateness of Sales Forecast and Methodology</u> SBUA actively participated in A.24-05-009 by submitting testimony, engaging in settlement discussions, and reaching a stipulation with PG&E regarding load	“In opening testimony, SBUA challenged PG&E’s approach to accounting for demand shifts prompted by the COVID-19 pandemic, such as increased work from home and hybrid work schedules. SBUA also questioned how PG&E handled large new load	Noted. While the decision acknowledged that SBUA challenged PG&E’s approach,

<p>forecasting methodologies that impact small commercial customers.</p> <p>SBUA’s expert submitted detailed testimony (Exhibits SBUA-01 and SBUA-01C) based on research, analysis, and PG&E’s responses to SBUA’s data requests (<i>see</i> Exhibits SBUA-02 and SBUA-03). He challenged PG&E’s load forecasting methodology, specifically its assumptions about post-COVID-19 behavioral changes and commercial energy usage patterns. The testimony included detailed graphed comparisons of residential and commercial usage, which SBUA argued showed ongoing load shift from commercial meters to residential meters. SBUA’s expert also used PG&E’s confidential data to make projections showing probably persistence of the shift. Exhibit SBUA-01C at 13-15. In addition, through discovery, SBUA identified instances where PG&E had made undocumented post-regression adjustments to its industrial load forecast without sufficient transparency, highlighting the need for this to be rectified.</p> <p>To address these concerns, SBUA successfully negotiated a Joint Stipulation with PG&E resolving the parties’ differences. Through the Joint Stipulation, SBUA secured PG&E’s commitments to identify post-regression adjustments in future ERRA Forecast Applications, provide enhanced transparency and data for small commercial customer forecasting, engage in a meet-and-confer process, and meet specific requirements in its next ERRA Application testimony. SBUA did not file an opening brief but only a reply brief to support the Joint Stipulation. Since the Proposed Decision approved the stipulation and future</p>	<p>additions.” Decision at 39 (fn. omitted).</p> <p>“PG&E and SBUA stipulated that PG&E would, in future ERRA Forecast Applications, identify in its load forecast workpapers whether a post-regression adjustment is applied to any customer class. This issue is no longer in dispute, and we appreciate and agree with the stipulation.” <i>Id.</i> at 40 (fn. omitted).</p> <p>Joint Exhibit-1 (Joint Stipulation Between Pacific Gas and Electric Company and Small Business Utility Advocates) at 3-4 (detailing terms requiring PG&E to identify post-regression adjustments, provide more transparency and additional data regarding forecasting for small commercial customers, meet-and-confer with SBUA, and submit testimony addressing concerns in the next ERRA Application); <i>see also</i>, Joint Motion of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39 E) and the Small Business Utility Advocates to Offer Stipulation into the Record, Oct. 30, 2024.</p> <p>Reply Brief of Small Business Utility Advocates, Oct. 31, 2024 at 2 (“By adopting the Joint Stipulation, the Commission will address the concerns raised by SBUA and ensure that the interests of small commercial customers are adequately protected and advanced.”); <i>see also, id.</i> at 2 (“In discovery, SBUA identified instances where PG&E made undocumented post-regression adjustments to its industrial load forecast, citing privacy considerations, yet lacking sufficient transparency in the testimony and workpapers.”).</p> <p><i>See also</i> Joint Case Management Statement of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U 39 E), the Public Advocates Office, the California</p>	<p>SBUA’s claims in their testimony are not backed by relevant data or quantitative analysis. Their contribution did not substantially affect the decision-making process. <i>See</i> Part III. D [2].</p>
--	--	--

<p>collaboration, SBUA saw no need to comment on the PD.</p> <p>The Final Decision recognizes and agrees with the Stipulation. The Commission should find that SBUA’s efforts on behalf of small businesses served the public interest and constituted a substantial contribution. SBUA’s engagement creates a more robust record and promotes more accurate forecasting, reducing risks of unfair rate allocations. Moreover, the Commission has long encouraged resolving issues through mutual agreements, which “allows parties to craft their own solutions reducing the risk of unacceptable outcomes” if cases are fully contested and litigated. D.10-06-038 at 38 (citation omitted); <i>see also</i> D.11-05-018 at 16.</p>	<p>Community Choice Association, the Direct Access Customer Coalition, and the Small Business Utility Advocates, Sept. 27, 2024 (“SBUA and PG&E believe that further settlement discussions merit consideration. These parties have initiated discussions to explore options impactful to PG&E’s showing for its 2026 load forecast of small commercial load.”).</p>	
---	--	--

1. 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.	Verified
b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?	No.	Noted
c. If so, provide name of other parties:		Noted
d. Intervenor’s claim of non-duplication: SBUA focused narrowly on load forecasting issues of particular relevance to small commercial customers. As a result, SBUA avoided undue duplication with other parties by focusing its efforts on this area.		Noted

PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION

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

	CPUC Discussion
a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:	Noted. <i>See</i> Part III. D

	CPUC Discussion
<p>SBUA’s claimed costs reflect the time and resources reasonably expended to represent small business customers and participate meaningfully in this docket. Small business ratepayers have an important interest in this Application given concerns that PG&E’s electric sales forecast may overstate commercial sales and understate sales behind residential meters, and any inaccuracies will flow through to revenue assignment and to rates, which will affect rates for small commercial and other customers</p> <p>SBUA actively participated throughout this proceeding, including with its timely response to PG&E’s Application on June 14, 2024. SBUA also engaged substantively by participating in both the February 6, 2024 and March 18, 2024 Sales Forecast Workshops mandated by D.23-12-022 (PG&E 2024 ERRR). SBUA subsequently filed detailed intervenor testimony, conducted discovery, and successfully negotiated the Joint Stipulation with PG&E filed on October 30, 2024. SBUA also filed a targeted reply brief in support of the stipulation.</p> <p>SBUA’s participation resulted in a more thorough analysis of load forecasting than would have occurred had SBUA not been a party to the proceeding, as well as the benefits under the stipulation. Also, by entering the Joint Stipulation with PG&E, the Commission and parties avoided the costs of more intensive litigation that could have included, for example, evidentiary hearings, a detailed opening legal brief by SBUA, comments by SBUA on the Proposed Decision, and otherwise. This targeted approach resulted in lower overall litigation costs while still securing meaningful improvements in transparency and future forecasting methods.</p>	[2].
<p>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</p> <p>SBUA expended hours efficiently in this proceeding and successfully focused its efforts on a single, important issue not adequately addressed by other parties. SBUA’s hours were spent on analyzing the application, attending the prehearing conference, engaging in discovery, submitting testimony, participating in meet-and-confers, negotiating to reach a stipulated agreement with PG&E, and drafting a reply brief. All the hours claimed were reasonably and efficiently expended and should be fully compensated.</p> <p>SBUA relied on two experienced attorneys and one expert. Attorney Michael Raykher assumed initial responsibility, leveraging familiarity with the ERRR case and prior involvement in PG&E’s 2024 ERRR Application. He focused primarily on attending PG&E workshops and addressing any concerns raised by SBUA. General Counsel James Birkelund also participated in managing the litigation team and developing SBUA litigation positions. When Mr. Raykher was not able to continue working on the case due to personal medical reasons, Mr. Birkelund completed SBUA’s remaining work. Both attorneys served as counsel on a contingency basis through E&E Law Corp., at prevailing market rates. The</p>	Noted. <i>See</i> Part III. D [2].

	CPUC Discussion
<p>Commission has previously approved this outside counsel arrangement. <i>See</i> Consent Agenda #43, Commission Meeting on Feb. 20, 2025, A.22-05-022, <i>et al.</i> (Decision Granting Compensation to Small Business Utility Advocates) at 16; <i>see also</i> SBUA's sealed supplement filing in R.21-03-010 on Jan. 30, 2025 (documenting attorney-client agreement).</p> <p>Expert James F. Wilson of Wilson Energy Economics led SBUA's technical analysis. A nationally recognized authority with over 35 years of utility experience, Mr. Wilson identified gaps in PG&E's analysis, drafted testimony, and advanced SBUA's positions. He performed this work on a deferral basis, and his invoices for services are included as <u>Attachment 3</u>.</p>	
<p>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</p> <p>SBUA concentrated its efforts on load forecasting and small business impacts, addressing both Scoping Issue 1 (reasonableness of PG&E's 2025 ERRRA forecast revenue requirement) and Scoping Issue 2 (adoption of 2025 electric sales forecast). Given the interrelated nature of load forecasting across these two Scoping Memo issues, SBUA submits that its work is not easily divisible on that basis. The following issue codes show SBUA's allocation of time:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sales Forecast and Methodology (44.25 hours; 35.5%) 2. Discovery, Data Analysis (30 hours; 24.1%) 3. Workshop Efforts (17.45 hours; 14.0%) 4. Settlement Activities, Conferences, and PHC (17.25 hours; 13.8%) 5. General Participation (15.75 hours; 12.6%) 	Noted

B. Specific Claim:*

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
James Wilson	2024	43.5	\$345	D.23-11-118 approving rate of \$300 for 2022, escalated by 4.46% for 2023 and 4.07% for 2024, plus a 5% step up per Res. ALJ-393.	\$15,007.50	10.75 [1,3]	\$345 [4]	\$3,708.75
Michael Raykher	2024	8.7	\$520	Res. ALJ-393; <i>see</i> Comment #1 below.	\$4,524.00	0 [2]	\$0 [5]	\$0

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
James Birkelund	2024	72.5	\$800	D.24-12-069	\$58,000.00	34.3125 [1,3]	\$800 [6]	\$27,450.00
Subtotal: \$77,531.50						Subtotal: \$31,158.75		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION **								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate \$	Basis for Rate*	Total \$	Hours	Rate \$	Total \$
James Birkelund	2024	11.25	\$400	50% of 2024 rate	\$4,500.00	11.25	\$400 [6]	\$4,500.00
Subtotal: \$4,600.00 ³						Subtotal: \$4,500.00		
TOTAL REQUEST: \$82,031.50						TOTAL AWARD: \$35,658.75		
<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 ⁴		Member Number		Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation		
James M. Birkelund		March 2000		206328		No		
Michael Raykher ⁵		New York State Bar (Mar. 2013); Maryland State Bar (June 2013)		282230		No		

C. Attachments Documenting Specific Claim and Comments on Part III:⁶

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
Comment 1	<u>2024 Hourly Rate for Attorney Michael Raykher</u>

³ Typographic error. Subtotal is \$4,500.00.

⁴ This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California's website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

⁵ Michael Raykher also practices under the spelling Mikhail Raykher. His bar admissions are: New York State (March 2013; Bar No. 5130653); Maryland (June 2013; Bar No. 1306190253). Ariel Strauss' CA Bar number was inadvertently listed next to Michael Raykher's name.

⁶ Attachments not included in the final decision.

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
	<p>Resolution ALJ-393 provides that an attorney with Mr. Raykher's years of experience (10-15 years) qualifies as a Level IV attorney, with a 2021 hourly rate range of \$381.81 (low) to \$497.15 (median) to \$619.29 (high). Mr. Raykher graduated from law school in 2012 and had approximately 12 years of legal experience in 2024. His professional background includes serving as Assistant People's Counsel for Maryland, advocating before the Maryland Public Service Commission and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, as well as extensive regulatory litigation experience in energy, utilities, and consumer protection law. He has represented clients before state and federal agencies and has managed high-value regulatory matters, including rate cases and energy efficiency programs. A summary of Mr. Raykher's qualifications is provided as <u>Attachment 4</u>.</p> <p>Mr. Raykher was admitted to the New York and Maryland Bars in 2013. In accordance with Resolution ALJ-393, the Commission has determined that the Labor Role for attorneys includes those licensed in any U.S. jurisdiction. Res. ALJ-393 at 6. SBUA seeks an hourly rate of \$520 for Mr. Raykher's 2024 work as outside counsel with E&E Law, which is below the median for a Level IV attorney. Using annual escalation factors of 3.31% (2022), 4.46% (2023), and 4.07% (2024) from Resolution ALJ-393, \$520 in 2024 corresponds to approximately \$463 in 2021. Given Mr. Raykher's experience in regulatory advocacy and public utility law, SBUA submits that this rate is reasonable and consistent with CPUC precedent.</p>
Comment 2	SBUA's substantive work on this case was completed in 2024. For administrative convenience and without prejudice to calculating 2025 rates in other claims, SBUA is requesting compensation for claim preparation time at 2024 rates.
Attachment 1	Certificate of Service (<i>see</i> attachment under separate cover)
Attachment 2	Time Sheet Records with Allocation of Hours by Issue
Attachment 3	Invoices for expert James Wilson
Attachment 4	Professional background for attorney Michael Raykher

D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments

Item	Reason
[1] Disallowances	<p>SBUA's efforts from 1/5/2024 – 5/1/2024 do not meet the substantial contribution standards set forth in Section 1802(j) and Section 1802.5, as this work occurred prior to the commencement of this proceeding and did not contribute to the final decision. Therefore, the following hours are disallowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson 2024: 3.5 • Birkelund 2024: 8.25

Item	Reason
	<p>The following efforts from 11/4/2024 – 12/6/2024 occurred after SBUA’s last filing in the docket of this proceeding. These activities consisted primarily of review of various documents without any further substantive contribution, and did not contribute to the decision-making process. Therefore, the following hours are disallowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birkelund 2024: 4 <p>The following timesheet entries listed in Mr. Birkelund’s 2024 hours, totaling 2.5 hours, did not contribute to the decision-making process and are therefore disallowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7/17/24: Rev PG&E notice of ex parte. (0.25) • 7/26/24: Rev PG&E Ex Parte Notice re RA Benchmarks remaining in scope of proceeding. (0.25) • 9/17/24: Confer w expert re no need to file rebuttal test. (0.25) • 9/18/24: Rev ALJ note on EH scheduled Oct 2-3. (0.25) • 9/18/24: Confer w expert re EH. (0.25) • 9/23/24: Rev ALJ notice of EHs (0.25) • 9/30/24: Rev ALJ ruling removing EH. (0.25) • 10/3/24: Emails w parties re extension for Fall Update. (0.25) • 10/4/24: Rev PG&E email to ALJ re Fall Update Schedule. (0.25) • 10/15/24: Rev ALJ ruling granting extension. (0.25) <p>With the disallowances noted here, the following are the new hourly totals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson 2024: 40 • Birkelund 2024: 57.75
[2] Disallowances of Raykher’s Hours	<p>SBUA’s efforts from 1/5/2024 – 5/1/2024 do not meet the substantial contribution standards set forth in Section 1802(j) or Section 1802.5 as this work occurred prior to the commencement of this proceeding and did not contribute to the final decision. Therefore, Raykher’s 8.7 hours of work during this period are disallowed.</p>
[3] Lack of Substantial Contribution	<p>We find SBUA’s claimed hours to be excessive when viewed in the context of the overall record of this proceeding. While some of these efforts were helpful, the number of hours claimed is excessive relative to their impact. Excessive is when the Commission determines that the time claimed is disproportionate to the reasonable amount of effort required for that contribution. The Commission compensates efficient effort that contributes to the proceeding’s outcomes; however, the Commission also disallows inefficient participation that is not contributory to the underlying issues.</p> <p>Given the volume of timesheet entries and the limited nature of SBUA’s contribution, we apply percentile deductions to SBUA’s hours to adjust their compensation to reflect their limited contributions to D.24-12-038. We remind</p>

Item	Reason
	<p>SBUA, per the Intervenor Compensation Program Guide at p. 21, the Commission compensates “productive, effective and efficient” efforts that contribute to the proceeding’s outcomes.</p> <p>As noted above, SBUA’s contribution to D.24-12-038 was limited. We apply a 75% deduction to the following hours labeled as Issue 1: “Sales Forecast and Methodology” as they are deemed excessive and unproductive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birkelund 2024: 16.5 • Wilson 2024: 24 <p>As noted above, SBUA’s contribution to D.24-12-038 was limited. We apply a 75% deduction to the following hours labeled as Issue 2: “Discovery, Data Analysis” as they are deemed excessive and unproductive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson 2024: 15 • Birkelund 2024: 14.75 <p>With the disallowances noted here and [1], the following are the new hourly totals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wilson 2024: 10.75 • Birkelund 2024: 34.3125
[4] Wilson Hourly Rate	<p>SBUA confirmed that James Wilson is a consultant in Part III.A(b).</p> <p>Pursuant to Commission policy, the rate requested by an intervenor must not exceed the rate billed to that intervenor by any outside consultant it hires, even if the consultant’s billed rate is below the floor for a given experience level. Per the IComp Program Guide at 24, the Commission may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§ 1804(d)).</p> <p>SBUA has confirmed that it paid James Wilson \$345 per hour for work in this proceeding in 2024. We find \$345 an hour reasonable and adopt it here.</p> <p>The award determined herein for the consultant’s contribution in this proceeding shall be paid in full to the consultant, and no portion of this part of the award shall be kept by the intervenor. Additionally, the rates approved here are specific to work in this proceeding and the contract terms between the consultant and intervenor, as they are established in accordance with the Commission’s policy on consultant compensation.</p> <p>We reiterate that it is the responsibility of the intervenor to be forthcoming about engaging consultants, to adhere to the Commission’s policy on compensation for consultant fees, and to provide the appropriate documentation with the initial claim to ensure efficient processing and thus avoid the need for the Commission to request supplemental documentation.</p>
[5] Michael Raykher	<p>Since Raykher did not earn any compensable hours, we will not establish a 2024 rate for him at this time.</p>

Item	Reason
Hourly Rate	
[6] James Birkelund Hourly Rate	<p>SBUA has confirmed that James Birkelund is a consultant in Part III.A(b). Although SBUA filed supplemental documentation on 1/30/2025 in R.21-03-010, the Commission requested the relevant supplemental documentation to be filed as a part of the official record of this proceeding. In response, SBUA filed supplemental documentation on 3/28/2025, detailing the consultant agreement between SBUA and E&E Law Corporation for all its representation before the Commission covering various proceedings.</p> <p>Pursuant to Commission policy, the rate requested by an intervenor must not exceed the rate billed to that intervenor by any outside consultant it hires, even if the consultant's billed rate is below the floor for a given experience level. Per the IComp Program Guide at 24, the Commission may audit the records and books of the intervenors to the extent necessary to verify the basis for the award (§ 1804(d)).</p> <p>SBUA has confirmed that per the terms of their contract, Birkelund is a consultant hired on a contingency basis, meaning that he has agreed to defer his consulting fees contingent upon receipt of this Intervenor Compensation award.</p> <p>Given this contingency, we utilize the reasonable rates established by Resolution ALJ-393 based on Birkelund's experience for work in this proceeding.</p> <p>Given the 2024 Legal Director - IV rate range is \$545.91 to \$860.03 with a median of \$699.57, we find the requested 2024 hourly rate of \$800 to be reasonable and we apply it here.</p> <p>The award determined herein for the consultant's contribution in this proceeding shall be paid in full to the consultant, and no portion of this part of the award shall be kept by the intervenor. Additionally, the rates approved here are specific to work in this proceeding and the contract terms between the consultant and intervenor, as they are established in accordance with the Commission's policy on consultant compensation, and the understanding that the consultant has not billed or collected full compensation for the work performed until the final award is given.</p> <p>We reiterate that it is the responsibility of the intervenor to be forthcoming about engaging consultants, to adhere to the Commission's policy on compensation for consultant fees, and to provide the appropriate documentation with the initial claim to ensure efficient processing and thus avoid the need for the Commission to request supplemental documentation.</p>

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 (<i>see</i> Rule 14.6(c)(6))?	No
--	----

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Small Business Utility Advocates has made a substantial contribution to D.24-12-038.
2. The requested hourly rates for Small Business Utility Advocates' representatives 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 \$35,658.75.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

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

ORDER

1. Small Business Utility Advocates is awarded \$35,658.75.
2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric Company shall pay Small Business Utility Advocates the total award. 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 May 4, 2025, the 75th day after the filing of Small Business Utility Advocates' request, and continuing until full payment is made.
3. The comment period for today's decision is not waived.
4. Application 24-05-009 is closed.

This decision is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.

APPENDIX

Compensation Decision Summary Information

Compensation Decision:		Modifies Decision?	No
Contribution Decision(s):	D2412038		
Proceeding(s):	R2405009		
Author:	ALJ Elizabeth Fox		
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Company		

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Date Claim Filed	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Small Business Utility Advocates	Feb. 18, 2025	\$82,031.50	\$35,658.75	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
James	Wilson	Expert ⁷	\$345	2024	\$345
Michael	Raykher	Attorney ⁸	\$520	2024	\$0 ⁹
James	Birkelund	General Counsel ¹⁰	\$800	2024	\$800

(END OF APPENDIX)

⁷ Consultant to SBUA.

⁸ Consultant to SBUA.

⁹ Since no hours were awarded to Michael Raykher, we will not adopt a 2024 rate at this time.

¹⁰ Consultant to SBUA.