



STATE OF CALIFORNIA

GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor

**PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

**FILED**

04/10/26

01:15 PM

C2503004

April 10, 2026

**Agenda ID #24134**  
**Adjudicatory**

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN CASE 25-03-004:

This is the proposed decision of Administrative Law Judge Debbie Chiv. 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 May 14, 2026 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](mailto:icompcoordinator@cpuc.ca.gov).

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE

Michelle Cooke

Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC:nd3

Attachment

Decision PROPOSED DECISION OF ALJ CHIV (Mailed 4/10/2026)**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Hansen Surfboards, Inc.,

Complainant,

vs.

San Diego Gas &amp; Electric Company (U902E),

Defendant.

Case 25-03-004

**DECISION ON INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM OF  
HANSEN SURFBOARDS, INC.**

<b>Intervenor:</b> Hansen Surfboards, Inc.	<b>For contribution to Decision (D.) 25-10-010</b>
<b>Claimed:</b> \$14,440	<b>Awarded:</b> \$0.00
<b>Assigned Commissioner:</b> Matthew Baker	<b>Assigned ALJ:</b> Debbie Chiv

**PART I: PROCEDURAL ISSUES**

<b>A. Brief description of Decision:</b>	D.25-10-010 approves the settlement between Hansen Surfboards, Inc. ("Hansen") and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) and dismisses Complaint Case C.25-03-004. Under the settlement approved in D.25-10-010, SDG&E agreed to rebill Hansen under the Schedule DG-R tariff retroactive to August 12, 2023, consistent with Hansen's complaint and the parties' joint motion to terminate the proceeding. The decision found the settlement reasonable, consistent with law, and in the public interest, and closed the proceeding. The resolution and decision resulted from Hansen's substantial contribution through its filings and the advocacy of Craig A. Sherman, APC.
--	---

**B. Intervenor must satisfy intervenor compensation requirements set forth in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812<sup>1</sup>:**

	<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>CPUC Verification</b>
<b>Timely filing of notice of intent to claim compensation (NOI) (§ 1804(a)):</b>		
1. Date of Prehearing Conference:	May 27, 2025	Verified
2. Other specified date for NOI:	Not applicable.	Verified
3. Date NOI filed:	June 25, 2025	Verified
4. Was the NOI timely filed?	Yes.	Verified
<b>Showing of eligible customer status (§ 1802(b)) or eligible local government entity status (§§ 1802(d), 1802.4):</b>		
5. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Not applicable.	Verified
6. Date of ALJ ruling:	Not applicable.	Verified
7. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Not applicable.	The determination is made in this decision.
8. Has the Intervenor demonstrated customer status or eligible government entity status?  Yes, as a Category 1 customer under PUC § 1802, subd. (b)(1). (See utility bills and Hansen NOI Attachment 2, filed June 25, 2025.)		The Intervenor has not demonstrated eligibility to claim intervenor compensation. See CPUC's discussion in Section (C), below.
<b>Showing of "significant financial hardship" (§ 1802(h) or § 1803.1(b)):</b>		
9. Based on ALJ ruling issued in proceeding number:	Not applicable.	Verified
10. Date of ALJ ruling:	Not applicable.	Verified
11. Based on another CPUC determination (specify):	Not applicable.	The determination is made in this decision.
12. Has the Intervenor demonstrated significant financial hardship?  Yes, based on the attached Declarations of Josh Hansen, Craig A. Sherman, and Exhibits thereto.		The Intervenor has not demonstrated eligibility to claim intervenor compensation. See CPUC's discussion in Section (C), below.

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to California Public Utilities Code unless indicated otherwise.

	Intervenor	CPUC Verification
<b>Timely request for compensation (§ 1804(c)):</b>		
13. Identify Final Decision:	D.25-10-010, Decision Approving Settlement and Dismissing Complaint, in Case C.25-03-004 (Hansen Surfboards, Inc. v. San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U902E)).	Verified
14. Date of issuance of Final Order or Decision:	October 15, 2025.	Verified
15. File date of compensation request:	December 8, 2025.	Verified
16. Was the request for compensation timely?  Yes. This request for intervenor compensation is filed within 60 days of the issuance of Decision (D.) 25-10-010, as required by PUC § 1804, subd. (c) and Rule 17.3 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure.		Yes

**C. Additional Comments on Part I:**

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
5-12		<p><b>A. Procedural Background</b></p> <p>Hansen is a complainant (Complainant) in this proceeding. After filing the complaint, Hansen filed a Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation (NOI). The NOI did not request a ruling and deferred a showing of the “financial hardship” element of eligibility for compensation to the subject claim.<sup>2</sup></p>
5-8		<p><b>B. Customer Status</b></p> <p>Eligibility to claim compensation consists of two elements: the applicable customer status and significant financial hardship. Hansen claims a Category 1 customer status. This category is defined in Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b)(1)(A) as</p>

<sup>2</sup> See Pub. Util. Code §§ 1802(h) and 1804(a)(2)(B) and (C), and Complainant’s NOI filed on June 25, 2025, at 6-7.

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
		<p>[a] participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of any electrical, gas, telephone, telegraph, or water corporation that is subject to the jurisdiction of the commission.</p> <p>The Commission explains that a Category 1 customer</p> <p>... is an actual customer who represents more than his own narrow self-interest; a self-appointed representative.<sup>3</sup> (D.98-04-059 at 30.)</p> <p>The NOI describes Complainant as a small commercial customer of SDG&amp;E, holding accounts for multiple meters at its property, including a net generation output meter (NGOM) associated with a solar system under a Virtual Net Energy Metering (VNEM) setup. The complaint alleged that SDG&amp;E refused to apply the Distributed Generation Renewable (DG-R) tariff despite Hansen's qualifications. According to the NOI, at 2, although Complainant's participation</p> <p>... arises from its own billing dispute, the issues it raises directly affect similarly situated customers across SDG&amp;E's service territory of small businesses that own their property, host multi-meter solar installations and rely on predictable application of tariff rules like DG-R. CPUC resolution of this complaint will impact not only Hansen but also the broader community of commercial customers that implement solar generation.</p> <p>This statement presumes that the complaint's impact on the community constitutes an element of the customer status. However, eligibility under § 1802(b)(1)(A) requires more than a potential impact of the proceeding on the ratepayers: the customer must be a "participant representing consumers" and more than its "own narrow self-interest." Facts of this case do not portray Hansen as such participant.</p> <p>D.98-04-059, a seminal decision on the Commission's Intervenor Compensation Program, discusses the relevant criteria in the case of <i>Milton Grinstead v. Pacific Gas and Electric Co.</i> (C.92-09-024), involving complaint against Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&amp;E) for overcharges. The Commission ruled in Mr. Grinstead's</p>

<sup>3</sup> D.98-04-059, 1998 Cal. PUC LEXIS 429, \*48.

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
		<p>favor but rejected his request for compensation.<sup>4</sup> As D.98-04-059 points out, in the Grinstead, the Commission</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">... reviewed the statute and Legislative intent and concluded that an individual cannot be an “intervenor” for the purpose of Article 5 of the Public Utilities Code “in a case which he has initiated and which is being prosecuted to vindicate a personal grievance or in quest of a personal remedy.” (D.95-10-050 at p. 4 ...).) The Commission concluded that a “complainant acting solely in an individual capacity and seeking a personal remedy is not entitled to claim compensation as an intervenor in a Commission proceeding...<sup>5</sup></p> <p>D.98-04-059 recommends D.95-10-050 as the ultimate guidance on determining complainant’s eligibility for compensation. The Commission has consistently applied this guidance. The instructions for intervenors published on its website note, specifically, that “Complainants in complaint proceedings are generally not eligible for intervenor compensation.”<sup>6</sup></p> <p>For example, in the case of <i>Michael Coltan v. Pacific Gas &amp; Electric Company</i> (C.18-02-003) the Commission observes that while the complainant</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">made many broad claims of PG&amp;E’s violations, Mr. Coltan’s requested relief was for himself, without consideration or reference to relief to other residential ... customers.<sup>7</sup></p> <p>The Commission further distinguishes the Coltan case from the cases where complainants were eligible and denies Mr. Coltan’s claim.<sup>8</sup> In another case, the Commission instructs the complainant that it “must</p>

<sup>4</sup> D.95-10-050, 1995 Cal. PUC LEXIS 906 \*; 62 CPUC2d 202.

<sup>5</sup> D.98-04-059, 1998 Cal. PUC LEXIS 429, \*36.

<sup>6</sup> Intervenor Compensation Guide at 9 published at [www.cpuc.ca.gov](https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/i-comp-materials/updated-icomp-program-guide-april-2017.pdf) (<https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/i-comp-materials/updated-icomp-program-guide-april-2017.pdf>).

<sup>7</sup> D.19-11-006, at 23.

<sup>8</sup> D.19-11-006, at 24-25.

#	Intervenor's Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
		<p>show that any issue on which it claims to have made substantial contribution did not seek or result in personal remedy.”<sup>9</sup></p> <p>In the case at hand, the record, including the complaint, the NOI, the motion to settle, and the subject claim, does not demonstrate that any issue on which Hansen claims to have made substantial contribution “did not seek or result in personal remedy.” Hansen filed the complaint as an individual utility customer alleging that Defendant refused to properly bill Complainant under the DG-R tariff rate. The complaint sought the Commission’s determination that Complainant’s solar system qualified for DG-R tariff tier, the utility’s compliance with D.11-07-031 and Resolution E-448 and the adjustment of Defendant’s charges to Complainant, to reflect the tariff rate. Defendant eventually conceded to the “basic premise of the complaint – that since August 9, 2023, Hansen’s virtual solar system has been eligible for SDG&amp;E tariff schedule DG-R.”<sup>10</sup></p>
9-12		<p><b>C. Significant Financial Hardship</b></p> <p>Pursuant to § 1802(h)), a Category I customer demonstrates financial hardship by showing that it “cannot afford, without undue hardship, to pay the costs of effective participation.” The demonstration of the “undue hardship” involves certain financial information,<sup>11</sup> which the claimant has not produced. Nor has it demonstrated how the litigation affected the business’s profitability (see, the NOI at 6-7).</p> <p>However, because this decision finds that Hansen has not demonstrated a “customer status” under § 1802(b), in general, and § 1802(b)(A) as a Category 1 customer, more specifically, we do not consider whether Hansen’s showing of financial hardship is complete or valid and what additional information must be produced to help us assess the “undue hardship” component of the financial hardship.</p>
		<p><b>D. Conclusion</b></p>

<sup>9</sup> Administrative Law Judge’s Ruling on Acton Town Council’s (Acton) Amended Notice of Intent to Claim Intervenor Compensation, issued on September 25, 2013, at 9 (C.12-09-002). See D.18-03-031, at 2 and 15, affirming the September 25, 2013 ruling and granting Acton’s compensation claim.

<sup>10</sup> See D.25-10-010 at 3, and Joint Motion of SDG&E and Hansen to settle and terminate proceeding, filed on July 24, 2025, at 2.

<sup>11</sup> D.98-04-059, 1998 Cal. PUC LEXIS, 429, \*61-62.

#	Intervenor’s Comment(s)	CPUC Discussion
		When, like in this case, “the proceeding is a complaint and the party is not an intervenor, but is rather the complainant pursuing a purely personal claim not representative of any public interests and not for the benefit of a class of customers.” <sup>12</sup> the complainant’s eligibility to claim compensation must be denied. Therefore, this decision denies Hansen’s claim.

**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><b>1. Issue 1 – Hansen contributed to the proper tariff classification and corrective rebilling of Hansen’s virtual solar system as a DG-R customer-generator under D.11-07-031, Resolution E-4481, and SDG&amp;E Tariff Rule 18C.</b></p>	<p>Hansen initiated this proceeding and developed the factual and legal record showing that its virtual solar system qualifies for SDG&amp;E’s Distributed Generation Renewable (DG-R) tariff as a customer-generator beginning August 9, 2023. Through the Complaint and subsequent communications and negotiations, Hansen demonstrated that its participation in SDG&amp;E’s VNEM program (now called Schedule NEM-V-ST), its multi-meter configuration, and its single service delivery point satisfy the eligibility criteria established in Decision 11-07-031 and Resolution E-4481. Hansen’s advocacy led SDG&amp;E to concede “the basic premise of the complaint – that since August 9, 2023, Hansen’s virtual solar system has been eligible for SDG&amp;E tariff schedule DG-R,” (Decision 25-10-010 at p. 3, Sec. 3.) Hansen further confirmed Hansen’s tariff eligibility under Schedule DG-R pursuant to SDG&amp;E Tariff Rule 18C,</p>	<p>Because this decision has determined that Hansen is not eligible to claim intervenor compensation, it does not consider Hansen’s claims of substantial contribution to the final decision.</p>

<sup>12</sup> D.98-04-059, 1998 Cal. PUC LEXIS, 429, \*34, referring to D.95-10-050, as affirmed on rehearing by D.96-11-063, denying complainant Grinstead’s claim for compensation.

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	Adjustment of Bills for Billing Errors with SDG&E agreeing to rebill from August 12, 2023, because that was the first day of the billing cycle commencing after Hansen’s tariff eligibility. (Decision 25-10-010 at p. 3, Sec. 3.)	
<p><b>2. Issue 2 – Hansen contributed to the Commission’s resolution of how a single service delivery point governs tariff treatment of Hansen’s NEM-V-ST accounts served by a DG-R-eligible generator.</b></p>	<p>Hansen’s Complaint and subsequent advocacy contributed to the finding that, for customers with multiple meters served by a single service delivery point, Schedule NEM-V-ST governs the allocation of generation credits, but that consumption from the grid is billed under a separate, appropriate tariff such as DG-R where the customer meets the eligibility criteria in Decision 11-07-031 and Resolution E-4481. Decision 11-07-031 and Resolution E-4481 established eligibility principles for virtual net-metered customer-generators and the treatment of common service delivery points. By tying Hansen’s specific configuration (virtual net energy metering, multiple meters, and a single service delivery point) to those authorities, Hansen supplied the Commission and SDG&amp;E with a clear, operational framework for treating similarly situated NEM-V-ST customers that share a single service delivery point. Decision 25-10-010 describes the dispute and Hansen’s contention that its solar system qualifies for DG-R as a customer-generator since August 9, 2023, and SDG&amp;E’s position that Hansen was on NEM-V-ST and billed under Schedule AL-TOU. (Decision 25-10-010 at p. 2, Sec. 2.) The Commission’s discussion and Statements of Law at page 4, Section 4 of Decision 25-10-010 confirms this understanding. By finding that the settlement is consistent with applicable law and SDG&amp;E’s published tariffs, the</p>	<p>Because this decision has determined that Hansen is not eligible to claim intervenor compensation, it does not consider Hansen’s claims of substantial contribution to the final decision.</p>

Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	Specific References to Intervenor’s Claimed Contribution(s)	CPUC Discussion
	<p>Commission agreed that, even where multiple meters are served by a single service delivery point behind a NGOM, Schedule NEM-V-ST governs only the allocation of generation credits, and the associated consumption from the grid is not separately billed under different tariffs for each meter but is instead billed under a single, appropriate tariff such as DG-R for which the customer qualifies. (Decision 25-10-010 at p. 4, Sect. 4.)</p>	
<p><b>3. Issue 3 – Hansen contributed to the efficient, settlement-based resolution of the proceeding consistent with Rule 12.1(d) and the Commission’s policy favoring settlement that is in the public interest.</b></p>	<p>By prosecuting the Complaint and then working with SDG&amp;E to negotiate and present a comprehensive settlement and joint motion to terminate the proceeding, Hansen contributed to the Commission’s resolution of this case through an uncontested settlement rather than continued litigation. (Decision 25-10-010 at p. 4, Sec. 4; Ordering Paragraph 1.) Hansen’s participation in settlement discussions, development of a structured remedial framework (including DG-R eligibility and rebilling under SDG&amp;E tariff rule 18C), and agreement to jointly move for approval of the settlement enabled the Commission to avoid unnecessary hearings, testimony, and further briefing, and instead decide the case on the basis of the settlement presented in Section 3 of Decision 25-10-010. In Decision 25-10-010, the Commission expressly finds under of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, Rule 12.1(d) that the settlement is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with law, and in the public interest because it resolves all issues between the parties, avoids the risks, burdens, and expense of further litigation, and conserves Commission resources.</p>	<p>Because this decision has determined that Hansen is not eligible to claim intervenor compensation, it does not consider Hansen’s claims of substantial contribution to the final decision.</p>

<b>Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>Specific References to Intervenor's Claimed Contribution(s)</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
	(Decision 25-10-010 at pp. 3-4. Secs. 3-4.) These findings show that the Commission accepted Hansen's position that a negotiated settlement embodying the DG-R eligibility was an appropriate and efficient way to resolve the proceeding, and was in the public interest, thereby constituting a substantial contribution to the proceedings.	

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

	<b>Intervenor's Assertion</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
<b>a. Was the Public Advocate's Office of the Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) a party to the proceeding?<sup>13</sup></b>	No.	Verified
<b>b. Were there other parties to the proceeding with positions similar to yours?</b>	No.	Verified
<b>c. If so, provide name of other parties:</b>  Not Applicable.		Verified
<b>d. Intervenor's claim of non-duplication:</b>  Hansen was the sole complainant and participated as the only non-utility party in this proceeding. There was no duplication of advocacy, as Hansen's efforts were unique and essential to the resolution of the tariff dispute and recognition that a Schedule NEM-V-ST multi-meter commercial customer served by a single Service Delivery Point qualifies under the DG-R tariff.		Verified

**C. Additional Comments on Part II:**

<b>#</b>	<b>Intervenor's Comment</b>	<b>CPUC Discussion</b>
1	Although the proceeding was resolved through a settlement rather than a litigated merits decision, Hansen's complaint and legal arguments directly led to SDG&E conceding Hansen's DG-R	Noted. However, because this decision has

<sup>13</sup> 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.

#	Intervenor’s Comment	CPUC Discussion
	<p>eligibility and to the Commission’s approval of the settlement in D.25-10-010. Under CPUC precedent compensation is appropriate where the intervenor’s advocacy substantially contributed to a settlement or resolution adopted by the Commission. (<i>See</i> D.02-11-070 [“we have awarded compensation to parties who participated in settlements when we find that party’s contribution to our order was substantial, whether or not the party requesting compensation supported an agreement adopted by the Commission”], citing D.98-04-059, memo. at 43; D.95-08-024, D.95-07-035, D.89-03-063, and D.89-09-103.)</p>	<p>determined that Hansen is not eligible to claim intervenor compensation, it does not consider the issues of Hansen’s substantial contribution.</p>

**PART III: REASONABLENESS OF REQUESTED COMPENSATION**  
*(Completed by Intervenor except where indicated)*

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

	CPUC Discussion
<p><b>a. Intervenor’s claim of cost reasonableness:</b></p> <p>Hansen is not claiming any direct costs or out-of-pocket expenses. All amounts requested are for attorneys’ fees and claim preparation.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p><b>b. Reasonableness of hours claimed:</b></p> <p>The hours claimed were reasonably and efficiently spent on necessary phases of advocacy that directly contributed to the resolution of the proceeding, as further elaborated in the attached Declaration of Craig A. Sherman. Counsel’s work included initial client consultation and case evaluation, including meetings with Hansen’s solar consultant and review of technical configuration to assess DG-R and Schedule NEM-V-ST eligibility; preparation of a detailed pre-litigation demand letter; analysis of SDG&amp;E’s response and legal evaluation of tariff language. Hansen’s counsel further drafted and filed the formal CPUC complaint, supported by legal and factual documentation; participated in procedural phases, including preparation for the prehearing conference and filing of the Notice of Intent (NOI). Counsel further met and conferred with SDG&amp;E and engaged in settlement discussions that resulted in a complete and early settlement; and presenting this intervenor compensation request. The hours claimed exclude duplicative or administrative time and reflect a focused legal effort by a solo practitioner and his contracted associate attorney and paralegal. No time is claimed for travel or costs. Given the complexity of the tariff and procedural issues involved and the success of</p>	<p>Because this decision has determined that Hansen is not eligible to claim intervenor compensation, it does not consider the reasonableness of the claimant’s costs, hours of work and hourly rates.</p>

	CPUC Discussion
the advocacy of Hansen’s counsel, the hours claimed are both reasonable and proportionate.	
<p><b>c. Allocation of hours by issue:</b></p> <p>Hansen estimated the following for the NOI:                      Issue Time Budget                      Issue #1: Adequacy of the Complaint 15%, \$4,200.00                      Issue #2: Ripeness for Adjudication, 15%, \$4,200.00                      Issue #3: DG-R Tariff Qualification, 45%, \$12,600.00                      Issue #4: Scope of Relief, 25%, \$7,000.00                      TOTAL 100% \$28,000.00</p> <p>Because of the nature of the settlement and joint motion to terminate, the time spent was on Issues #3 and #4 as follows and the total amount of time is less than the estimate for Issues #3 and #4, at a total of \$14,440.</p> <p>Tariff Interpretation and DG-R Qualification (Schedule NEM-V-ST &amp; DG-R) approx. 85%                      Legal analysis supporting DG-R qualification, including interpretation of CPUC Decision 11-07-031 and Resolution E-4481 as it applies to the issues in this proceeding.                      Procedural Resolution (Settlement &amp; Motion) approx. 15%                      Time spent on meet-and-confer efforts, settlement negotiation, and preparing this compensation request.</p>	Noted

**B. Specific Claim:\***

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
ATTORNEY, EXPERT, AND ADVOCATE FEES								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total	Hours	Rate	Total
Craig A. Sherman	2024-2025	14.9	\$600.00	30+ years experience in CEQA and administrative law; see NOI & Sherman Decl. thereto.	\$8,940	\$0.00 [1]	\$0.00 [2]	\$0.00

CLAIMED						CPUC AWARD		
Jeffrey D. Anson	2024-2025	22	\$200.00	Admitted 2025; 10+ years supervised legal work	\$4,400	\$0.00 [1]	\$0.00 [2]	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal: \$13,340.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>		
OTHER FEES								
Describe here what OTHER HOURLY FEES you are Claiming (paralegal, travel **, etc.):								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total	Hours	Rate	Total
[Person 1]								
<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>		
INTERVENOR COMPENSATION CLAIM PREPARATION**								
Item	Year	Hours	Rate	Basis for Rate*	Total	Hours	Rate	Total
Craig A. Sherman	2024-2025	2	\$300.00 (1/2 normal hourly)	30+ years experience in CEQA and administrative law; see NOI & Sherman Decl. thereto.	\$600	\$0.00 [1]	\$0.00 [2]	\$0.00
Jeffrey D. Anson	2024-2025	5	\$100 (1/2 normal hourly)	Admitted 2025; 10+ years supervised legal work	\$500	\$0.00 [1]	\$0.00 [2]	\$0.00
<b>Subtotal: \$1,100.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>		
COSTS								
#	Item	Detail			Amount	Amount		
1.		None requested.						
<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>						<b>Subtotal: \$0.00</b>		
<b>TOTAL REQUEST: \$14,440</b>						<b>TOTAL AWARD: \$0.00</b>		
<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>								

CLAIMED			CPUC AWARD
**Travel and Reasonable Claim preparation time are typically compensated at ½ of preparer’s normal hourly rate			
ATTORNEY INFORMATION			
Attorney	Date Admitted to CA BAR <sup>14</sup>	Member Number	Actions Affecting Eligibility (Yes/No?) If “Yes”, attach explanation
Craig A. Sherman	June 13, 1994	171224	No
Jeffrey D. Anson	January 15, 2025	360243	No

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

Attachment or Comment #	Description/Comment
1	Certificate of Service
2	Declaration of Craig A. Sherman
3	Declaration of Josh Hansen

**D. CPUC Comments, Disallowances, and Adjustments**

Item	Reason
[1]	The Commission denies this intervenor compensation claim in its entirety for the claimant’s failure to demonstrate eligibility to claim intervenor compensation, as set forth in Part I(C).
[2]	Because this claim is denied this decision does not set hourly rates for the claimant’s representatives.

**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))**

<b>A. Opposition: Did any party oppose the Claim?</b>	No
<b>B. Comment Period: Was the 30-day comment period waived (see Rule 14.6(c)(6))?</b>	No

<sup>14</sup> This information may be obtained through the State Bar of California’s website at <http://members.calbar.ca.gov/fal/MemberSearch/QuickSearch>.

If not:

Party	Comment	CPUC Discussion

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Hansen Surfboards, Inc., has not demonstrated customer status as required under Public Utilities Code § 1802(b)(1) as set forth in Part I (C) of this decision.

**CONCLUSION OF LAW**

1. The Claim fails to satisfy the requirements of Pub. Util. Code § 1802(b) and must be denied in its entirety, as set forth in Parts I (C) and III (D).

**ORDER**

1. Hansen Surfboards, Inc.’s request for intervenor compensation is denied for the reasons set forth in Part I (C) and III (D), above.
2. The comment period for today’s decision is not waived.
3. Case 25-03-004 is closed.

This decision is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.

**APPENDIX****Compensation Decision Summary Information**

<b>Compensation Decision:</b>		<b>Modifies Decision?</b>	No
<b>Contribution Decision(s):</b>	D2510010		
<b>Proceeding(s):</b>	C2503004		
<b>Author:</b>	ALJ Chiv		
<b>Payer(s):</b>	Not applicable		

**Intervenor Information**

<b>Intervenor</b>	<b>Date Claim Filed</b>	<b>Amount Requested</b>	<b>Amount Awarded</b>	<b>Multiplier?</b>	<b>Reason Change/ Disallowance</b>
Hansen Surfboards, Inc.	December 8, 2025	\$14,440	\$0.00	N/A	Failure to establish eligibility as a "customer" pursuant to § 1802(b)(1).

**Hourly Fee Information**

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Attorney, Expert, or Advocate</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Year Hourly Fee Requested</b>	<b>Hourly Fee Adopted</b>
Craig A.	Sherman	Attorney	\$600	2024-2025	
Jeffrey D.	Anson	Attorney	\$200	2024-2025	

**(END OF APPENDIX)**